



International  
Labour  
Organization

► Evaluation Office



i-eval Discovery



## Protecting garment sector workers: occupational safety and health and income support in response to the COVID-19 pandemic

ILO DC/SYMBOL: GLO/20/20/MUL

Type of Evaluation: Project

Evaluation timing: Final

Evaluation nature: Independent

Project countries: Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Madagascar, Vietnam

P&B Outcome(s): P&B (2020-21) Policy Outcome 8 and Outcome 7 (7.2 in particular)

SDG(s): 1,3,8,10, 16 and 17

Date when the evaluation was completed by the evaluator: 30 June 2022

Date when evaluation was approved by EVAL: 23 September 2022

ILO Administrative Office: SOCPRO

ILO Technical Office(s): SOCPRO and LABADMIN/OSH (VZF)

Project duration: Sept. 2020 – March 2022

Donor and budget: BMZ, Germany. Budget: USD 17,180,095

Name of consultant(s): Lotta Nycander (team leader), Somith Sok, Meaza Nega Indah Budiani, Latsany Pakdisoth, Tran Thi Phuong Arafat Khan and Masy Andriamparanony (team members).

Name of Evaluation Manager: Yoshie Ichinohe and Naomi Asukai

Evaluation Office oversight: Naomi Asukai

Evaluation budget: US\$ 53,000

Key Words: Garment sector, COVID-19, social protection, cash transfer, income support, wage subsidy, occupational safety and health, small and medium-size enterprises

## Contents

<b>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>1 CONTEXT</b> .....	<b>13</b>
1.1 THE PROJECT – SOME BASIC FACTS .....	14
1.2 EVALUATION FRAMEWORK .....	16
<b>2 METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS</b> .....	<b>19</b>
2.1 METHODOLOGY .....	19
2.2 LIMITATIONS.....	20
<b>3 FINDINGS</b> .....	<b>21</b>
3.1 RELEVANCE AND VALIDITY OF DESIGN.....	21
3.2 COHERENCE.....	23
3.3 EFFECTIVENESS.....	23
3.4 EFFICIENCY OF RESOURCE USE .....	31
3.5 IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY .....	32
3.6 CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES.....	33
3.7 MONITORING AND EVALUATION .....	34
<b>4 CONCLUSIONS</b> .....	<b>35</b>
<b>5 RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	<b>38</b>
<b>6 LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES</b> .....	<b>40</b>
<b>ANNEX I. TERMS OF REFERENCE</b> .....	<b>41</b>
6.1 INTRODUCTION .....	42
6.2 PROJECT’S THEORY OF CHANGE.....	42
6.3 MANAGEMENT SET-UP .....	44
6.4 ALIGNMENT OF THE PROJECT WITH THE ILO’S STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK, THE SDGS AND THE COVID-19 CALL TO ACTION IN THE GLOBAL GARMENT INDUSTRY .....	45
6.5 PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION .....	46
6.6 EVALUATION PURPOSE, SCOPE AND CLIENTS.....	46
6.7 PURPOSE .....	46
6.8 SCOPE.....	47
6.9 CLIENTS.....	47
6.10 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS .....	48
6.11 EVALUATION QUESTIONS .....	48
6.12 EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY .....	51
6.13 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND CONFIDENTIALITY.....	54
6.14 QUALITY .....	55
6.15 MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS.....	55
6.16 EVALUATION TIMELINES AND DELIVERABLES .....	55
6.17 .....	57
6.18 EXPECTED STRUCTURE OF THE EVALUATION REPORT.....	57
6.19 ELIGIBILITY .....	58
6.20 ANNEX 1: RELEVANT ILO EVALUATION GUIDANCE .....	60
6.21 ANNEX 2: CURRENT STATUS OF THE INTERVENTION .....	61
<b>ANNEX II. SUMMARY OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES</b> .....	<b>64</b>
<b>ANNEX III. PROJECT FRAMEWORK IN 7 COUNTRIES</b> .....	<b>66</b>
<b>ANNEX IV. PPT PRESENTATION IN STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP</b> .....	<b>69</b>
<b>ANNEX V. EVALUATION MATRIX: SOURCES OF DATA &amp; METHODS</b> .....	<b>76</b>

ANNEX VI. LESSONS LEARNED & EMERGING GOOD PRACTICES .....	78
ANNEX VII. SCHEDULE OF EVALUATION'S ACTIVITIES WORK .....	83
ANNEX VIII. PERSONS PARTICIPATING IN INTERVIEWS, FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS & STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP .....	84
ANNEX IX. DOCUMENTS CONSULTED .....	93
ANNEX X. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS.....	95

**Tables**

Table 1. Summary of the expenditures of the cash transfer, including commitments, by country (as of 6 <sup>th</sup> June 2022).....	23
---	----

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ALGI	Association of Lao Garment Industries
APINDO	Ministry of Manpower, Indonesia Employer Association
BGMEA	Bangladesh Garment Manufacturers and Exporters Association
BKMEA	Bangladesh Knitwear Manufacturers and Exporters Association
BMZ	German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development/ Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung
COVID-19	Coronavirus Disease 2019
CTA	Chief Technical Adviser
DGTLS	General Directorate of Labour and Social Laws
DIFE	Department of Inspection for Factories and Establishments
DSST	Department of Workers' Social Security
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
FGG	Focus Group Discussions
GMAC	Garment Manufacturing Association in Cambodia
HIPIA	Hawassa Industrial Park Investors Association
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IPDC	Industrial Park Development Corporation
KII	Key Informant Interviews
LFA	Logical Framework Analysis
LSSO	Lao Social Security Organization
MTE	Mid Term Evaluation
MoLE	Ministry of Labour and Employment
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NEA	National Employment Agency
NSSF	National Social Security Fund
OECD- DAC	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development

OSH	Occupational Safety and Health
POESSA	Private Organizations Employees Social Security Agency
RMG	Ready-Made Garments
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SNNPR	Bureau of Labour and Social Affairs
SOCPRO	Social Protection Department
SPF	Social Protection Floors
TOC	Theory of Change
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
VCCI	Chamber of Commerce (Vietnam)
VGCL	General Confederation of Labour
VIHEMA	Viet Nam Health Environment Management Agency, Ministry of Health
VZF	Vision Zero Fund
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The evaluation team wishes to extend its sincere gratitude to all ILO tripartite partner organisations (government ministries, social partners and private sector actors) in the seven countries, who took part in the evaluation process through virtual and physical interviews and meetings; providing documents and data; and attending the evaluation stakeholder workshop.

Special thanks go to all the ILO staff at headquarters and all countries for their hard work and patience in arranging interview appointments and field visits for the evaluation team; sharing documents and data, answering questionnaires and communicating via -email - and who throughout the process did their utmost to ensure that the evaluation team had access to relevant documentation.

Lotta Nycander, team leader

Team members:

Somith Sok, Cambodia

Meaza Nega, Ethiopia

Indah Budiani, Indonesia

Latsany Pakdisoth, Lao PDR

Tran Thi Phuong, Vietnam

Arafat Khan, Bangladesh

Masy Andriamparanony, Madagascar

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Project titled Protecting garment sector workers: occupational safety and health and income support in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, herein referred to as “the Project”, has been implemented by the International Labour Organisation (ILO), specifically by SOCPRO and LABADMIN/OSH (VZF), in collaboration with Better Work of the ILO and partner organisations – under the Global Flagship Programme on Building Social Protection Floors for All. The latter is a flagship programme aiming at developing a comprehensive and coherent global programme on social protection.

The German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) has funded the Project with a total budget of €14.5 million (\$ 17,180,095). It has been in operation between 3 September 2020 and 30 June 2022, with three “no-cost” project extensions. The key stakeholders and partners are government ministries and national agencies, employers, business associations and workers organisations/unions.

The Project has responded to disruptions in the garments industry caused by the COVID-19 pandemic which created havoc in the industry and led to cancellations of orders, resulting in closing of factories and establishments, at least temporarily. The situation, as it developed after March 2020 greatly impacted a large number of garment sector workers - and their families - in the majority being women. Seven countries participated in the Project: Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Madagascar and Vietnam.

Two key components constituted the structure of the Project, namely preventing exposure to COVID-19/OSH<sup>1</sup> and ensuring that policies are in place for future epidemics; and providing income support to workers e.g. in the form of cash transfer.

**The immediate goals** are:

- 1) Strengthened safety and health protection measures, to ensure that employers, workers, and their families are protected from the direct and indirect health risks of COVID-19 and that workplaces are not negatively impacted by further outbreaks due to a poor management of OSH hazards; and
- 2) Cushioned enterprises against immediate employment and income losses and to compensation to workers for their loss of income due to COVID 19, through providing wage subsidies and other cash transfers; and to facilitate “back to normality” by maintaining an employment relationship.

The evaluation has taken place between the 1st week of January and 1st week of July 2022, with about two months “halt” in the evaluation process in April and May due to the fact that the Project unexpectedly was granted another “no-cost” extension to allow the Project to complete the remaining activities until 30 July.

## CONCLUSIONS

### Relevance and validity of design

The ILO has responded to the pandemic crisis in the garment industry with the intention to mitigate the negative effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in momentous disruptions of global and domestic supply chains. The majority of the stakeholders have appreciated the Project’s activities, and partnered with the ILO in the process of reaching the project outcomes.

The immediate outcomes relate to strengthening safety and health protection measures in relation to Covid-19 and build resilience/systems in view of future crisis; and cushioning enterprises against immediate employment and income losses and to compensation to workers for their loss of income due to the pandemic. The evaluation concludes that **the Project overall is relevant**, as regards its design, and that it is in line with the DWCP and ILO policy framework on OSH and social protection as well as national priorities. However, the way the cash transfer component eventually played out, it is

---

<sup>1</sup> The Vision Zero Fund (VZF) is implementing the OSH component, in close collaboration with the *Better Work Programme*.

concluded that it was **less relevant in a few countries in comparison with** the OSH component - for which the implementation was much more straightforward. The reason for this is that, generally, beneficiaries received funds very late; *not* at the time that they needed it the most. The situation demonstrates the necessity to thoroughly discuss similar projects' strategies at the design stage in close communication with the national constituents/stakeholders, so as to serve the beneficiaries in the best way in the future, even if the projects are to address crisis/covariate situations.

Only Cambodia and Madagascar had included the informal economy actors as beneficiaries in their "logframes". The project could have been more relevant if it had paid much more attention to garment workers in the *informal* economy.

The Project lacked a valid Theory of Change and has no Logical Framework Analysis matrix, but has listed outcomes, outputs and sub-outputs in a logical order.

### Coherence

Regarding internal coherence, concluded that coherence vis-à-vis national priorities in relation to Covid-19 was found in the majority of countries, while coherence with the Bangladesh situation seemed to be lacking. There clearly exist synergies and interlinkages between the Project under evaluation, and the major ILO interventions in the garment sector (BWP), as well as ILO's interventions in the field of OSH (VZF). Regarding external coherence with the work of other actors, the Project has made efforts to avoid duplication of effort.

### Effectiveness

Overall, the Project's effectiveness lies in the extent of the achievements and in reaching the outputs and outcomes towards the end. Much has been achieved with generally a high level of effort and with a medium-high level of effectiveness as regards the COVID-19/OSH component. Protection campaigns reached large numbers of people with relevant messages, in some countries also outside the garment sector, thus meeting the assessed needs of the beneficiaries for more awareness and knowledge.

A number of internal and external circumstances affected the outcomes. It is concluded that the implementation of the social protection (cash transfer/funds disbursement) component has a lower level of effectiveness in comparison with the OSH component. The reason for this is that in early June 2022 - after three "no-cost" project extensions - Cambodia had only been able to pay 4 000 out of the intended 18 000 plus female beneficiaries. In Bangladesh no SMEs or workers had yet received any payments in early June when the evaluation work was resumed. Towards the very end of June, just before the closing of the Project, it was reported that most of the payments finally were disbursed. Project staff stated that ILO's part "was done" as the funds had left the ILO and were transferred to BGMEA and BKMEA. Although DIFE is the agency that has been tasked to conduct random checking, Bangladesh (and Cambodia) need to conduct some form of independent follow-up to confirm that workers actually have received the funds – even if the Project officially closed 30<sup>th</sup> June.

It is also concluded that the result of policy level work is rather weak which may be attributed to the fact that all the project country frameworks had low level policy outputs (*sub*-outputs) under the OSH component (except two countries that had none) and that policy is not mentioned at all in the Social Protection component outputs. The evaluation has assessed that for an emergency-oriented project, which initially was meant to be one-year project, contributing to policy changes was probably not regarded as very realistic by the project designers.

The Project's efforts to integrate cross-cutting issues has been quite successful as gender equality issues, social dialogue, tripartism and labour standards have been important aspects in the *majority* of the countries – but *only a few countries, have addressed non-discrimination as regards people with disabilities*.

### Efficiency

The vast majority of the funds have been spend, and the budget delivery rate is now over 95%. However, the overall efficiency of the Project is assessed to be at medium level. Looking at the two components separately, the OSH/Covid protection component has been more efficient in terms of benefitting the



intended target groups, while the cash transfer component was problematic and only after three project extensions (at the end of June 2022) did the disbursements to the SMEs materialize in Bangladesh, and most of the remaining stipends were disbursed to female workers in Cambodia.

The approach of using staff who work fulltime in other ILO projects has kept costs down but several of the staff in the field have opined that this “undercutting of resources” approach should be revisited by the ILO as it may not actually lead to efficiency in terms of reaching the outcomes.

### Impact

The full impact of the Project cannot be known to date but it is clear that through e.g. webinars, social media campaigns and training, the Project has been able to spread information/messages about COVID-19, and ways to minimise the risks of spreading infections at the workplace, and in communities and at home too. The project has also imparted knowledge regarding behaviour change; and enhanced government officials insight in garment industry realities, as well as ILO key principles related to the world of work. Stakeholders learning how to utilize/apply information and communications technology (ICT) have played a big role in the Project’s efforts to reach large populations with messages. Some beneficiaries who received income support have confirmed its usefulness (examples from Lao and Indonesia) while others stated that the support didn’t bring any change to their lives as the amount was small, and they had to use their life time savings and money borrowed from friends during the pandemic. In a few cases beneficiary enterprises viewed the support as immense and that it had helped the business to flourish.

### Sustainability

The emergency/pilot nature of the Project and the need for rapid action, is most likely a reason that sustainability has not been of primary issue, neither in the eyes of the Project staff, nor in the eyes of the stakeholders. However, as the COVID prevention and protection activities have been closely linked to, or even part of, the VZF and Better Work programmes – there is a chance that some of the activities and/or learning will remain in the garment/industry sector and among the various actors.. The variations of income support (wage subsidy support/job retention, salary compensation, training stipends) are perceived as “one-off event” that will end when the project closes. The social protection approach of disbursing funds (cash transfer) to factories and workers have in some cases met with initial reluctance from stakeholders (e.g. employers and factories) and in a few countries it has been perceived as detrimental vis-à-vis the aim to develop sustainable national social protection (contributory) systems in the formal economy. However, the result of the Project’s awareness-raising and capacity building; mechanisms and work on developing eligibility criteria and various tools, e.g. guidelines for Labour Inspectors and factory managers, webinars, and apps, may very well be sustained and could come to use when/if new epidemics occur in the industry in the future.

### Monitoring and evaluation

It is concluded that overall M&E plans should be developed by all ILO projects as key strategic management instruments with information to users about monitoring questions and relevant data collection processes. Designing detailed LFA matrices providing the *basis* for operational and M&E plans is important for all ILO technical assistance projects.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The following are recommendations based on the findings in chapter 3 and conclusions in chapter 4:

### **Recommendation No 1.**

a) The **ILO should** ensure that multi-country/interregional technical cooperation projects, even emergency -oriented or pilot projects, have necessary key strategic and management tools such as an overall Theory of Change; and/or an overall Logical Framework Analysis matrix, and detailed Monitoring and Evaluation plans in each country – to enable strategic management and a smoother follow-up on results, benefitting both projects and evaluators;

b) The Project is a product of rapid action, with less than adequate participation of the national tripartite stakeholders in its design. The **ILO should** make sure that also emergency oriented projects follow the rule of involving/consulting with the relevant stakeholders at the very formulation stage.

c) When designing new similar projects, the **ILO should** ensure that garment workers in the *informal* economy also are targeted (in this Project, only Cambodia and Madagascar had included the informal economy actors as beneficiaries in their “logframes”).

d) If policy change/influence is crucial to the Project’s attainment of the overall (immediate) objectives or development objectives, the **ILO should** in the future emphasise the importance at the level of **outcomes** or immediate objectives - not at sub-output level.

The recommendation is directed to: ILO (SOCPRO), LABADMIN/OSH), VZF, BWP and donor agency.

*Timeframe: Immediate (or when new projects are being formulated); Priority: High; Level of resources: Low-Medium*

### **Recommendation No. 2**

The way the cash transfer component eventually played out it was found to be less relevant in a few countries, in comparison with the OSH component - for which the implementation was much more straightforward. In the future, the **ILO should** concentrate its technical cooperation and assistance efforts, in the field of social protection, on systems, policies, knowledge development and institutional change which are core mandate .The recommendation is directed to: ILO (SOCPRO).

*Timeframe: Immediate (or when new projects are being formulated); Priority: Medium; Level of resources: Medium*

### **Recommendation No. 3**

When designing new cash transfer interventions, the **ILO should** engage in cash transfer when the circumstances are straight forward and can be perceived to have a reasonable and realistic chance to reach the set objectives - in view of the complexities described by this evaluation. Discussions and consultations with key project stakeholders about strategies should be done at the *design* stage, so as to eventually serve the beneficiaries in the best way, even if the project is to be implemented under crisis/covariate conditions.

The recommendation is directed to ILO (SOCPRO).

*Timeframe: Immediate (or when new projects are being formulated); Priority: High ; Level of resources: Low-Medium*

### **Recommendation No. 4**

In future projects that have high complexities (as in the case of the income support/cash transfer) the **ILO should** ensure that a dedicated Project Coordinator/Manager, or Chief Technical Adviser, is posted in nearer proximity to the project countries (“field level as opposed to HQs”) as there is a lot to win in terms of physical closeness to country implementation, monitoring, and follow-up. The recommendation is directed to: ILO (SOCPRO), LABADMIN/OSH), VZF, BWP, donor agency (BMZ).

*Timeframe: Immediate (or when new projects are being formulated); Priority: Medium; Level of resources: High*

### **Recommendation No. 5**

The use of ICT, including apps ,have played a big role in reaching large populations with Covid-19/OSH protection/prevention and related messages, and actual training. As the pandemic is not likely to go away any time soon, the **ILO should**, in future projects make use of /build on video clips and webinars directed to factory owners/managers and workers - on how to avoid the spread of the virus in the workplace and at home too, and related OSH issues (notwithstanding difficulties with weak internet

connections in some areas). The recommendation is directed to: ILO (SOCPRO), LABADMIN/OSH, VZF, BWP.

*Timeframe: 6 months - 1 year; Priority: Medium; Level of resources: Low-Medium*

#### **Recommendation No. 6**

In this Project, sustainability efforts have not been a primary concern, as other activities were in the foreground. **ILO should** in future projects clarify the importance of sustaining the activities and make projects develop realistic sustainability plans, in close cooperation with the constituents and partners in which *national stakeholders* are encouraged to take the bulk of responsibility for the continuation of activities or upholding systems created. The recommendation is directed to ILO (SOCPRO), LABADMIN/OSH), VZF, BWP, ILO constituents.

*Timeframe: 6 months-1 year; Priority: Medium, Level of resources: Medium-High*

#### **Recommendation No. 7**

The **ILO should** make sure that successful activities in the Project related to the COVID-19 protection/prevention campaigns; and raising awareness through media are integrated and sustained even after the closing of the garment sector protection project. The recommendation is directed to: ILO (LABADMIN/OSH), ILO (SOCPRO), VZF, BWP and ILO constituents.

*Timeframe: Immediate-6 months- , Priority: High, Level of resources: Low*

#### **Recommendation No. 8**

As Bangladesh and Cambodia were very late in disbursing the funds of the income support/social protection, the **ILO should** conduct independent and rapid follow-ups/checks to confirm that workers actually have receive the funds as has been stipulated. The recommendation is directed to the ILO project staff and country offices in these countries in particular - as well as the national/local organisations that have assumed the responsibility to follow-up that the funds reached the beneficiaries.

*Timeframe: Immediate; Priority: High, Level of resources: Low-Medium.*

## 1 CONTEXT

Globally it is estimated that there are 60–70 million garment workers worldwide. The vast majority are engaged in informal employment. The COVID-19 pandemic has threatened livelihoods and well-being of people around the world. According to the International Labour Organization (ILO), it is the greatest public health and socioeconomic crisis, globally, in the century, and it has led to worsened inequalities that already were systemic before it started spreading in early 2020.<sup>2</sup> The pandemic has resulted in momentous disruptions of global and domestic supply chains.<sup>3</sup> In the garments industry, many factories had to close their businesses, at least temporarily and many workers lost their jobs and/or incomes because of lock downs and orders that were cancelled. This situation has greatly impacted a large number of workers - and their families - in the industry, the majority being women (75 per cent), who already may be vulnerable and/or living in poverty, although the extent of which may differ in the seven countries involved in the Project.<sup>4</sup>

Social protection is a crucial part of inclusive development and social justice and can reduce poverty and inequality. It promotes domestic consumption and contributes to economic growth. It is a powerful instrument to prevent and mitigate economic crises, natural disasters and conflicts. However, only 46.9 per cent of the global population are effectively covered by at least one social protection benefit. The remaining 53.1 per cent (4.14 billion people) do not have any protection.<sup>5</sup>

Social protection consists of policies and programmes that include benefits for individuals and families to cushion shocks, including covariate shocks, that may be faced throughout the life cycle. It covers child and family benefits, 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.<sup>6</sup>

COVID-19 has generated an increased global interest in extending and strengthening social protection systems, as it has been realised that both employers and employees are losing out heavily. Many employers in the garment producing countries in e.g. Asia and Africa, do not offer severance payment or (partial or full) unemployment benefits/insurance or wage supplements to their workers in crisis situations, such as the one brought on by the pandemic.

The German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), the key donor agency for this Project, initiated contact with Vision Zero Fund (VZF)<sup>7</sup> at the ILO. VZF supports sustainable, safe and healthy supply chains and is part of ‘Safety and Health for All’ (promoting safe and healthy work environments) located within the Labour Administration, Labour Inspection and Occupational Safety and Health Branch (LABADMIN/OSH). The contact was a bid to identify ways and means to act urgently to support suppliers and temporarily secure their business continuity, and help alleviate the situation for both employers and employees in selected garment-producing countries. As neither the LABADMIN/OSH Branch nor the VZF have experience in cash transfers it was decided that it would join hands with other departments in the ILO, such as the Social Protection Department (SOCPRO), to implement the Project.”

The ILO has provided support in the context of various humanitarian crisis and emergency situations, such as the Haiti earthquakes, the Tsunami in 2004, the financial crisis in 2008-2009, the Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines, however it has limited experience in delivering emergency humanitarian cash

---

<sup>2</sup> Secretary-General’s Policy Brief Investing in Jobs and Social Protection for Poverty Eradication and a Sustainable Recovery, 28 September 2021.

<sup>3</sup> Source: Terms of Reference.

<sup>4</sup> Source: *Garment Worker Sector Focus*, <https://16dayscampaign.org/campaigns/garment-worker-sector-focus/>

<sup>5</sup> Source: ILO. 2021. World Social Protection Report 2020–22: Social protection at the crossroads – in pursuit of a better future (Geneva). <https://www.ilo.org/global/research/global-reports/world-social-security-report/2020-22/lang--en/index.htm>

<sup>6</sup> Source: Ibid.

<sup>7</sup> VZF was launched by the G7 and endorsed by the G20. Source: <https://vzf.ilo.org/>.

transfers. The aim of the project is to strengthen national delivery systems and institutions where they exist and help build new systems to deliver assistance to those affected where they don't exist.<sup>8</sup>

ILO's development/technical assistance are normally designed and implemented within a tripartite arrangement involving governments, employers and workers organisations, aiming at long-term institution-building goals and sustainability – arrangements that not easily render quick actions or humanitarian-oriented assistance when calamities/covariate shocks occur.

## 1.1 THE PROJECT – SOME BASIC FACTS

The Project titled *Protecting garment sector workers: occupational safety and health and income support* has been implemented in 7 countries, namely Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Madagascar, Lao PDR and Vietnam.<sup>9</sup> It should be seen in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic as it was *designed* to respond to the socio-economic effects of the pandemic on owners, managers and workers in the garments industry in those countries.

It is implemented jointly by SOCPRO and LABADMIN/OSH (VZF) in collaboration with Better Work of the ILO and partner organisations – under the *Global Flagship Programme on Building Social Protection Floors for All* flagship programme which works toward the development of a comprehensive and coherent global programme on social protection. The Project was signed in August 2020 with a project start date of 3 September 2020 and actual implementation starting in October/ November 2020. It was designed as a multi-donor project with the BMZ being the key donor agency. The total allocation amount for the Project is €14.5 million (\$ 17,180,095), with the cash transfer component by far being the largest component.

“No-cost” extensions have been requested and granted three times: First until 31/12 2021; the second until 31/03 2022; and the third until 30 June 2022.

The main problems that the Project is tackling are the negative consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic in the garments industry in the seven countries that are “covered” by the evaluation i.e. the consequences for both factory owners and workers caused by the disruptions on the industry's supply chain, and the health and safety risks in the industry's working environment. The activities were expected to have direct impact on both suppliers and workers in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic – in helping to secure businesses by helping them pay wages of their workers, or providing direct income support to affected workers and simultaneously ensuring their safety and health.”

The key activities were designed to produce the Project's outputs and reach outcomes; such as drawing agreements with the partners; raising awareness and building capacity; designing databases; devising mechanisms to facilitate cash transfers; working at policy level to strengthen social protection systems; and advising and supporting constituents in various ways. From a learning perspective the project is regarded as important as it is expected to generate information and valuable lessons for the future, particularly in strengthening ILO's capacity/ability to respond to crisis and/or similar situations in the world of work.<sup>10</sup>

The Project conducted an internal evaluability assessment/mid-term evaluation (MTE) during March-June 2021, which included six recommendations.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> *Source:* This aim is provided as a written comment from KII at headquarters (the Project Document does not include a clear statement as to the aim, or purpose, of the Project).

<sup>9</sup> Herein it is referred to as “the Project”, or “Protecting garment sector project”. See: [https://www.ilo.org/jakarta/whatwedo/projects/WCMS\\_766702/lang--en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/jakarta/whatwedo/projects/WCMS_766702/lang--en/index.htm)

<sup>10</sup> *Source:* Interview with ILO.

<sup>11</sup> Midterm Evaluation Report, “Protecting garment sector workers: occupational safety and health and income support in response to the COVID-19 pandemic” project, June 2021. The evaluability assessment of the exercise served two purposes: (i) Review the quality of the project's M&E plan and systems in the light of implementation realities; and (ii) Recommend changes in the Theory of Change (ToC) and results frameworks to make the project evaluable.

## Strategies for preventing exposure to COVID-19 and implementing income support

Two key components constitute the structure of the Project, namely a component on preventing exposure to COVID-19/OSH<sup>12</sup> and ensuring that policies are in place for future epidemics; and the other component on income support, e.g. in the form of cash transfer.<sup>13</sup> The first component is implemented in all seven countries. Two out of the seven countries are *only* implementing this component, namely Madagascar and Vietnam. The social protection component is implemented *only* in five countries to enable employment retention, namely Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Indonesia and Lao PDR. This component was adjusted to each country's context to build, or strengthen, existing social protection mechanisms/systems, and support unemployment insurance initiatives.

### Project management, staff and project framework (outcomes, outputs)

The ILO staff involved at HQs include a Social Transfers Expert (who was the only full time staff on the Project), with support from a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Officer, a Legal officer; a Management Information Systems (MIS) officer and a Communication Officer for a limited amount of time. These work under the supervision of a Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) who is the Head of the Actuarial Services Unit of the Social Protection Department (SOCPRO). Currently 19 staff members, based in the 7 project countries are providing support to the Project. Technical backstopping is drawn from SOCPRO and LABADMIN/OSH in the ILO Headquarters, Geneva.

The Project's **immediate goals**<sup>14</sup> are:

- i) Strengthened safety and health protection measures, to ensure that employers, workers, and their families are protected from the direct and indirect health risks of COVID-19 and that workplaces are not negatively impacted by further outbreaks due to a poor management of OSH hazards; and
- ii) Cushioned enterprises against immediate employment and income losses and to compensation to workers for their loss of income due to COVID 19, through providing wage subsidies and other cash transfers; and to facilitate "back to normality" by maintaining an employment relationship.

The (original) **outcomes and outputs** for each of the seven countries from the Project Document are<sup>15</sup>:

#### *Bangladesh: the garment sector workers in Bangladesh are protected in response to the COVID-19 pandemic ([Outcome 1](#))*

- Ready-Made Garments (RMG) sector's workers received wage subsidy and retained employment relation in response to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic (output 1);
- Policy options and e-payment mechanism available for the government and global supply chain partners to develop an Unemployment Insurance for the formal sector (output 2); and
- Reinforced OSH measures in the enterprises of the garment sector (output 3);

#### *Cambodia<sup>16</sup>: Workers, in particular female workers, in the garment factories are better equipped to deal with the impact of the crisis ([Outcome 2](#))*

---

<sup>12</sup> The Vision Zero Fund (VZF) is implementing the OSH component, in close collaboration with the *Better Work Programme*.

<sup>13</sup> See Annex I for details of planned provisions of income support/cash transfer.

<sup>14</sup> *Source*: Project document, however it is noted that goal ii) is slightly differently phrased in the Terms of Reference: "(ii) Cushioning enterprises against immediate income losses; and compensating workers for the loss of income due to COVID 19 by providing wage subsidies and other cash transfers; this helps to prevent a chain of supply shocks (e.g. losses in workers' productivity capacities) and demand shocks (e.g. suppressing consumption among workers and their families) that could lead to a prolonged economic recession."

<sup>15</sup> For more details see Annex III.

<sup>16</sup> This framework was changed. The new outcome is "Livelihood of suspended maternity workers is sustained and their knowledge on soft skills including social security, labour law, and financial management are enhanced".

- Maternity allowance to every garment female workers (with children between 3 months and 27 months) in factories that have suspended operations, through NSSF (Output 2.1);
- Employers and workers in the garment sector benefit from better employment protection measures through RGC measures (Output 2.2); and
- OSH measures in the garment factories are reinforced (Output 2.3).

*Ethiopia: Targeted garment and textile enterprises are able to sustain business continuity through retaining their workers ([Outcome 3](#))*

- Workers incomes temporarily protected from the impact of COVID-19 (Output 3.1);
- Selected factories are supported to repurpose their production to COVID-19 prevention products (Output 3.2); and
- Health and Safety of workers protected (Output 3.3).

*Indonesia: Workers in the garment and footwear sectors are better protected through wage subsidies ([Outcome 4](#))*

- Workers are protected through temporary and partial income replacement and employment retention in the garment sector in Indonesia (Output 4.1); and
- Strengthened OSH measures in the garment industry Output 4.2.

*Lao PDR: Workers in the garment sector are better equipped to deal with the impact of the crisis ([Outcome 5](#))*

- All garment factory workers registered in NSSF (18 500) receive a wage subsidy (Output 5.1);
- Employers in the garment sector are supported to maintain their operations during the crisis (Output 5.2); and
- Strengthened OSH measures in the garment industry (Output 5.3).

*Madagascar: COVID-19 Response - Protection for Garment Factory Workers ([Outcome 6](#))*

- OSH Support (Output 6.1).

*Vietnam: COVID-19 Response - Protection for Garment Factory Workers ([Outcome 7](#))*

- OSH Support (Output 7.2).

## **1.2 EVALUATION FRAMEWORK**

The evaluation has taken place between the 1<sup>st</sup> week of January and 1<sup>st</sup> week of July 2022, with about two months “halt” in the evaluation process in April and May due to the fact that the Project was granted another late “no-cost” extension to allow the Project to complete the remaining activities until 30 July.

The **purposes** of the evaluation are as follows:

- Assess progress achieved towards the outcomes of the project at the end of the implementation period for both OSH and income support component.
- Assess the relevance and validity of project design and the efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of its outcomes
- Identify the key strengths and shortcomings in the design and implementation of both components.
- Assess how well intervention-level actions supported COVID-19 response strategies and policies.
- Provide in-depth reflection on the strategies and assumptions that have guided the interventions at country level

- Make recommendations towards design and implementation management for future projects from the perspective of emergency response in the area of OSH and through cash transfer modality.

The **chronological scope** of the evaluation is to assess and evaluate the Project implementation for the entire duration of (3 September 2020 – 30 June 2022) and the **thematic scope** include assessing its progress, its implementation, partnerships, achievements, challenges, good practices, and lessons learned during the project’s life. **Geographically, the scope** includes all seven countries: Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Madagascar and Viet Nam.

The **key clients** of this evaluation are the ILO constituents, the development partner, the project teams at global and country levels, and their implementing partners across the project countries. These users interest lies primarily, although not exclusively, in learning from experience to inform future interventions and investments in this area.<sup>17</sup>

ILO, the development partner, the implementing partners across the project countries:

- Bangladesh:** Department of Inspection for Factories and Establishments (DIFE); Bangladesh Garment Manufacturers and Exporters Association (BGMEA); Bangladesh Knitwear Manufacturers and Exporters Association (BKMEA); Bangladesh Employers’ Federation (BEF);
- Cambodia:** Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training OSH Department; Garment Manufacturing Association in Cambodia (GMAC), National Social Security Fund (NSSF); and National Employment Agency (NEA)<sup>18</sup>;
- Ethiopia:** Bureau of Labour and Social Affairs (SNNPR)<sup>19</sup>; Ministry of Women and Social Affairs, Employers' Confederation, Confederation of trade union, Private Organizations Employees Social Security Agency (POESSA); Industrial Park Development Corporation (IPDC); Hawassa Industrial Park Investors Association (HIPIA);
- Indonesia:** Ministry of Manpower, Indonesia Employer Association (APINDO), Partnership at Work Foundation/YKK(BWP), Trade Unions, garments companies and factories
- Lao PDR:** Association of Lao Garment Industries (ALGI), Lao Social Security Organization (LSSO), garments companies and factories.
- Madagascar:** General Directorate of Labour and Social Laws (DGTLS) of the Ministry in charge of Labour; Department of Workers' Social Security (DSST); Labour Inspectorate in the Analamanga, Vakinankaratra and Southwest Regions and various OSH institutions, garments companies and factories;
- Vietnam:** VIHEMA (Viet Nam Health Environment Management Agency, Ministry of Health, Director of Bureau for Employer’s Activities (VCCI); General Confederation of Labour (VGCL), Director of Bureau for Employer’s Activities, garments companies and factories.

The **direct beneficiaries** are selected garment and textile factories and factory workers, and the **indirect beneficiaries** are their family members.<sup>20</sup>

The **evaluation criteria**<sup>21</sup> are **relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, results/impact orientation and sustainability**. Cross-cutting concerns were part of the work process throughout, such

<sup>17</sup> Source: ToR.

<sup>18</sup> Eventually, the NEA assumed the task as implementing agency for the social protection/cash transfer component as the National Social Security Fund (NSSF) declined to take on this responsibility, as explained in this report.

<sup>19</sup> Under the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, MOLSA.

<sup>20</sup> Source: The Project Document.

<sup>21</sup> These are the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria for evaluating development assistance projects. Source: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>. They are also defined in the ILO



as gender equality, disability inclusion and other non-discrimination issues, ILO standards, social dialogue and tripartism, and medium and long-term effects of capacity development initiatives throughout the evaluation methodology and all deliverables, including the final report.<sup>22</sup> An inception report was produced.<sup>23</sup>

A number of **key evaluation questions**, sorted under each evaluation criteria, guided the evaluation's data gathering process and analysis (Annex I).

---

Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation, 2020 ([https://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS\\_571339/lang--en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS_571339/lang--en/index.htm)).

<sup>22</sup> Source: ToR.

<sup>23</sup> See: <https://www.ilo.org/ievaldiscovery/#bd7z9vm>

## 2 METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS

### 2.1 METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the methodology applied during the evaluation, selection criteria, quality assurance, evaluation norms and standards, gender equality and non-discrimination; and limitations to the methodology.

The evaluation team was made up of one external consultant as team leader, and seven consultants based in the respective seven countries. Information was collected through several means from many different sources, in order to look for any trends or evidence of achievement and performance, and to determine their relative contribution to the Project's outputs and outcomes. The documentation review phase included developing data collection instruments and compiling the Inception report. The evaluation team had access to a number of documents, received from the Project, requesting for clarity and some more documents during the course of the data collection phase. For the key documents reviewed, see Annex IX. Briefing sessions were held with the two Evaluation Managers, key staff at ILO headquarters and stakeholders in the project countries.

The Key Informant interviews (KII) consisted of semi-structured in-depth interviews, both virtual and face-to-face (Annex VIII). Altogether 88 interviews were done (33 women; 55 men). A preliminary interview guide (with questions for each category of stakeholder) and a report template were developed for the national consultants. A brief questionnaire survey was developed and sent to 19 ILO staff members in the seven project countries on 16<sup>th</sup> February (see Annex X). 18 staff members in 7 countries responded. A limitation with a questionnaire survey is that it usually is difficult to get replies from non-ILO stakeholders, i.e. from the government and social partners.

Only a few factory visits could take place to meet beneficiaries (factory managers/staff and workers) due to the COVID-19 pandemic-induced restrictions on movement. Altogether 25 persons (18 women; 7 men) working in garment factories took part in Focus Group Discussions (FGD) in Cambodia, Indonesia, Madagascar and Vietnam, ranging from sewing workers, quality control, sample production assistants, chiefs and supervisors to project managers and executive directors (Annex VIII). Field work took place between mid-February and mid-March 2022.

Selection of participants to participate in the KIIs, and sites for field visits was purposive. To the extent possible the evaluation team (through triangulation) mitigated any bias arising from the risk involved in having a purposive sampling in the selection of the interviewees.

A (virtual) Stakeholder workshop took place on 10 March 2022, from 9 am to 10:35 CET. In total 50 persons participated including the evaluation team, the first evaluation manager and interpreters (Annex VIII).<sup>24</sup> The evaluation team leader presented the *preliminary findings* during 45 minutes. The presentation was followed by a participatory Question & Answer session for 40 minutes. The evaluation manager introduced and closed the workshop. This was a good opportunity for the evaluation team to collect more information and receive feedback on the preliminary findings.

To ensure quality assurance, credibility and validity of the results, methodological triangulation of the data/information from the various above-mentioned methods was applied, i.e. information received was cross-checked from more than one source. The methods described above were relevant for the evaluation team to find answers to the specific evaluation questions and the team made efforts to ensure data quality and evidence to enable sound and relevant assessments contributing to the conclusions. The two Evaluation Managers have also provided quality assurance of the deliverables.

The evaluation has adhered to evaluation norms, standards and ethical considerations followed by the ILO, such as the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms and standards for evaluations (revised in 2020)<sup>25</sup>, as well as the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards (2010). The ILO's policy

---

<sup>24</sup> Comprising 39 Stakeholders (= 23 ILO staff + 14 national constituents/partners + 1 from WHO + 1 donor representative) and 11 others (=8 evaluation team members + 1 Evaluation manager + 2 Interpreters).

<sup>25</sup> Source: <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866> revised in 2020

guidelines for results-based evaluations (2020)<sup>26</sup> and relevant Guidance Notes have been observed.<sup>27</sup> Regarding gender issues, ILO guides are also relevant, such as Guidance 1.1 Integrating Gender Equality in Monitoring and Evaluation; and ILO Action Plan for Gender Equality (2018-2021).

Gender mainstreaming/integration of gender equality and non-discrimination (particularly disability) were addressed in the data collection, as well as social dialogue, tripartism and international labour standards. When assessing the relevance and validity of the Project's design, implementation as well as follow-up, the evaluation team has also been considering the extent to which the Project has addressed the needs of persons with disabilities.

COVID-19 pandemic has posed limitations to the evaluation methodology in the sense that the international consultant (team leader) could not travel to any of the Project countries, and the national consultants could not (with one exception) travel outside of the cities and visit factories. The situation was mitigated through triangulation at each step of the process.

## 2.2 LIMITATIONS

The fact that the evaluation team leader could not visit any of the seven project countries is a clear limitation, however, this has been mitigated by triangulation and checking, and close coordination and communication with the seven national consultants who have worked on the evaluation.

Another limitation was the disruption of the evaluation process after it was decided to put the final evaluation on "halt" *for two months between end March and end May 2022*. This was done after it became known that a third "no-cost" extension had been requested and granted by the donor agency. The decision was made to allow the final evaluation to fully reflect and document the project. The extension was requested to allow two countries to spend the cash transfer amounts which not yet had been disbursed in Bangladesh and Cambodia. This unfortunate disruption in the evaluation process was mitigated by renewing contacts with the Project to update the data on activities and expenditures at end May/early June 2022, prior to submitting the 2<sup>nd</sup> draft evaluation report to the ILO on 6<sup>th</sup> June.

---

<sup>26</sup> ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations 4th Edition, 2020.

<sup>27</sup> Checklist No. 3 (Writing the inception report); Checklist No. 5 (Preparing the evaluation report, including the two templates for Lessons learned and Emerging good practices); and Checklist No. 7 (Filling in the title page).

### 3 FINDINGS

This chapter accounts for the key findings of the evaluation, in relation to each of the standard evaluation criteria and the evaluation questions.

#### 3.1 RELEVANCE AND VALIDITY OF DESIGN

The evaluation found that *overall the Project can be said to be relevant* as regards its design to support factories and workers in the garment industry that were impacted negatively due to the COVID-19. The stakeholders have (generally) appreciated the Project's activities and partnered with the ILO in reaching the goals. However, the way the cash transfer component eventually "played out" (see the section under Effectiveness in this chapter) **it was found to be less relevant in comparison** with the OSH component which was also found to be more straightforward in implementation. This is mainly due to the fact that *generally* beneficiaries received the cash transfer funds late and not at the time they needed it most, i.e. at the time when the effects of the pandemic created havoc in the industry and had an adverse impact on the employees.

The Project is aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals<sup>28</sup> (SDGs) 1,3,8,10, 16 and 17 and its promotion of international labour standards, and legal instruments drawn up by its constituents i.e. Governments, Employers and Workers organisations, with the basic principles and rights at work. The Project is also aligned with the ILO Programme and Budget (biennium 2020–21),<sup>29</sup> the Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCP)<sup>30</sup> and the ILO conventions ILO C168 (wage subsidy), C102 (Social Security, Minimum Standards). At the country level, all activities are aligned with UN support, including the UN support to national COVID-19 response plans.

The pandemic that spread in 2020 created an extraordinary situation in the world. It hit the garment sector in countries in Asia and Africa hard, affecting millions of workers and enterprises in the supply chains. Large parts of the garment supply chain jobs were dependent on domestic or foreign consumer demand - from countries that had rigorous lockdowns, and where retail sales declined sharply.<sup>31</sup> According to the ILO, the garment industry was in a state of chaos, experiencing panic in the supply chain. Some extreme actions in terms of cancellation of orders led to collapse in employment and incomes. Workers, mainly women, were most vulnerable as social protection and safety systems were weak but mostly non-existent and many workers lost whatever savings they had which in turn contributed to families falling into poverty.

The ILO had information about the actions of some companies in the sector, e.g. H&M that did pay for orders they had made even though it was not sure to be able to sell, but many companies did not reveal what their actions or contractual arrangements were in this respect.<sup>32</sup> ILO initiated a Call to Action<sup>33</sup> with a document of intent, to which about 100 organisations signed up. Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) campaigned, putting huge pressure on the organisations and companies saying "you have signed, but not acted". EU's assistance to the garment sector and workers proceeded slowly; governments were reluctant to help; employers federations and workers unions did not provide any strong support to the sector. Many organisations became engaged in cash transfer, such as other UN agencies, and international and bilateral development organisations.<sup>34</sup> Any assistance from the ILO to the garments sector had to be channelled through national authorities. Clearly, the Project under evaluation was developed very rapidly with the understanding that the cash transfer support in particular

---

<sup>29</sup> P&B Policy Outcome 8. and Outcome 7 (7.2 in particular). Source: Terms of Reference.

<sup>30</sup> DWCPs in Bangladesh 2017-2020; Cambodia: 2019-2023; Ethiopia 2021-2025; Indonesia 2020-2025; Lao PDR: 2017-21; and Vietnam 2017-2021 (Madagascar does not have a DWCP).

<sup>31</sup> *The supply chain ripple effect: How COVID-19 is affecting garment workers and factories in Asia and the Pacific*. ILO research brief, 2020.

<sup>32</sup> *Source*: In-depth interview with the Director, Better Work Programme, ILO, who researched and worked on the "Call to Action 22 April 2020".

<sup>33</sup> *Source*: *COVID-19: Action in the global garment industry*, ILO, 22 April 2020.

<sup>34</sup> *Source*: In-depth interview with Director, Better Work Programme, ILO.

could involve various risks in terms of effectiveness and is/was viewed as a pilot project and experimental in nature.<sup>35</sup>

ILO's core assistance is technical assistance. Nevertheless, it has shown a great deal of interest in cash transfer over the years as a means of social protection and combatting poverty. ILO has closely studied cases from Latin America and the Caribbean where households and workers with no formal employment - and no contributions to social security – have received cash transfers from the State.<sup>36</sup> ILO is also a member of the *Grand bargain cash workstream subgroup*<sup>37</sup> which the mid-term evaluation in 2021 pointed out. In the case of the Project under evaluation, the emergency and humanitarian needs brought on by the pandemic were obvious and acute in a large sector that ILO for many years have contributed to the raised labour standards and workers' rights. Thus it was considered justified that cash transfer be used as an instrument in development cooperation although it could come with certain "risks"<sup>38</sup> - which are highlighted by this evaluation.

In some countries, stakeholders have opined that the Project would have been more relevant if it had paid much more attention to garment workers in the *informal* economy including other sectors than the garment sector, as they do not receive any support or protection from the respective employers and governments.<sup>39</sup> An example is Madagascar, where a KII from the government opined that the Project also should have addressed the needs in "all the trades" e.g. agro-food industry, transport and particularly those of the informal economy. The reason being that they constitute the bulk of the activities at risk in the country – while the large textile companies "already have their regulatory provisions in line with international standards imposed by their clients and the market".<sup>40</sup>

Regarding **validity of design**, the evaluability assessment/MTE in 2021 recommended that the Project should develop a simple Theory of Change (ToC) or logic structure, summarising key expected outcomes and causal linkages from each country, and also develop an overarching "summary" logframe. However, it does not have a ToC, e.g. a matrix with a narrative that explains how change will occur as a result of the project's activities. The evaluation has also not been able to identify a Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) matrix for the Project, with the understanding that an LFA clearly shows the outputs, outcomes, development objective, means of verification and assumptions and their logical relationship. However, **a framework of sorts does exist** - separate and different for each country - which shows that 16 outputs and a number of sub-outputs are intended to generate 7 outcomes. There are different outcomes and outputs for the most of the involved countries, adapting to the relevant contexts, except for Madagascar and Viet Nam that have identical logical structures/formulations.

The MTE also recommended to update baselines and associated targets to present a clearer representation of what the Project is seeking to achieve, and that SOCPRO should ensure that all future projects have some form of M&E plan that is specifically devoted to operationalising relevant ToCs and logframes. As for the baselines and targets – this seems no to have been acted upon. At the time of the MTE, the Project was expected to close soon after it was conducted (November 2021) i.e. it was believed that there was not much time left for making improvements in this area.<sup>41</sup> The evaluation's own assessment is that the emergency nature in the eyes of the Project management perhaps did not warrant that these documents be drawn with the same "rigour" as when designing other development cooperation projects.

All the project country frameworks had low level policy outputs (*sub-outputs*) under the OSH component (except two countries that had none) but policy is not mentioned at all in the Social Protection component outputs. None of the countries had policy changes at outcome level and none of

---

<sup>35</sup> KII interviews (triangulated).

<sup>36</sup> See *Cash transfer programmes, poverty reduction and empowerment of women: A comparative analysis Experiences from Brazil, Chile, India, Mexico and South Africa*, Working Paper 2013, ILO; and *The employment situation in Latin America and the Caribbean, Number 10, Conditional transfer programmes and the labour market*, ECLAC/ILO May 2014.

<sup>37</sup> Source: *Linking humanitarian cash and social protection for an effective cash response to the Covid-19 Pandemic*.

<sup>38</sup> Source: Interviews.

<sup>39</sup> Source: Interviews.

<sup>40</sup> Source: Interview.

<sup>41</sup> Source: Interviews with Project staff.

the two immediate goals feature policy.<sup>42</sup> The evaluation has assessed that for an emergency-oriented project, which initially was meant to be one-year project, contributing to policy changes was probably not regarded as very realistic by the project designers.

Covid-19 crisis has highlighted the urgency for the ILO of building national social protection systems.<sup>43</sup> Critical voices regarding the Project's relevance (both components) were voiced in this evaluation, in particular regarding this issue. Social protection activities in ILO's technical assistance targets all sectors, but this Project's emergency approach has, by some, been perceived as contradictory, or detrimental to this objective as its purpose is quick disbursement of funds only in the garment sector. In Cambodia (as explained in detail in the effectiveness section) the National Social Security Fund (NSSF) declined to be associated with the Project, as it perceived it as a means to support the industry itself, as well as the government - but not the employees. This posed a "political risk" to ILO's social protection activities in Cambodia. In Indonesia, Project staff who have handled the social protection component brought up similar views. The involved ACTRAV and ACTEMP Hq officials, who had been involved in the project at the design stage and had voiced strong concerns at that stage continued to be critical to the cash transfer component when interviewed by the evaluation. They opined that although they appreciated many of the good efforts in the project, cash transfer is "not part of ILO's mandate" and "Covid-19 prevention work should not be seen as being part of OSH".<sup>44</sup>

### 3.2 COHERENCE

Coherence looks at the compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in the country, sector or institution. **Internal coherence** has been found as there were synergies and interlinkages between the Project under evaluation, and the major ILO intervention in the garment sector (BWP), as well as ILO's interventions in the field of OSH (VZF). It was noted, though, that national stakeholders have viewed the Project as being part of the BWP and/or VZF, and many times have not been able to differentiate between these and the Project under evaluation. As regards ILO's activities in the area of social protection<sup>45</sup>, voices of concern were raised in two countries - as described above - opining that the cash transfer/income support component has undermined ILO's efforts to contribute the long term goals of sustainable social protection systems.

**External** coherence vis-à-vis national priorities in relation to Covid-19 was found in all countries, i.e. to work towards increasing workers protection against Covid-19 and raise awareness about the virus. Regarding the social protection (cash transfer) component, coherence was less obvious in Bangladesh. Regarding the with the work of other actors, the Project has avoid duplication of effort. In some countries it was mentioned that coordination with others is important, e.g. in Madagascar where new initiatives are emerging where three EU projects are being launched with the same theme.

### 3.3 EFFECTIVENESS

This section brings out findings regarding the two distinct project components; COVID-19/OSH- and social protection) as well as stakeholder involvement.

It is clear that much has been achieved with a high level of effort and, *in parts* with good effectiveness and in a few cases targets have been exceeded. At the headquarter level, the VZF, Better Work and SOCPRO have developed visibility and knowledge products to generate reference documents for the future, e.g. a video on the Project and two human interest stories (Ethiopia on cash transfer and Cambodia on OSH digital campaign<sup>46</sup>). Regarding OSH, a lessons document was also produced, based

---

<sup>42</sup> Source: Project Document, pp. 63-66.

<sup>43</sup> Source: The strategy for building social protection floors for all (the ILO Global Flagship Programme Strategy) for the second phase 2021–2025.

<sup>44</sup> Source: In-depth interviews and e-mail correspondence with ILO Headquarter staff in the respective departments.

<sup>45</sup> This refers to the *Global Flagship Programme on Building Social Protection Floors for All*, the SPF Flagship Programme which works toward the development of a comprehensive and coherent global programme on social protection.

<sup>46</sup> The Cambodia campaign with related information is now available online: "*BetterWork Cambodia: Su Su Cambodia*" – meaning "together we can make it." (<https://betterwork.org/2022/05/10/su-su-means-together-we-can-make-it-digital-behaviour-change-campaign-in-cambodia/>)

on five digital workshops<sup>47</sup>, and a compendium of tools and training related products developed by the countries. SOCPRO has also developed some learning documents.

In some parts, effectiveness has been lower which is seen in this chapter, mainly related to the late disbursement of the social protection cash funds to the beneficiaries, in particular in Bangladesh and Cambodia. The Project has held many extensive discussions/dialogues with stakeholders over many months and has, whenever feasible, coordinated with other ILO and government initiatives in social protection and OSH. All country projects have made good efforts to implement the project activities and *most* of the them, as well as the outputs, were finally achieved at the end of June 2022.

The Project had to be flexible in its implementation strategy, e.g. in deciding on eligibility criteria, i.e. who should receive support, and in which way it should be delivered? In this process adjustments and changes were done to adapt to the realities, including stakeholders' wishes and the socio-political contexts in the respective countries. Project staff and partners needed to act rapidly and timely while at the same time adhere to the ILO key principles, e.g. apply tripartism and social dialogue, and integration of other cross-cutting issues in the implementation.

The flexibility of Project staff is perceived as particularly important and necessary due to its pilot /experimental nature. The staff were employed full time in other projects, which in fact was one of the Project strategies i.e. to rely on staff from the other established projects (BW, VZF and social protection). A number of staff members claimed that the Project was time consuming due to the complexities and that their "own" projects' activities suffered. These complexities relate to the fact that developing tailor made approaches to suit each country takes time and requires a lot of openness. Various national institutional frameworks were involved in the implementation, which varied from one country to the other. Another complexity was the a rapidly changing environment related to COVID 19 which also took different shapes in the respective project countries.

This challenges were real even though national consultants were commissioned to monitor the day-to-day work, and technical support from ILO headquarters and the regions was availed. Tripartite committees and technical working groups have been (temporarily) formed and mostly functional.

The evaluation has not been able to identify instances where the project has substantially contributed to OSH policies or systems or social protection policies or systems (e.g. employment insurance) in the short term. In a few countries regarding the implementing of the OSH component, the mechanisms that the Project worked on extensively together with partners could be of use in future health crisis situations, for instance the development and updating of eligibility criteria for receiving support; and guidelines on the prevention of COVID-19 in the garment industry. Implementing the income support/cash transfer component - which is the component of the two with the largest budget - has taken place successfully in three countries (Ethiopia, Lao PDR and Indonesia) while Bangladesh and Cambodia lagged behind significantly and only managed the pay-out to SMEs and workers in June 2022.

Below is an account of the evaluation's findings in the seven participating countries - regarding the many achievements and challenges. The section is divided in i) OSH component; ii) social protection component; iii) stakeholder involvement; iv) cross-cutting issues; and v) monitoring and evaluation:

### **OSH component – effectiveness and challenges**

This component has been quite effective although not without challenges. On the whole, it was less complicated to implement than the social protection component.

In *Bangladesh*, protecting garment sector workers, in response to COVID-19 pandemic was the planned outcome (outcome 1) which was to be reached through reinforced OSH measures in the garment enterprises through practical workplace prevention and mitigation measures; Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) and disinfection; and awareness raising and communication. The Project reached out to 301 factories for workplace prevention and mitigation measures. Twenty Master Trainers were trained who, in turn, trained 2000 people (mainly using virtual/online training) of garment factory employees from health and safety committees; Nurses and Doctors in large Better Work factories (4-5

---

<sup>47</sup> These involved stakeholders from all seven project countries, specialists and development partners. *Source:* Written comments by KII at ILO headquarters.

from each factory). In connection with the celebration of the national OSH Day in April 2021, PPEs, disinfection, 5000 face masks and 5000 hand sensitizers were distributed to the garment industry.

A COVID-19 prevention and awareness campaign for workers in six RMG locations was completed<sup>48</sup>, entailing a drama titled “*Get Vaccinated, Wear a Mask*” in the communities; demonstration of personal hygiene; distribution of masks and leaflets. The campaigns were held in Savar, Gazipur and Tongi and reached about 51,000 people.<sup>49</sup> Project staff was also involved in the 3rd UN South Asia Forum on business and human rights, co-organized by UNDP, UNWG and ILO in which OSH and COVID recovery were part of the themes covered. The session on OSH took stock of success stories and good practices in South Asia.

In *Cambodia*, the Project was able to adopt a flexible approach and most of the garment factory worker population was reached with COVID prevention and protection messages. After finding out how people were affected in terms of stress and anxiety levels, the Project was able to bring messages and reach 2.3 million people through a digital campaign on Communication and Behavioural Change and it was able to verify that 2.4 million engagements were made on social media – and in this way it was able to connect as a community. In addition, 300 workers were reached in a large-scale survey via SMS and social media, and (physical) interviews with factory workers. At the time of the evaluation Stakeholder workshop held on 10<sup>th</sup> March, some outputs still remained, however, the third and last “no-cost” extension of the Project to 30 June, enabled it to use some savings to support the Ministry of Labour to sustain awareness and hygienic practices in factories.<sup>50</sup> Labour offices and factories benefitted from this activity and the IEC materials they received. A short animated video targeting factory managers was also produced to be disseminated (with USB stick) to 200 factories before the end of June intended to be viewed during lunch breaks.

In *Ethiopia*, the Project’s activities generated an increase in the number of factory labour inspections, which reportedly resulted in increased awareness about Covid-19 prevention. It enabled the coming-together of OSH and labour inspectors, employers representatives and workers’ organisations in the regions in carrying out covid related inspections which was described as a “unique undertaking”.<sup>51</sup>

The Project was engaged with e.g. Covid-19 prevention mechanisms. risk assessment, emergency preparedness, response plans and inspection exercises. In collaboration with regional Bureaus of Labour and Social Affairs (BoLSA), covid protection task forces were set up.<sup>52</sup> 295 labour inspections with focus on Covid-19 protocol took place in Oromia, SNNPR<sup>53</sup>, Amhara and Addis Ababa, in enterprises including garment and textile and high-risk sectors. This was done both with government and tripartite inspection approaches. Taskforces and OSH committees were trained in factories and workplaces.<sup>54</sup> Awareness creation campaigns were also organized in ten sub-cities, reaching 28,935 workers in industrial parks and more than 130,000 surrounding communities through gender sensitive awareness raising campaigns. The Project Steering Committee and Technical Working Group worked well, enabling results.<sup>55</sup>

### Challenges

The workers were initially reluctant to apply for Covid-19 prevention measures and vaccinations - demanding continuous engagement which took focus from other Project activities. There was a slow response from the implementing partners, and factories would not fulfil all the required PPEs for Covid-

---

<sup>48</sup> This was done in six communities in Savar, Gazipur and Tongi, which reached about 51,000 people.

<sup>49</sup> *Source*: Project staff.

<sup>50</sup> This was part of a MOL activity named “Post-Covid-19 measure in the new normal”. *Source*: Project staff.

<sup>51</sup> *Source*: KII

<sup>52</sup> These were established in Regional, Zonal, City (town) and Woreda (District) Offices in the three regions of SNNPR, Amhara and Oromia (22 representatives from the constituents participated).

<sup>53</sup> SNNPP: Southern Nations, Nationalities, and Peoples' Region

<sup>54</sup> The training provided on COVID 19, was part of a larger training programme outside of the scope of this evaluation – which activated bipartite committees, social dialogue and establishment of 15 labour unions in project targets in collaboration with the Confederation of Workers Trade Union (CETU). *Source*: ILO’s written comments.

<sup>55</sup> ILO’s written comments.



19 prevention on time. The security situation during the Project period led to some delays and some activities were halted e.g. in the Amhara region, bordering the conflict torn Tigray region.

In *Indonesia*, the Project provided hand sanitizers (80,000 litres); hand soaps (64,000 litres) and masks (60,000) to 198 factories registered with Better Work Indonesia (Partnership at Work Foundation/BWI). Posters, campaign materials to encourage companies to comply with health protocols were distributed and safety in the workplace was promoted in a timely manner. It also facilitated a COVID-19 vaccination program with Apindo (the Indonesia Employers Association) to around 10,000 workers in central Java. A Labour Inspection Manual with the Ministry of Manpower was also published, and the Project cooperated with BWI and others that were concerned with OSH, e.g. an HIV/AIDS project and an ILO/Japan Covid-19 Project. Close coordination existed and commitment was extended from the Employers, factories and workers unions.

### Challenges

Covid-19 cases increased in Indonesia until August 2021 which caused delays and limited movement of the Project staff and partners and hindered new inspection arrangements in factories. The enactment of the new Omnibus Law on Employment Creation impacted on social dialogue. During October 2020 – March 2021, tripartite partners did not want to meet and discuss any labour issues. The Project mitigated this situation by encouraging partners to focus on COVID-19 protection and OSH for the interest of the workers and employers. It had to cancel the plan to pilot the Labour Inspection Manual in some BWI factories because of time constraint.

In *Lao PDR*, the Project worked in cooperation with the National Chamber of Commerce and Industry (LNCCI), the Association of Lao Garment Industry (ALGI) and the Ministry of Health, as well as the garment factories. 54 ALGI member factories were supported with COVID 19 prevention materials and equipment. Dormitory managers and HR officers from 47 garment factories in Vientiane participated in training on Covid-19 prevention and protection measures. The project also provided support for training to OSH committees in garment factories (40 garment factories and two footwear factories) on Covid-19 emergency preparedness and response plans. LFTU also held information sessions on its roles and responsibilities, and workers' rights. It has generated increased awareness and contributed to strengthened knowledge of workers and staff of garment factories, leading to minimized risk of COVID-19 infection and outbreak.

### Challenges

The work was channelled through Vision Zero Fund (VZF) but the Project closed in March 2021, just a few months after the start of this project, which reportedly made resources and expert technical advice less accessible – however, it is noted that the Project Manager (LABADMIN/OSH) at HQs stated that resources in fact were available despite the closing of the VZF project in the country.<sup>56</sup>

In *Madagascar*, the Project is closely linked to the ILO VZF project on improving safety and health in the textile supply chain. It has been involved in deploying resources to other non-garment sectors - including in the informal economy where the demands are reported to be considerable.<sup>57</sup> The Project trained a core group of Labour Inspectors through Training of Trainers, who, in turn, trained others. Together with the Labour Inspectorate it also provided support to 113 enterprises which exceeded the initial target of 77 enterprises – and which is reported to have enabled continuation of the production in the sector. PPEs and hygienic products were delivered to stakeholders including 14 (tripartite) organizations and almost 100 companies. The project enabled access to Covid-19 vaccines to 6400 persons in cooperation with WHO and the Ministry of Public Health. Training sessions and awareness-raising campaigns were organised and it is reported that capacity building involved nearly 986 persons (government, employers, workers' organizations, companies et. al.). No online training was done against the background that, compared to the other project countries, Madagascar faced less lockdowns.

---

<sup>56</sup> Source: Stakeholder Workshop discussion.

<sup>57</sup> It is noted that Madagascar is one of the two countries that had included the informal economy in the “logframe” (as a sub-output), the other is Cambodia (see Annex III).

Developing online training would have been too time consuming and many stakeholders have a very limited access to internet.

### Challenges

There was no Project Manager in place during the first period of the pandemic which limited the capacity of the Project team on the ground (who work in the VZF project)<sup>58</sup>. The Covid-19 and State of Sanitary Emergency in the country, between March and October 2020, led to a closing of the borders – which resulted in temporary difficulties to acquire large quantities of PPE. The autonomous Trade Union of Labour Inspectors (SAIT) went on strike in November 2020 which also impacted negatively on the PPE supply. According to the Project Manager, the strike had threatened to impact negatively on the *overall* Project’s mission, but ways were found to continue activities while reassuring the labour inspectors who feared being stigmatized by their striking colleagues.<sup>59</sup>

In *Viet Nam*, the Better Work Vietnam project issued guidelines for prevention, control and assessment of COVID-19 infection risk for employees in the workplaces and dormitories. It has built capacity and raised awareness among factories and workers on Covid-19 – and worked with VIHEMA, of the Ministry of Health. The Project under evaluation organised 2 training courses on risk assessment and developed a responsive plan for workplaces. In 2021, the VCCI (Chamber of Commerce) had a series of seminars and training for factories; webinars were used in the campaign; and messages were passed on to raise awareness through community radio channels, reaching workers in other industries beyond the garments. The application and updating of technology for webinars and the GOPY app/social platform to which documents, guidelines and tools (e.g. a self-assessment checklist) were uploaded, with the purpose of helping enterprises and workers to respond to COVID-19 and generate impact at many more factories than those that were within the scope of the BWV project.

Guidelines were produced to prevent COVID; and the Ministry of Health is better able to provide guidance to businesses and employees in epidemic prevention and control measures in the garment factories.

### Challenges

Helping all partners to understand the common goal of the Project and to follow the time schedule was a challenge. The fact the Project does not have dedicated staff resulted in BWV staff having to, at times, leave their own project activities behind in order to implement the tasks in the Project, particularly in terms of communicating and coordinating activities with partners. This made it necessary to undertake some activities online which enabled factories and partners to participate virtually. However, activities such as training of the medical team at the enterprise level, demonstration activities to build scenarios in dealing with similar epidemics could not be implemented. Also adjusting the Project’s activities with the business practices was a challenge. VIHEMA (MoH) found that the financial process and procedures “a bit complicated” and the funds for the COVID-19 protection and prevention component was divided into small parts, disbursed in three stages, and each time the financial procedures had to be done all over again.<sup>60</sup>

### **Social protection component – effectiveness and challenges/**

The work under this component has proved to be more challenging to implement than the COVID/OSH component and the objectives have, at least parts, proved to be quite unrealistic, especially regarding the timing. The original intervention strategy was to provide income support (“*immediate income security*”)<sup>61</sup> to the direct beneficiaries to enable employment retention and contribute to sustainable social protection systems. The evaluation found that the setting up the necessary institutional framework, adopting the necessary implementation agreements, and establishing eligibility criteria

---

<sup>58</sup> The Project took off in October, and the Manager was in place from November 2020 (source: ILO Hqs.).

<sup>59</sup> The Social Security representative of Madagascar and the ILO Manager of LABADMIN/OSH, who participated in the Stakeholder Workshop, confirmed that the situation did not impact negatively on the project as a whole - only the distribution of PPEs.

<sup>60</sup> Source: KII.

<sup>61</sup> Source: Project Document, p. 70

depending on the country specificities - proved to be more complicated than envisaged, a fact that was also mentioned by the MTE.

In **Bangladesh** (IFC-Better Work Bangladesh)

In early June the Project reported that it finally had been able to transfer funds to BGMEA and BKMEA (USD 3,14m split equally between the two). It was done on the basis of signed implementation agreements with these associations, stipulating that they would, in turn, pay the factories, who in turn would pay the workers. The workers would receive Tk. 3000 each, combined with one monthly salary by 15 June 2022.<sup>62</sup> The initial plan at the design stage of the Project, and in discussions with employers and workers representatives, was to transfer the amounts *directly* to the workers. However the two garment associations suggested that it would be more efficient to pay the amounts to the workers *as part of the wages through the employer*. The Project also realised that issuance of contracts with more than 200 employers would be logistically challenging, and therefore the Project requested the associations to do the contracts on behalf of the ILO - which would be more efficient.

In early June Project staff stated that ILO's part "was done" as the funds had left the ILO. In late July, the staff reported that BGMEA and BKMEA had disbursed the funds. DIFE is the agency that has been tasked to conduct random checking that that workers *actually receive the money*. **This clearly also needs to be monitored and follow-up also by the ILO.** The Project has informed the evaluation that a "post distribution monitoring" activity will be conducted for this purpose.

### Challenges

The social protection component has met with serious challenges in Bangladesh. After many meetings and discussions with the key stakeholders regarding eligibility criteria and ways to benefit the industry, a mechanism was developed and agreed upon to disburse funds as employment retention through subsidy disbursement targeting small and medium size enterprises (SMEs). The criteria was that they should not have received any government support and that they employ 250-500 workers. Should no payments be disbursed; this mechanism could remain as a policy option for the stakeholders to deploy in future crisis in any formal sector of the country.

The delay in the support to the enterprises depended on various factors: It took time to finalise the design of the disbursement mechanism and eligibility criteria<sup>63</sup> and integrate the feedback from all stakeholders including the Ministry of Labour and Employment (MoLE). The Economic Resource Division (ERD) found it difficult to appreciate why the funds would be disbursed through the ILO - and not as a part of government budget support.<sup>64</sup> Initially, the amount to be disbursed was considered *much too small* and did not generate interest among the employers. By end March 2022, at the time of the evaluation's Stakeholder workshop, the Project outputs 1.1 and 1.2 had not been implemented, mainly because of the lack of approval by the ERD. Granting the Project a three months no-cost extension up to June 30<sup>th</sup> (three months), enabled some break in the deadlock. In April, two important tripartite meetings were held on 19<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> April, respectively.<sup>65</sup> The involved parties agreed on the implementation strategy with the assumption that transfers would happen before the end of that month - however this did not happen.. After April, new agreements with the parties had to be negotiated and signed as by this time some garment factories originally targeted had been closed, and some were newly established. Thus, new lists of workers had to be drawn to enable the process of identification and verification of factories and workers who would benefit from the support - which took some more time.

In **Cambodia** (BFC Better Work Cambodia) it was decided that women workers who took maternity leave during the peak period of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020-21, and who had been affected and/or suspended from their jobs, were particularly vulnerable and should receive support. 18,785 female

---

<sup>62</sup> The previous budget amount for was USD 2,1 - but savings from Indonesia could be used to increase the cash amount in Bangladesh (source: Project staff).

<sup>63</sup> Source: Project Progress report, 2021.

<sup>64</sup> Here it is interesting to note that an EU-KfW project has a target to support 1m workers (cash transfer to RMG and Leather factory workers) but has only been able to issue funds to a few thousands workers. It plans to support the government in implementing sustainable social protection systems, including social insurance-unemployment insurance. Source: ILO office, Dhaka.

<sup>65</sup> Source: Two meeting minutes, and project staff.

workers in over 400 factories would receive USD 90 each as training stipend (the cash transfer component). The money would be paid directly to beneficiaries as training stipends - conditional to beneficiaries undergoing ILO training including six subjects.<sup>66</sup> By March 2022, only 4000 workers were identified, to participate in ILO training, and 500 were trained, however, nobody had received any funds at the time of the evaluation's Stakeholder workshop on 20<sup>th</sup> March. **The last project no-cost extension up to June 30<sup>th</sup> enabled the Project to progress and 18,785 beneficiaries identified (all female workers), and the 4000 women identified earlier finally received stipends in May 2022.** By 30<sup>th</sup> June, the last day of the Project, 17, 971 beneficiaries received the stipend.

According to Project staff, NEA has also benefitted from the involvement as it now is able to issue digital (electronic) payments - thus a new channel has been opened for possible use/replication in the future.

### Challenges

The component has been surrounded by difficulties, partly due to political circumstances, resulting in several deviations from the original plans. The National Social Security Fund (NSSF) was supposed to be the intermediary for the component but in the end it was unwilling to take on this responsibility and reluctant to be linked to the Project, as were some other agencies. The reasons given were that it is perceived to be supporting the industry itself, as well as the government - not the workers. This has posed a "political risk" to the work of the ILO Social Protection project operating in the country which provides technical support to the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) in the implementation of a social policy *framework* - rather than a *scheme*. The work entails raising awareness in the process of developing sustainable social protection systems. The Project under evaluation has been perceived as contradicting the SP project's long term efforts to contribute to system development, as it has adopted a rapid fund disbursements approach to be applied in *one* sector - while the SP project is looking at *all* sectors.<sup>67</sup>

In the actual implementation there were also complications surrounding the cash payment arrangements. For the National Employment Agency (NEA) that finally was selected as the agency to assume the responsibility of issuing the stipends (cash payments) to garment workers, it was a new role and experience. It entailed a process of thorough verification, i.e. verifying the identity of the workers eligible to benefit from the stipends. This took a long time, some of the reasons being that workers' phone numbers had changed and workers had changed jobs. A low-key independent follow-up was planned to take place before the end of the Project period.

In **Ethiopia** (ILO-SIRAYE, incl. VZF) the social protection component has worked quite well and the Project received support from the government in transferring the money directly to the workers' personal bank accounts without service charges during a five months period. A (temporary) technical working group, supported by a consultant, was formed to help develop eligibility criteria. USD 4,45m was transferred to 14 336 workers in 46 factories.

### Challenges/issues of concern

The online application process was somewhat challenging for the enterprises involved, and developing/agreeing upon the eligibility criteria took some time as all members of the tripartite committee had to be in agreement. Offline support was offered to help those who couldn't register online.

In **Indonesia** (ILO-IFC Better Work Indonesia). The initial strategy was to implement a wage subsidy scheme (or partial unemployment benefits). It was implemented at the lowest peak of the pandemic, one of the reasons being that by the time the Project was implemented, the sector had started experiencing recovery in orders and income for workers. It gave managers and workers the opportunity to experience bipartite cooperation at enterprise level.

7 out of 16 BW enterprises benefitted (no the full sector); and 9,610 out of 15,631 workers. A planned continuation was delayed and the approach was replaced by a salary compensation scheme *because*

---

<sup>66</sup> This is a "soft conditionality" - as in fact they will receive the stipend regardless, and nobody will be excluded (*source*: Written comments from ILO).

<sup>67</sup> *Source*: In-depth interviews and questionnaires from several KIs (triangulation).

*there was an interest in disbursing the funds to the BWI member factories and workers as soon as possible.* The trade unions had an intermediary role in implementing the scheme, and this partnership helped them build their own capacity. The garment factories also contributed to the outcome.

#### Challenges/issues of concern

The first scheme (wage subsidy scheme) was discontinued although it reportedly worked quite well in terms of effective coverage - but the needs for wage subsidy to furloughed work increased quite substantially. The reasons that it was discontinued was due to operational burdens and to speed up the (cash transfer) implementation. The Project did not have any dedicated staff to handle this scheme.<sup>68</sup> Project staff have expressed that the decision not to continue it and replace it with a salary compensation scheme was a lost opportunity as it could have been used to advocate to the government to reform its wage subsidy programme. Staff also opined that the Project might have reached more beneficiaries and made wider impact had it been continued. The University of Indonesia was commissioned to conduct a randomized control trial to assess the impact of the wage subsidy scheme design but this was not completed because the shift in approach.

In *LAO PDR* the approach was universal coverage, i.e. all workers in the garment sector who met the criteria were eligible for the support – with special attention to pregnant or lactating women. An income support system was implemented and more than 20,698 workers from 47 garment factories (44 garment factories, 3 footwear factories) have benefitted from the disbursements. This was a one-time cash assistance amount of 900,000k (approximately US\$ 85) made to the beneficiaries between February and November 2021 through Lao Social Security Organisation (LSSO) - *which already pays unemployment insurance to its members*. It is noted that the regular unemployment insurance requires contributions during a minimum of 12 months, while this Project required only one month of contribution.<sup>69</sup>

The project exceeded some of its planned outputs, for example, the total number of beneficiaries reached is, 20,698 workers, approximately 12 per cent higher than the plan targeted. Digital payment apps were used to transfer money to the beneficiaries and the LSSO has appreciated it as a new tool it can use in the future. This enhanced the number of garment workers as beneficiaries as those without bank accounts could easily be reached. There has been good tripartite participation in the day-to-day planning and implementation.

#### Challenges

In interviews with key informants, the issue of targeting was brought up, e.g. that informal economy workers should have been part of the beneficiaries (as they do not receive any support or protection from employers or LSSO) and that special attention should have been given to pregnant or lactating women.

Table 1 shows the status of the cash transfer expenditures at the time of the evaluation.

---

<sup>68</sup> Source: Questionnaire surveys and interviews (triangulation).

<sup>69</sup> Source: Written comments from stakeholders.

**Table 1.** Summary of the expenditures of the cash transfer, including commitments, by country (as of 7 June 2022)

	Total amount (including commitments) (USD) <sup>70</sup>	No. of workers identified to benefit from the cash transfer support	Reported status of received payments by 30 <sup>th</sup> June 2022	No. of factories/SMEs benefitting from support
Bangladesh	(BDT 128,976,000.00)	90 144	90 692 <sup>71</sup> received	223 <sup>72</sup> (SMEs)
Cambodia	1 710 000	18,785	17,971 <sup>73</sup> received <sup>74</sup>	474
Ethiopia	4 450 000	14 336	Received	46
Indonesia	2 schemes: 1 752 199 & 1 704 915	11 614 <sup>75</sup>	Received	7 <sup>76</sup>
Lao PDR	1 979 487	20 698 <sup>77</sup>	Received	47 <sup>78</sup>

### Stakeholder involvement

The Projects developed communication strategies adapted to the respective country context which have worked rather well in many countries. With a few exceptions, inputs and feedback from members of technical working groups and tripartite committees (in most cases temporarily set up for the purpose of the project) were taken into account in the development and/or updating of the eligibility criteria. In some cases, representatives of workers' unions expressed that they had not been involved in the design and that there had been a lack of communication during the data collection process in factories. In some countries, the way to get things moving was to approach the factories directly instead of via employers or workers unions.<sup>79</sup> In Madagascar, the project partnered with WHO in the implementation of the Covid-OSH component.

### 3.4 EFFICIENCY OF RESOURCE USE

The Project has had a tight budget. The total expenditure is USD 16 627 497 including *commitments* out of the total budget of USD 17 180 095. - thus the budget delivery rate is finally high (97%).<sup>80</sup> **Efforts**

<sup>70</sup> Source: ILO CTA, Hqs.

<sup>71</sup> Workers benefitting: 42 992 under BGMEA; and 47 700 under BKMEA.

<sup>72</sup> Factories involved: 113 under BGMEA and 110 under BKMEA.

<sup>73</sup> 18,786 workers were identified and 17,963 workers had received funds by 30<sup>th</sup> June (source: Project staff). All workers are female.

<sup>74</sup> Source: ILO staff (info from attending a Final Steering Committee meeting in mid June).

<sup>75</sup> 9 610 workers benefitting from the income subsidy scheme; and 2 004 workers benefitting from the salary compensation scheme.

<sup>76</sup> The Project paid directly to the workers' accounts and it is not known in which factories they had worked. 7 out of 16 enterprises benefitted.

<sup>77</sup> This is 12% higher than the planned targeted (source: Interview).

<sup>78</sup> This includes 44 garment factories and 3 footwear factories. 900,000k (approximate US\$85) was paid to each of the beneficiaries between February and November 2021. Source: Post Distribution Monitoring Report.

<sup>79</sup> Source: Interviews and questionnaire survey.

<sup>80</sup> See Annex II. Summary of budget expenditures (source: ILO SOCPRO).

**have been made to ensure that most of the funds are translated to actual benefits** (implementation) in terms of the emergency cash transfer and OSH. In one case only it was reported that parts of the budget for direct payments to beneficiaries was used for the implementation activities, contrary to an agreement with the implementing/intermediary organisation - which seems to point to implementation budgets being underestimated.

The overall efficiency of the Project is assessed to be at medium level. Looking at the two components separately, the OSH/Covid protection component has been more efficient in terms of benefitting the intended target groups, while the cash transfer component was problematic and only after three project extensions (at the end of June 2022) did the disbursements to the SMEs materialize in Bangladesh, and most of the remaining stipends were disbursed to female workers in Cambodia.

The Project has commissioned consultants in the respective countries to work on the day-to-day tasks but the main responsibility lies with the ILO project staff who work fulltime in *other* projects. Several ILO project staff members have opined that the “undercutting of resources” for ILO implementation and management is an oversight and should be a lesson learned – however, no doubt this approach has kept costs down considerably.

### 3.5 IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY

Impact and sustainability are closely related. **The real impact of the Project cannot be known** to date but it is clear that through webinars, social media campaigns and trainings, the Project has been able to impart knowledge, spread information/messages and thus raise awareness regarding COVID-19 prevention, the need for behaviour change as well as some of the ILO principles in the world of work.

In some cases, stakeholders have expressed that by being involved in the Project implementation, they have gained more knowledge about the realities in the garment industry. In one case, a Ministry representative stated that gaining knowledge about actual needs, difficulties, and conditions, s/he was now in a much better position to develop COVID-19 protection policies directed to the industry.

Impact can also be seen in the sense that increased information and communications technology (ICT) among stakeholders have played a big role in the efforts to raise awareness through reaching large populations with messages. One example is the GOPY app/social platform developed in Vietnam, which helped raise awareness regarding COVID-19 risk assessments and prevention at the workplace and the new labour code, especially the new requirements relating to gender equality.

The FGDs in Ethiopia revealed that *workers* who had received income support used the cash for food; remittances to family members in the provinces; buying household items; paying rent, utilities and bills. The support had reduced stress, given them better sleep and made them feel more secure. It had also provided them with better health protection as the money had also been used to buy face masks, alcohol gel, vitamins and supplements for their families. Other FGD participants stated that the support didn't bring any change to their lives as the amount was small, and they had to use their life time savings and borrowing money from friends during the pandemic. *Enterprises* stated that the support had been immense and had helped the business to flourish because they were able to invest on raw materials, accept higher orders, hire more labour and pay loans.

In Lao PDR, a survey found that top five usages of the income support included spending on food, remittances to family in the provinces, purchasing face masks, alcohol gel, vitamins, supplements and household items for their families; paying rent, utilities and bills. In Indonesia, the laid-off workers stated that the cash received was very beneficial during pandemic and was used when trying to start their own businesses; apply for a new jobs; pay for medical expenses; and daily expenses.

The emergency nature of the latter, and the need for rapid action, has had the effect that **sustainability has not been of primary concern**, neither in the eyes of the Project staff nor stakeholders, perhaps with the exception of the COVID-19 prevention and protection activities that have been closely linked to the work of the VZF programme - here there is a chance that some of the activities will continue. The variations of income support such as wage subsidy support/job retention, salary compensation, training stipends have been perceived by most stakeholders involved as “one-off events” intended to end when the project closes. The social protection approach of disbursing funds to factories and workers have in

some cases met with initial reluctance from stakeholders (e.g. employers and factories) and in a few countries (Indonesia and Cambodia) it was perceived as detrimental vis-à-vis the aim to develop national social protection (contributory) systems in the formal economy. However, the Project's capacity building e.g. on developing eligibility criteria, awareness raising activities, tools (e.g. guidelines for Labour Inspectors and factory managers) and even covid/health related policies at factory level **may very well be sustained**, and could come to use when/if new epidemics occur in the industry in the future.

### 3.6 CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

#### *Gender equality and non-discrimination*

The country projects have taken into consideration most of ILO's key cross-cutting issues, some to a large extent, others less. The Project produced materials that are gender sensitive and targeting risk groups, e.g. pregnant women; raising gender awareness among stakeholders with the message that more women than men will benefit from the wage subsidy. It raised awareness among Labour Inspectors through including discrimination and violence/harassment issues, in labour inspection manuals, that may workers may face during the pandemic; and addressing gender issues when designing training modules in combination with risk assessment, prevention/mitigation measures; and requesting the factories to supply gender/sex-specific information about beneficiaries (shoe sizes, size of fluorescent waistcoats) before distributing PPEs.

In Ethiopia it was mentioned that there were many unwanted pregnancies during the pandemic (but no figures are available) and, after women had given birth, they did not return to the factories. In Vietnam, the manuals all refer to health and safety issues, particularly concerning female workers. The key employer stakeholder (VCCI - Chamber of Commerce) has drawn attention to the health of female workers, especially at project seminars.

Most country projects have stated that the industry does not employ people with disability (PWD) and the Project has therefore, generally, not been concerned with paying attention to the issue of inclusion of PWD in the project, e.g. identifying beneficiaries in the industry who would warrant special support. Stakeholders and ILO staff have stated that this (cross-cutting) issue was not clearly communicated in the Project document. However, in some countries PWD was still addressed by the Project staff: In Bangladesh, the Project requested the implementing partners to have separate data on PWDs for receiving the subsidy. In Madagascar, many PWD were said to work in the cotton value chain and that the Covid-19 prevention campaign had spread beyond the garment sector to this sector.<sup>81</sup> In Vietnam the training materials mention disadvantaged groups, including people with disabilities, and the Project provided hygienic products to women with disabilities through a training institute which organises textile-related trainings.

Regarding *other* non-discrimination issues, the country projects attended to this issue in different ways, for instance in Indonesia the salary compensation scheme was provided to workers *outside* BWI factories; and in Lao, the approach was to involve all workers in the garment sector, not leaving out anyone for reasons, such as geographical distance among others.<sup>82</sup>

#### *Social dialogue, tripartism and labour standards*

Social dialogue is seen as a means, a vehicle to achieve social and economic progress and as an end in itself giving people a voice and a stake at their societies and workplace. Social dialogue is a prerequisite for ILO's project implementation and in this pilot, the Project initiated and engaged in social dialogue<sup>83</sup> with ILO's constituents (government, employers and workers) to higher extent in some countries, and with less intensity in some. In all countries, tripartite committees such as Project Steering Committees and/or tripartite Working groups were either set up or already existing, to give key stakeholders/social

---

<sup>81</sup> Centre National de Formation des Personnes en Situation d'Handicap. *Source*: Interview.

<sup>82</sup> *Source*: Interviews, questionnaire survey.

<sup>83</sup> ILO defines social dialogue to include consultation, or simply exchange of information between, or among, representatives of governments, employers and workers, on issues of common interest, such as the two key components of this project – the main goal being promote consensus building and democratic involvement among the key stakeholders.



partners the opportunity to voice any concerns freely and participate in open exchanges of ideas and experiences to create consensus regarding the implementation.

The stakeholders' feedback and ideas were taken into account when working out eligibility criteria in the selection/targeting of beneficiaries. *In some cases national stakeholders have highlighted that their participation took place in a series of consultations regarding how to implement the activities – rather than at the design, or preparatory stage.* In Ethiopia, the tripartite technical committee met every week at least at the start of the implementation, and in Lao, the social partners in the tripartite committee did the day-to-day planning and implementation.

The Project has also, to a varying degree, promoted ILO labour conventions, particularly ILO C168 (Employment Promotion and Protection against Unemployment Convention) and C102 (Social Security, Minimum Standards).<sup>84</sup> In Madagascar, C155 (Occupational Safety and Health Convention), C161 (Occupational Health Services Convention) and C187 (Promotional Framework for Occupational Safety and Health Convention) were also among the promoted conventions.<sup>85</sup>

### 3.7 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The Project has no detailed overall M&E plan as key strategic and management instrument with information to users about monitoring questions and relevant data collection processes. Possibly this is because there is not detailed LFA *to provide the basis* for it, e.g. indicating means of verification. However, in order to mitigate the risk of benefits not reaching the intended beneficiaries, the Project staff have held regular monitoring discussions with the stakeholders, such as in tripartite committees and working groups and established M&E routines, and also drawn on the implementing organisations' technical and financial monitoring system. This has sometimes been challenging, as the COVID pandemic during peak periods limited mobility and visits to factories/enterprises. In some countries, specific post distribution monitoring surveys were carried out, however only one country has monitoring as a specific activity in the original "logical framework".<sup>86</sup> This evaluation has found it necessary that both Bangladesh and Cambodia need to conduct some form of rapid post implementation follow-up to confirm that funds from the cash transfer/social protection component were received by SMEs and workers.

---

<sup>84</sup> Source: Interviews, questionnaire survey.

<sup>85</sup> Source: E-mail with comments from ILO.

<sup>86</sup> See Sub-output 3.1.3. Project Document.

## 4 CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions in this chapter are derived from the findings in Chapter 4.

### Relevance and validity of design

The ILO has responded to the pandemic crisis in the garment industry with the intention to mitigate the negative effects of the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in momentous disruptions of global and domestic supply chains. The majority of the stakeholders have appreciated the Project's activities, and partnered with the ILO in the process of reaching the project outcomes.

The immediate outcomes relate to strengthening safety and health protection measures in relation to Covid-19 and build resilience/systems in view of future crisis; and cushioning enterprises against immediate employment and income losses and to compensation to workers for their loss of income due to the pandemic. The evaluation concludes that **the Project overall is relevant**, as regards its design, and that it is in line with the DWCP and ILO policy framework on OSH and social protection as well as national priorities. However, the way the cash transfer component eventually played out, it is concluded that it was **less relevant in a few countries in comparison with** the OSH component - for which the implementation was much more straightforward. The reason for this is that, generally, beneficiaries received funds very late; *not* at the time that they needed it the most. The situation demonstrates the necessity to thoroughly discuss similar projects' strategies at the design stage in close communication with the national constituents/stakeholders, so as to serve the beneficiaries in the best way in the future, even if the projects are to address crisis/covariate situations.

Only Cambodia and Madagascar had included the informal economy actors as beneficiaries in their "logframes". The project could have been more relevant if it had paid much more attention to garment workers in the *informal* economy.

The Project lacked a valid Theory of Change and has no Logical Framework Analysis matrix, but has listed outcomes, outputs and sub-outputs in a logical order.

### Coherence

Regarding internal coherence, concluded that coherence vis-à-vis national priorities in relation to Covid-19 was found in the majority of countries, while coherence with the Bangladesh situation seemed to be lacking. There clearly exist synergies and interlinkages between the Project under evaluation, and the major ILO interventions in the garment sector (BWP), as well as ILO's interventions in the field of OSH (VZF). Regarding external coherence with the work of other actors, the Project has made efforts to avoid duplication of effort.

### Effectiveness

Overall, the Project's effectiveness lies in the extent of the achievements and in reaching the outputs and outcomes towards the end. Much has been achieved with generally a high level of effort and with a medium-high level of effectiveness as regards the COVID-19/OSH component. Protection campaigns reached large numbers of people with relevant messages, in some countries also outside the garment sector, thus meeting the assessed needs of the beneficiaries for more awareness and knowledge.

A number of internal and external circumstances affected the outcomes. It is concluded that the implementation of the social protection (cash transfer/funds disbursement) component has a lower level of effectiveness in comparison with the OSH component. The reason for this is that in early June 2022 - after three "no-cost" project extensions - Cambodia had only been able to pay 4 000 out of the intended 18 000 plus female beneficiaries. In Bangladesh no SMEs or workers had yet received any payments in early June when the evaluation work was resumed. Towards the very end of June, just before the closing of the Project, it was reported that most of the payments finally were disbursed. Project staff stated that ILO's part "was done" as the funds had left the ILO and were transferred to BGMEA and BKMEA. Although DIFE is the agency that has been tasked to conduct random checking, Bangladesh (and Cambodia) need to conduct some form of independent follow-up to confirm that workers actually have received the funds – even if the Project officially closed 30<sup>th</sup> June.

It is also concluded that the result of policy level work is rather weak which may be attributed to the fact that all the project country frameworks had low level policy outputs (*sub*-outputs) under the OSH component (except two countries that had none) and that policy is not mentioned at all in the Social Protection component outputs. The evaluation has assessed that for an emergency-oriented project, which initially was meant to be one-year project, contributing to policy changes was probably not regarded as very realistic by the project designers.

The Project's efforts to integrate cross-cutting issues has been quite successful as gender equality issues, social dialogue, tripartism and labour standards have been important aspects in the *majority* of the countries – but *only a few countries, have addressed non-discrimination as regards people with disabilities*.

### Efficiency

The vast majority of the funds have been spend, and the budget delivery rate is now over 95%. However, the overall efficiency of the Project is assessed to be at medium level. Looking at the two components separately, the OSH/Covid protection component has been more efficient in terms of benefitting the intended target groups, while the cash transfer component was problematic and only after three project extensions (at the end of June 2022) did the disbursements to the SMEs materialize in Bangladesh, and most of the remaining stipends were disbursed to female workers in Cambodia.

The approach of using staff who work fulltime in other ILO projects has kept costs down but several of the staff in the field have opined that this “undercutting of resources” approach should be revisited by the ILO as it may not actually lead to efficiency in terms of reaching the outcomes.

### Impact

The full impact of the Project cannot be known to date but it is clear that through e.g. webinars, social media campaigns and training, the Project has been able to spread information/messages about COVID-19, and ways to minimise the risks of spreading infections at the workplace, and in communities and at home too. The project has also imparted knowledge regarding behaviour change; and enhanced government officials insight in garment industry realities, as well as ILO key principles related to the world of work. Stakeholders learning how to utilize/apply information and communications technology (ICT) have played a big role in the Project's efforts to reach large populations with messages. Some beneficiaries who received income support have confirmed its usefulness (examples from Lao and Indonesia) while others stated that the support didn't bring any change to their lives as the amount was small, and they had to use their life time savings and money borrowed from friends during the pandemic. In a few cases beneficiary enterprises viewed the support as immense and that it had helped the business to flourish.

### Sustainability

The emergency/pilot nature of the Project and the need for rapid action, is most likely a reason that sustainability has not been of primary issue, neither in the eyes of the Project staff, nor in the eyes of the stakeholders. However, as the COVID prevention and protection activities have been closely linked to, or even part of, the VZF and Better Work programmes – there is a chance that some of the activities and/or learning will remain in the garment/industry sector and among the various actors.. The variations of income support (wage subsidy support/job retention, salary compensation, training stipends) are perceived as “one-off event” that will end when the project closes. The social protection approach of disbursing funds (cash transfer) to factories and workers have in some cases met with initial reluctance from stakeholders (e.g. employers and factories) and in a few countries it has been perceived as detrimental vis-à-vis the aim to develop sustainable national social protection (contributory) systems in the formal economy. However, the result of the Project's awareness-raising and capacity building; mechanisms and work on developing eligibility criteria and various tools, e.g. guidelines for Labour Inspectors and factory managers, webinars, and apps, may very well be sustained and could come to use when/if new epidemics occur in the industry in the future.

## **Monitoring and evaluation**

It is concluded that overall M&E plans should be developed by all ILO projects as key strategic management instruments with information to users about monitoring questions and relevant data collection processes. Designing detailed LFA matrices providing the *basis* for operational and M&E plans is important for all ILO technical assistance projects.

## 5 RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are recommendations based on the findings in chapter 3 and conclusions in chapter 4:

### Recommendation 1.

- a) The **ILO should** ensure that multi-country/interregional technical cooperation projects, even emergency -oriented or pilot projects, have necessary key strategic and management tools such as **one** overall ToCs; **one** overall LFA and detailed M&E plans in each country – to enable strategic management and a smoother follow-up on results, for both projects and evaluators;
- b) The Project is a product of rapid action, with less than adequate participation of the national tripartite stakeholders in its design. The **ILO should** make sure that also emergency oriented projects follow the rule of involving/consulting with the relevant stakeholders at the very formulation stage.
- c) When designing new similar projects, the **ILO should** ensure that garment workers in the *informal* economy also are targeted (in this Project, only Cambodia and Madagascar had included the informal economy actors as beneficiaries in their “logframes”).
- d) If policy change/influence is crucial to the Project’s attainment of the overall (immediate) objectives or development objectives, the **ILO should** in the future emphasise the importance at the level of **outcomes** or immediate objectives - not at sub-output level.

The recommendation is directed to: ILO (SOCPRO), LABADMIN/OSH), VZF, BWP and donor agency.

*Timeframe: Immediate (or when new projects are being formulated); Priority: High; Level of resources: Low-Medium*

### Recommendation 2

The way the cash transfer component eventually played out it was found to be less relevant in a few countries, in comparison with the OSH component - for which the implementation was much more straightforward. In the future, the **ILO should** concentrate its technical cooperation and assistance efforts, in the field of social protection, on systems, policies, knowledge development and institutional change which are core mandate .The recommendation is directed to: ILO (SOCPRO).

*Timeframe: Immediate (or when new projects are being formulated); Priority: Medium; Level of resources: Medium*

### Recommendation 3

When designing new cash transfer interventions, **ILO should** engage in cash transfer when the circumstances are straight forward and can be perceived to have a reasonable and realistic chance to reach the set objectives - in view of the complexities described by this evaluation. Discussions and consultations with key project stakeholders about strategies should be done at the *design* stage, so as to eventually serve the beneficiaries in the best way, even if the project is to be implemented under crisis/covariate conditions.

The recommendation is directed to ILO (SOCPRO).

*Timeframe: Immediate (or when new projects are being formulated); Priority: High ; Level of resources: Low-Medium*

### Recommendation 4

In future projects that have high complexities (as in the case of the income support/cash transfer) the **ILO should** ensure that a dedicated Project Coordinator/Manager, or Chief Technical Adviser, is posted in nearer proximity to the project countries (“field level as opposed to HQs”) as there is a lot to win in terms of physical closeness to country implementation, monitoring, and follow-up. The recommendation is directed to: ILO (SOCPRO), LABADMIN/OSH), VZF, BWP, donor agency (BMZ).

*Timeframe: Immediate (or when new projects are being formulated); Priority: Medium; Level of resources: High*

### **Recommendation 5**

The use of ICT, including apps ,have played a big role in reaching large populations with Covid-19/OSH protection/prevention and related messages, and actual training. As the pandemic is not likely to go away any time soon, the **ILO should**, in future projects make use of /build on video clips and webinars directed to factory owners/managers and workers - on how to avoid the spread of the virus in the workplace and at home too, and related OSH issues (notwithstanding difficulties with weak internet connections in some areas).

The recommendation is directed to: ILO (SOCPRO), LABADMIN/OSH, VZF, BWP.

*Timeframe: 6 months - 1 year; Priority: Medium; Level of resources: Low-Medium*

### **Recommendation 6**

In this Project, sustainability efforts have not been a primary concern, as other activities were in the foreground. The **ILO should** in future projects clarify the importance of sustaining the activities and make projects develop realistic sustainability plans, in close cooperation with the constituents and partners in which *national stakeholders* are encouraged to take the bulk of responsibility for the continuation of activities or upholding systems created. The recommendation is directed to ILO (SOCPRO), LABADMIN/OSH), VZF, BWP, ILO constituents.

*Timeframe: 6 months-1 year; Priority: Medium, Level of resources: Medium-High*

### **Recommendation 7**

The **ILO should** make sure that successful activities in the Project related to the COVID-19 protection/prevention campaigns; and raising awareness through media are integrated and sustained even after the closing of the garment sector protection project. The recommendation is directed to: ILO (LABADMIN/OSH), ILO (SOCPRO), VZF, BWP and ILO constituents.

*Timeframe: Immediate-6 months- , Priority: High, Level of resources: Low*

### **Recommendation 8**

As Bangladesh and Cambodia were very late in disbursing the funds of the income support/social protection, the **ILO should** conduct independent and rapid follow-ups/checks to confirm that workers actually have receive the funds as has been stipulated. The recommendation is directed to the ILO project staff and country offices in these countries in particular - as well as the national/local organisations that have assumed the responsibility to follow-up that the funds reached the beneficiaries.

*Timeframe: Immediate; Priority: High, Level of resources: Low-Medium.*

## **6 LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES**

*See Annex VI.*

## ANNEX I. TERMS OF REFERENCE

Final independent evaluation of the project titled “*Protecting garment sector workers: occupational safety and health and income support in response to the COVID-19 pandemic*”

Beneficiary countries	Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Madagascar, Viet Nam
Project codes	GLO/20/20/MUL
Development Partner	BMZ (Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development, Germany)
Duration of project implementation	September 2020 – March 2022
Sustainable Development Goals	1, 3, 8, 10, 16, 17
Total project funds	Planned investment of €14.5 million or \$ 17,180,095 in terms of the total allocation to the project
Administrative offices	CO-Dhaka (for Bangladesh) DWT/CO-Bangkok (for Cambodia and Lao PDR) CO-Addis Ababa (for Ethiopia) CO-Jakarta (for Indonesia) CO-Antananarivo (for Madagascar) CO-Hanoi (for Viet Nam) SOCPRO LABADMIN/OSH
Technical units	Social Protection Department (SOCPRO) and the Labour Administration, Labour Inspection and Occupational Safety and Health Branch (LABADMIN/OSH)
Type of evaluation	Independent Final Evaluation
Evaluation dates	December 2021 – March 2022



## 6.1 INTRODUCTION

These Terms of Reference provide the framework for the final independent evaluation of the project “*Protecting garment sector workers: occupational safety and health and income support in response to the COVID-19*” (GLO/20/20/MUL). Funded by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development the project was signed in August 2020 and started implementation in November 2020. The project was initially foreseen to end activities on 31 October 2021. Following a no-cost extension the project will end activities on 31 March 2022.

As per ILO evaluation policy, the project will be subject to an independent final evaluation for the period of project activity (3 September 2020-31 March 2022). The evaluation will take place between December 2021 and February 2022.

## 6.2 PROJECT’S THEORY OF CHANGE

Global and domestic supply chains (GSC) across the world have been affected by significant disruptions due to the COVID-19 pandemic, linked to the barriers of lockdown and the cancellation of orders. In the garment GSC many factories in producing countries have reduced, temporarily suspended their activities and some have closed, leading to partial unemployment of workers or layoffs. Most of the affected workers do not receive any severance payment or (partial or full) unemployment benefits. This has left a large number of poor workers, primarily women, without any source of income. Urgent action was needed to support suppliers during this period and secure their business continuity when it is still possible, by helping companies paying wages of their workers. In addition to providing direct income support to these workers, it was imperative to simultaneously address the issue of occupational safety and health. It is clear that if appropriate OSH actions were not taken when countries have started easing lockdowns or other exceptional measures, there would have been a heightened risk of new infections in workplaces, which in turn would have resulted in increased absenteeism and possibly (re)suspension of operations.

In this context, the “Protecting garment sector workers: occupational safety and health and income support in response to the COVID-19 pandemic” project has been implemented in 7 countries, namely Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Madagascar, Lao PDR and Vietnam.

This Project focuses on two immediate goals:

- (i) Strengthening safety and health protection measures, to ensure that employers, workers, and their families are protected from the direct and indirect health risks of COVID-19 and that workplaces are not negatively impacted by further outbreaks due to a poor management of OSH hazards; and
- (ii) Cushioning enterprises against immediate income losses; and compensating workers for the loss of income due to COVID 19 by providing wage subsidies and other cash transfers; this helps to prevent a chain of supply shocks (e.g. losses in workers’ productivity capacities) and demand shocks (e.g. suppressing consumption among workers and their families) that could lead to a prolonged economic recession.

The Project is structured around two components: (A) OSH and (B) Income support that operates jointly in Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, whereas in Madagascar and Vietnam the focus is on OSH only. Component (A) focuses on the OSH measures that are implemented under the auspices of the Vision Zero Fund (VZF) and in

close collaboration with the Better Work Programme. Component B focuses on providing income support for garments factory workers, facilitate employment retention and ultimately contribute to building strengthened and sustainable social protection systems.

Under component (A), the project supports the implementation of quick OSH- oriented actions to support national efforts to mitigate the possible OSH impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic in global supply chains and prepare for future epidemics/ pandemics. The actions have been designed to pay particular attention to vulnerable workers in the garment GSC (See Annex 2 for further information). In order to facilitate fast and efficient interventions, the ILO was to put in place a fast-track procedure to give small grants to key selected partners to implement activities whenever feasible. The OSH component is divided into three sub-components and seven outputs:

1. Prevention of exposure to SARS-CoV-2 and transmission of COVID-19 in the workplace
  - i) Constituents' efforts in the design and implementation of practical workplace prevention and mitigation measures are supported.
  - ii) Public health measures with an impact in workplaces are in place.
  - iii) Enhanced capacity of employers and workers on risk management and assistance in the development of preparedness and response plans for COVID-19 prevention at workplace
  - iv) Enhanced awareness by all relevant stakeholders on the risks of COVID-19 in the workplace and effective responses
2. Ensuring that policies are in place for future epidemics
  - v) OSH issues are integrated into policy responses.
  - vi) Emergency preparedness integrated into OSH management systems and policies at the enterprise level.
3. Providing support to workers and their families through the employment injury insurance system
  - vii) Provide support to modify the legal framework related to employment injury to include a flexible list of covered contingencies

The project pursues a two-pronged strategy for social protection. Firstly, the project aimed to extend existing social security benefits or implement rapid compensation mechanisms for workers who had lost partially or fully their income, while promoting employment retention. Secondly, the project aimed to ensure that the rapid intervention is aligned with the principles enshrined in International Social Security Standards, and can serve as a basis for the development of more complete and sustainable social protection systems. These principles include:

1. Pursuing the objective of universal and rights-based social protection
2. Consolidating the responsibility of the State as the primary guarantor of the right to social security
3. The principle of social dialogue and active engagement of the social partners.
4. Making ODA part and parcel of the principle of solidarity in financing

This strategy was to be adjusted to the context in each country in order to build on existing social protection mechanisms and to develop or further strengthen existing initiatives that aim at providing unemployment insurance.

### 6.3 MANAGEMENT SET-UP

Project implementation is supported at global level by SOCPRO (component B) and LABADMIN/OSH, through Vision Zero Fund (component A). Country level activities are decentralised to the respective country teams. The specific implementation modalities, such as the agency in charge of the cash transfers/ income subsidies for example, depend on the country context. A schematic overview of the implementing partners for the SOCPRO and OSH components, related initiatives/ projects and relevant policies is provided in **Error! Reference source not found.**

**Table 1 Summary of implementation partners and related projects for the 7 countries.**

Country	Implementing partner/partner institutions OSH component	Implementing partner for income support/ wage subsidy/ Job Retention programmes	Other projects/ partnerships
Bangladesh	Department of Inspection for Factories and Establishments (DIFE), Bangladesh Garment Manufacturers and Exporters Association (BGMEA), Bangladesh Knitwear Manufacturers and Exporters Association (BKMEA), BEF (Bangladesh Employers' Federation)	Employment retention External mechanism	EC-INTPA on Social Protection (SP) and Public Finance Management (PFM)
Cambodia	Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training / Department of OSH, Garment Manufacturing Association in Cambodia (GMAC)	Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training/National Employment Agency	
Ethiopia	Industrial Park Development Corporation (IPDC); Hawassa Industrial Park Investors Association (HIPIA); Bureau of Labour and Social Affairs (SNNPR), POESSA	Employment retention Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs	EC-INTPA on SP and PFM
Indonesia	Ministry of Manpower, EOs and WOs.	Wage subsidy (phase 1) + income support (phase 2) Partnership at Work Foundation ("Better Work Foundation")	Fast retailing project on Unemployment Insurance

Lao PDR	Association of Lao Garment Industries (ALGI)	Income support Lao Social Security Organization	
Madagascar	General Directorate of Labour and Social Laws (DGTLS) of the Ministry in charge of Labour; Department of Workers' Social Security (DSST); Labour Inspectorate in the Analamanga, Vakinankaratra and Southwest Regions and various OHS institutions (a Tripartite Project Technical Committee is in place)		
Viet Nam	Viet Nam Health Environment Management Agency, Ministry of Health, VGCL		

#### 6.4 ALIGNMENT OF THE PROJECT WITH THE ILO'S STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK, THE SDGs AND THE COVID-19 CALL TO ACTION IN THE GLOBAL GARMENT INDUSTRY

The cash transfer component provides short-term humanitarian assistance. However, the design of the transfers, including the development of selection criteria and transfer modalities, is based on ILO principles for strengthening sustainable national social protection systems. These principles are listed in the ILO Recommendation on social protection floors, 2012 (No. 202) and include among others, the overall and primary responsibility of the State, social dialogue and tripartite participation, transparency, non-discrimination and solidarity in financing. The application of these principles is expected to facilitate the consolidation of the short-term measures into sustainable schemes or at least their contribution to the development of long-term national social protection schemes. To this effect, the cash transfer component is accompanied by a technical assistance component that allows supporting the development or further strengthening of national unemployment insurance schemes. It is aligned with the strategy of ILO's Programme and Budget (2020-21) policy Outcome 8 on Comprehensive and sustainable social protection for all and Outcome 7 (7.2 in particular)<sup>87</sup>. At country level, it links to the priorities identified in the Country Programme Outcomes, namely BGD101 for Bangladesh, KHM226 for Cambodia, ETH154 for Ethiopia, IDN103 for Indonesia, and PDR226 for Lao PDR. The country programme Outcomes linked to OSH component are BGD 227 (Bangladesh); KHM 227 (Cambodia); ETH 152 (Ethiopia); IDN 152 (Indonesia); LAO 201 (Laos); MDG 202 (Madagascar); and VNM 107 (Vietnam)

<sup>87</sup> ILO P&B 2020-21: Outcome 7: Adequate and effective protection at work for all; Output 7.2. Increased capacity of member States to ensure safe and healthy working conditions

The project contributes to the SDGs 1, 3, 8, 10, 16 and 17. At country level, activities are aligned with UN support, including the UN support to national COVID-19 response plans. The project is also closely linked with the [COVID-19: Action in the Global Garment Industry](#). This Call to Action aims to catalyse action from across the global garment industry to support manufacturers to survive the economic disruption caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and to protect garment workers' income, health and employment. This global action also calls for work on sustainable systems of social protection for a more just and resilient garment industry. The Call to Action sets out urgent priorities and specific commitments for organizations across the industry to endorse as the first step to collective action to achieve these goals.

The evaluation will integrate ILO's cross-cutting issues, including ILO standards and social dialogue, gender equality, disability inclusion, non-discrimination, and medium and long-term effects of capacity development initiatives throughout the evaluation methodology and all deliverables, including the final report.

## **6.5 PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION**

An evaluability review with elements of internal mid-term evaluation was conducted in April-May 2021 by an independent consultant. The internal evaluation examined how well the project interventions were progressing towards achieving its objectives. The internal-evaluation process included individual review meetings with each implementing partner, focus group discussions with target groups in the project target areas, and a one-day stakeholder's workshop where the findings of the self-evaluation were presented to all relevant and key project stakeholders. This allowed the key findings and recommendations to be shared with the project partners and receive their feedback and comments.

The evaluation report concluded that the implementing partners tried their best to implement the project within their limitations; that it was progressing as planned and that the outcomes were emerging but not yet well established. It highlighted potential good practices for scale up in the future, after refinements. The OSH component of the project was found pertinent, effective and efficient and had an overall satisfactory progress towards outcome at the time of mid-term evaluation. The evaluation report included recommendations in specific areas of work for further action.

This evaluation will be managed by an independent evaluation manager from the ILO and shall be conducted by an evaluation team consisting of a lead evaluator who will be assisted by national level independent evaluators. The evaluation will follow EVAL guidance on conducting evaluations during the COVID 19 pandemic. ILO SOCPRO and LABADMIN/OSH focal points will provide the necessary support in terms of identifying stakeholders, providing documents and other support required to facilitate timely data collection.

## **6.6 EVALUATION PURPOSE, SCOPE AND CLIENTS**

The evaluation will take place between December 2021 and March 2022.

## **6.7 PURPOSE**

The purpose of the evaluation is as follows to:

- Assess progress achieved towards the outcomes of the project at the end of the implementation period for both OSH and income support component.
- Assess the relevance and validity of project design and the efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of its outcomes
- Identify the key strengths and shortcomings in the design and implementation of both components.
- Assess how well intervention-level actions supported COVID-19 response strategies and policies.
- Provide in-depth reflection on the strategies and assumptions that have guided the interventions at country level
- Make recommendations towards design and implementation management for future projects from the perspective of emergency response in the area of OSH and through cash transfer modality.

The evaluation will serve for accountability purposes, as well as for knowledge sharing purposes through documentation of lessons learned and good practices.

## **6.8 SCOPE**

The proposed evaluation will examine the project in terms of its progress, its implementation arrangements, partnerships, achievements, challenges, good practices, and lessons learned from the implementation of the project.

The final evaluation will cover all seven countries of the project and all components.

The evaluation shall include all project activities undertaken from September 2020 to March 2022

The evaluation should give specific attention to how the intervention is relevant to the ILO's programme and policy frameworks at the national and global levels, to relevant national United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks and national social protection strategies and national sustainable development strategy or other relevant national development frameworks. The evaluation should focus on an exit strategy and the sustainability of the outcomes of the project.

## **6.9 CLIENTS**

The primary clients of the evaluation will be the ILO constituents, the development partner, the project teams at global and country levels, and their implementing partners across the project countries. These users interest lies primarily, although not exclusively, in learning from experience to inform future interventions and investments in this area.

The target group of the project are the workers and factories in the garment sector in the respective countries (see Annex 2 for further information). The evaluation should collect feedback from key stakeholders directly involved in the implementation of the project. The final evaluation should also reflect the views of the final beneficiaries namely the workers and the factory owners in the garment sector.

## 6.10 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The evaluation will be conducted according to the criteria and approaches for international development assistance, as established by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development / Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC). It will also abide by the code of conduct for evaluation in the UN system<sup>88</sup>, in addition to those set out by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards. The ILO's Evaluation Guidelines<sup>89</sup> provide the basic framework.

The evaluation will address the following criteria (but is not limited to) project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results/impact orientation and sustainability. In addition, the evaluability assessment will focus on the existing monitoring tools and frameworks and assess if they can provide the data necessary to conduct the final evaluation. The evaluation will provide findings, conclusions, lessons learned, good practices and recommendation that are evidence-based. The following questions, organized by criteria, are expected to be addressed by the evaluation.

## 6.11 EVALUATION QUESTIONS

### 6.11.1.1 Relevance and design

1. How does the Project fit within the ILO's P&B Policy Outcomes and in the framework of DWCPs where available? How has it advanced the ILO's flagship programme Social Protection Floors for All and Safety + Health for all/VZF? How does it fit with the COVID-19 Call to Action in the Garment Sector?
2. Has the specific context of each country been sufficiently taken into account in the design of the project, including in response to comments from the ILO supervisory mechanisms (where applicable)?
3. How does the project interface with other partners or interventions in the country that were related to social protection and/or OSH?
4. To what extent has the Project provided a timely and relevant response to the three constituents' needs and priorities in the COVID-19 context? To what extent were they consulted and involved in the design of the scheme?
5. To what extent were the issues and concerns raised by various stakeholders during the design process taken into account?
6. Did the project follow a sound theory of change and logical connect between its levels of results? Was the design suitable to serve and emergency response situation? Are there specific logics and assumptions that did not work well?
7. To what extent does the Project implementation strategy ensures synergies between the different components of the project?

---

<sup>88</sup> The ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation and technical and ethical standards are established within these criteria and the evaluation should therefore adhere to these to ensure an internationally credible evaluation. Ref: ILO EVAL Policy Guidelines Checklists 5 and 6: "Preparing the evaluation report" and "Rating the quality of evaluation reports".

<sup>89</sup> List of all Guidance notes, templates, checklists and tools: [http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed\\_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms\\_176814.pdf](http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_176814.pdf)

8. Have the risk factors and assumptions been adequately taken into account and updated, including on any liability issues for the ILO concerning the cash transfer modality?
9. to what extent did the project design take into account concern relating specifically gender equality and non-discrimination and to the inclusion of persons with disabilities?
10. How responsive was the project design to national sustainable development plans for the SDGs?

### **6.11.1.2 Effectiveness**

1. To what extent have the overall Project objectives and expected outputs, been achieved? Is the project likely to achieve its outputs and outcomes by the end of the project?
  - a. Is the intervention targeting the right group of stakeholders to achieve its objectives (incl. the most vulnerable ones)?
  - b. To what extent has the cash transfer/wage subsidy/income contributed to retaining workers in the months following distribution and/or effectively helped employers pay for wages?
  - c. To what extent the OSH component was effective in terms of being timely, flexible and useful to factories and workers?
2. How effective are the project management arrangements? How effectively do the COs, ROs, DWTs and HQ departments co-ordinate and complement each other in timely delivery of project outcomes?
3. Has the project fostered ILO constituents' active and continuous involvement through social dialogue in articulating, implementing and sustaining coherent response strategies to mitigate the effects of the pandemic on the world of work?
4. Did the mainstreaming of ILO principles, including of R202- Social Protection Floors Recommendation, 2012 (No. 202), in all social protection activities contribute to a more efficient implementation of the project?
5. What progress has been made under the project in terms of the crosscutting issues of standards; social dialogue and tripartism; gender equality and non-discrimination; and environmental sustainability?
6. Is the Project implementation coordinated with other ILO, UN and governments initiatives in social protection and OSH, as required?
7. What are the key factors that constrain/potentially constrain achieving the project's intended results?
  - a. How has the cash transfer been targeted to and used by workers? Are there any unintended results among the recipients and/or those workers in vulnerable situations who were excluded?
  - b. How adequate have the operational processes been, including training, stakeholders including employers and workers sensitization, beneficiary



outreach, enrolment, payments, and the complaints and feedback mechanism?

- c. How effective have the Programme delivery mechanisms been, with recommendations for any necessary amendments?
8. Were there any unplanned effects (negative or positive)?
9. What are the noteworthy good practices and lessons learned, including on the cash transfer modality?
10. What are the areas for further reinforcement of the project achievements?
11. What innovative/creative approaches have been applied under this project to be flexible, fast and agile in mitigating the immediate effects of the pandemic on the world of work?
12. Are administrative modalities sufficiently flexible to support this novel approach of linking short term assistance with long term development objectives?
13. Did the project receive adequate political, technical and administrative support, including from the national constituents and any other partners?
14. How effectively does the project management monitor performance and results? To what extent did the project take into account the findings of the EA/MTE exercise to strengthen the monitoring and evaluation aspects of the project?

#### **6.11.1.3 Efficiency**

1. Have project's funds and outputs been used and delivered in a timely manner? Why or why not?
2. Are ILO administrative modalities adequate to facilitate good results and efficient start-up and delivery of the project? Are there areas where management processes could be improved or where there is a misfit with the organization? How is the project's management approach perceived by ILO technical units, implementing partners, constituents, and others?
3. To what extent did the project budget factor-in the cost of specific activities, outputs and outcomes to address gender equality and non-discrimination?
4. To what extent did the project leverage partnerships (with constituents, national institutions and other UN/development agencies) that enhanced projects relevance and contribution to priority SDG targets and indicators? (explicitly or implicitly)

#### **6.11.1.4 Impact**

1. What are key results achieved by the project vis a vis its committed outcomes and outputs?
  - a. How well did the project address the root causes of the vulnerabilities arising at the country-level as a result of COVID-19?
  - b. To what extent has the cash transfer/wage subsidy/income been linked into, and contributed to the development of national social protection systems?

- c. Has the project contributed to building medium to longer-term institutional capacities for social dialogue in articulating, implementing and sustaining coherent strategies to mitigate the effects of the pandemic on the world of work?
2. What are the impacts of the project?
  - a) To what extent has the project made a significant contribution to broader, longer term development impact in the project countries, including with respect to the institutional capacities of constituent organizations and the livelihoods of the end beneficiaries e.g. workers who received cash transfers?
  - b) What elements/result areas of the project are likely to have a longer term impact (in terms of further policy dialogues and reforms concerning Social protection and OSH)?
3. To what extent did the project use gender disaggregated data and take into consideration gender specific analysis?
4. What are the good practices and lessons learned noteworthy of documentation?

#### **6.11.1.5 Sustainability**

1. What are the main risks for sustainability of the project and the immediate actions/interventions required by the ILO and the development partner to ensure that the achievements of the project can be met and sustained?
2. To what extent has it been possible to achieve tripartite involvement in the project implementation and thus increase ownership of the project, and to what extent have tripartite constituent capacity been enhanced to take forward the outcomes of the project?
3. Are there indications that the mainstreaming of ILO principles in all social protection activities can contribute to increased sustainability of the short-term crisis response compared to other humanitarian interventions? Is the Project on track to create the link between short term measures and long-term development of social protection systems?
5. The Project has been designed as a multi-donor project that can receive contributions from additional donors. Is the structure and current status of the project appropriate to scale up?
6. To what extent are the results of the intervention likely to have a long term, sustainable positive contribution to the SDG and relevant targets? (explicitly or implicitly)

### **6.12 EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY**

#### **6.12.1.1 Approach**

The evaluation will address the areas of project relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. The evaluation will assess the positive and negative

changes produced by the project – intended and unintended, direct and indirect – as reported by respondents and as evidenced in project data. The final report should provide findings and recommendations derived from evidence and observation and should also identify good practices/good models of intervention that have the potential for replication and/or scaling. The evaluation will give specific attention to how the intervention is relevant to the ILO's programme and policy frameworks at the national and global levels, to the COVID-19 Global Call to Action in the Garment Sector, to the UNDAF/UNSDCF and national sustainable development strategy (or its equivalent) or other relevant national development frameworks, including any relevant sectoral policies and programme, and national COVID-19 response efforts.

The combination of short-term measures with technical assistance to contribute to long-term strengthening of national social protection scheme is a new approach for the ILO. The ILO's principles as defined in its conventions and recommendations constitute the unique identity of the organization and define its approach that differs from that of most humanitarian actors. In addition, the ILO's decent work agenda facilitates the linkages between social protection measures and broader employment and protection of workers policies including occupational safety and health. The evaluation is expected to assess as well that this approach is reflected in the project, its relevance in the framework of the COVID-19 response and the adequacy of ILO project management arrangements to implement such an approach.

The COVID-19 crisis has sparked increased interest in social protection schemes including unemployment insurance. If research has been conducted on the multiplier effects of social protection investments for the economic development of a country, evidence on the effect of social protection, including unemployment insurance on businesses and factories is scarce. The evaluation is expected to assess if the current project could contribute to this research agenda (through specific research and/ or its final evaluation).

For the OSH component, the evaluation should probe the usefulness and effectiveness of measures being implemented for employers and workers as well as for workplaces with the national response frameworks. It should also provide feedback on how well the OSH measures under the project complement the efforts of the constituents and engage with them to leverage existing capacities while also making useful value-addition to build their capacity to respond to pandemic/health emergency situations in future.

The evaluation is an independent evaluation and the final methodology and evaluation questions will be determined by the Evaluator in consultation with the Evaluation Manager in the inception phase of the evaluation.

The evaluation will apply a set of mixed methods analysing both quantitative and qualitative data, and ensure triangulation of information.

The evaluation will be qualitative and participatory in nature. Qualitative information will be obtained through interviews, including with stakeholders at country level. Interviews with stakeholders will improve and clarify the quantitative data obtained from project documents and performance measurements. The participatory nature of the evaluation will contribute to the sense of ownership among stakeholders. Quantitative data will be drawn from project documents, project updates, project monitoring data including the SOCPRO results monitoring tool, and other documents. The evaluation should also follow these principles:

- The approach should be constructive;
- The data collection should follow the principles of representation i.e. all stakeholders get a chance to voice their viewpoints;
- To the extent possible, women, men, and persons with disabilities and representatives from other vulnerable groups should be included in the respondents group. To the extent possible, data collection and analysis will be disaggregated by gender as described in the ILO Evaluation Policy Guidelines and relevant Guidance Notes. The evaluation will integrate gender equality, disability inclusion and other non-discrimination issues as cross-cutting concern throughout its methodology and all deliverables, including the final report;
- Findings should be presented in an analytical rather than descriptive manner, be evidence-based and triangulated; limitations of the chosen evaluation methods are to be stated;
- It should follow the UN recommended ethical guidelines, including confidentiality issues.

All findings should be appropriately analysed and triangulated against the evaluation's methodology. Evaluation findings should determine potential of cross-learnings of what could be replicated in other implementing countries with a special focus on other priority countries under the COVID-19 Call to Action in the Garment Sector.

#### **6.12.1.2 Methodology**

The evaluation will be primarily qualitative in nature, but will incorporate some quantitative data. Several methods will be used to collect information. Methods to be considered include desk review of background documents, interviews with key informants, case studies, a survey and a stakeholder workshop. Qualitative analysis will be grounded primarily on interviews with key project personnel, partners, and stakeholders, and include the review of project documents and reports. The evaluator will also develop a systematic questionnaire as part of the inception report to guide the interviews, capture qualitative and quantitative data and ensure objectivity and consistency in interviews in the different countries with respect to the various types of stakeholders. The project will be evaluated through the lens of a diverse range of stakeholders that participate in and are intended to benefit from the project's interventions. Due to travel restrictions, interviews with stakeholders in the seven countries will be conducted virtually, and where possible, in persons.

The findings of the evaluation will be presented to all stakeholders during a restitution workshop, in finalizing the evaluation report. The evaluation must coherently and logically triangulate all data collection methods. All recommendations put forth in the evaluation must stem from the evaluation's findings and conclusions.

The evaluator may adapt the methodology, subject to the agreement between the evaluation manager and the evaluator during the inception phase.

### **6.12.1.3 Document review**

The evaluator will review all necessary documents to inform the evaluation. Documents may include, but are not limited to:

- Funding Agreement (2020);
- Project Documents;
- Project results frameworks, log frame/logic models and theory of change;
- Regular project updates;
- Work plans;
- Progress reports;
- Management procedures and guidelines;
- Implementation agreements at country level;
- Documentation related to the COVID Call to Action in the Garment Sector;
- Documentation on ILO principles for strengthening of social protection systems (C102, R202, papers on invest better);
- Evaluability assessment and mid-term review reports;
- Other reports and publications undertaken by the project including policy briefs and country case studies.

### **6.12.1.4 Interviews with stakeholders**

Interviews with stakeholders should be undertaken to successfully inform the evaluation. The evaluator will prepare an interview guide that includes a list of interview questions for each type of stakeholder. The interview guides should be submitted to the evaluation manager for review. Interviews with stakeholders will be scheduled by designated project staff. The interviews should be conducted through the use of IT tools (Zoom, MS-Teams, Skype, e-mails, online tools such as SurveyMonkey, etc.). Depending on the circumstances, these interviews will be one-to-one or group interviews. It is important to note that some interviews might need assistance of interpreters and any such/other support from the national consultants based in the beneficiary countries.

### **6.12.1.5 Stakeholder workshop**

Following the desk review and the interviews, the evaluator will conduct a web-based stakeholder workshop with project staff in headquarters, project teams in the field, development partner representatives, and with other stakeholders. The purpose of the stakeholder workshop is to present the main preliminary findings, solicit recommendations, relay any issues and request for clarification or further information from stakeholders. The list of participants will be confirmed in consultation with the evaluation manager. The meeting's agenda will be prepared by the evaluator in consultation with the evaluation manager.

## **6.13 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND CONFIDENTIALITY**

The evaluation team will observe utmost confidentiality related to sensitive information and feedback elicited during the individual and group interviews. To mitigate bias during the data collection process and ensure maximum freedom of expression of the implementing partners

and stakeholders, the project staff will generally not be present during interviews. However, project staff may need to make introductions whenever necessary, to facilitate the final evaluation process, and make respondents feel comfortable. The evaluator will follow the standard Code of Conduct which should be carefully read and signed.

#### **6.14 QUALITY**

The evaluator will be required to ensure the quality of data (validity, reliability, consistency and accuracy) throughout the analytical and reporting phases. It is expected that the report shall be written in an evidence-based manner such that all observations, conclusions, recommendations, etc. are supported by evidence and analysis. The links to relevant ILO guidance for conducting evaluations are included in Annex 1.

#### **6.15 MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS**

A designated certified ILO Evaluation Manager who has no prior involvement in the project will manage this independent evaluation with oversight provided by the ILO Evaluation Office.

The Evaluation Manager will undertake the following tasks:

- Serve as the first point of contact for the evaluator;
- Provide background documentation to the evaluator in cooperation with the project team;
- Brief the evaluator on ILO evaluation procedures;
- Circulate the reports to all concerned stakeholders for comments; and
- Consolidate comments for the evaluator.

*The evaluation will be carried out by a team of evaluators, consisting of one international consultant (team leader) and national-level consultants in-country (the latter may be hired by the ILO separately). The team leader evaluator reports directly to the ILO Evaluation Manager.*

The international consultant (Team Leader) will conduct the final evaluation. The Team Leader will report to the Evaluation Manager and be responsible for the timely submission of deliverables, including the final evaluation report, which should comply with ILO's Evaluation Policy Guidelines and related checklists and templates.

National consultants (who may be hired by the ILO separately) will be commissioned for shorter periods of time to support the evaluation at country level up to 7 countries. The national consultants will report to the Team Leader. Under his/her guidance, national consultants will be responsible for the implementation of data collection activities at country level. The Evaluation Manager will facilitate this collaboration.

The Social Protection Department (SOCPRO) will handle all contractual arrangements with the evaluation team and provide any logistical and other assistance as may be required.

#### **6.16 EVALUATION TIMELINES AND DELIVERABLES**

The evaluation is scheduled to take place from late December 2021 to late March 2022. The tentative schedule for the evaluation, subject to modification following discussions with the ILO Evaluation Manager, is the following:

OUTPUT	DESCRIPTION	# WORK DAYS	TENTATIVE DUE DATES (2021-2022)	RESPONSIBLE PERSON
TOR	Prepare and finalize the ToR in consultation with project teams and other stakeholders		17 December 2021	Evaluation manager
Selection of independent evaluator	Identification of an independent evaluator in consultation with EVAL, briefing for the selected evaluator (also to provide him/her with the core set of project documents) and ensuring the issuance of the relevant contract(s).		Selection due 17 Dec 2021 Initial briefing and contract for the international evaluator (team lead) due 23 December 2021	Evaluation manager The project team to support contract administration - to be completed before year-end Office closure.
<b>Deliverable 1: Desk review and Inception Report</b>	Read and review the core set of project documents (to be provided by the Evaluation Manager at the initial briefing). Request any additional documentation as required Undertake initial consultation with the project team, including in preparation for the evaluation activities. Prepare inception report - An operational work plan which indicates the phases of the evaluation, finalizes the set of evaluation questions, the approach, the timing, key deliverables and milestones, aligned with this TOR	10	Initial consultation with the project team on the 2nd week of January 2022 (tbc on asap basis). Draft inception report due 14 January 2022 Final (revised) report due 21 January 2022	Evaluator
Interviews with the project team and key stakeholders	Online meetings with the project teams, ILO-Geneva and other stakeholders (development partner representative and other partners, etc.) at global and country level.	21	21 Feb 2022	Evaluator Project team to support the organisation of interviews
<b>Deliverable 2: Draft evaluation report, and</b>	A draft report of no more than 30 pages (templates and annexes not counted in the	7	3 March 2022	Evaluator

<b>restitution workshop agenda and presentation</b>	page numbers) addressing the final evaluation questions and A draft agenda and draft presentation for the stakeholder workshop (including announcement of the deadline for written comments - 15 March 2022).			
<b>Deliverable 3: Stakeholder (restitution) workshop</b>	Conduct a web-based stakeholder workshop with stakeholders, collect information.	2	10 or 11 March 2022 (tbc)	Evaluator
<b>Deliverable 4: Final report, Summary report and PPT</b>	All feedback from stakeholders are communicated by the ILO Evaluation Manager in a consolidated manner. The draft is revised by the evaluator, based on the feedback received in writing and during the consultation workshop, edited and formatted as per ILO template. Executive summary report produced in a separate document, the template for which will be provided by the ILO Evaluation Manager. A PPT for sharing of evaluation findings.	5	Full package including executive summary and PPT due 23 March 2022	Evaluator
	Total	45 days		

### 6.17 EXPECTED STRUCTURE OF THE EVALUATION REPORT

The report should include the following sections. The evaluator is encouraged to critically review the proposed structure and can propose modifications in consultation and with approval from the ILO's evaluation manager. The final report should not exceed 30 pages (excluding executive summary annexes). Please see [Checklist 4.2 on preparing the evaluation report](#) for further detailed guidance.

- Table of Contents
- List of figures and tables
- List of acronyms
- Acknowledgements
- Executive summary



- Introduction
- Evaluation Methodology
- Key evaluation findings along the evaluation criteria specified in the ToR
- Conclusion and recommendations by degree of importance, separated by components if required.
- Lessons learned and good practices on the intervention approaches and results
- Recommendations
 

*All recommendations should be structured by component, country and globally, indicating the stakeholder(s) whom the recommendation is addressing. It must specify: (1) level of priority (high, medium or low), (2) level of resources (high, medium or low), and (3) timeframe (long, medium or short)*
- Annexes, including but not limited to list of interviews, evaluation schedule, proceedings of stakeholders meetings, and other relevant information.

For ease of communication between all the stakeholders, all reports, including drafts, will be written in English. The Evaluation Report will meet the minimum quality standards as per the evaluation report quality checklist as shown in Annex III (See also checklist 4: Formatting requirements for midterm evaluation reports). The final report is subject to final approval by the ILO Evaluation Office (EVAL). All draft and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided in electronic version compatible with Word for Windows. The copyrights of the evaluation report rests exclusively with the ILO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

#### 6.18 ELIGIBILITY

The independent evaluation Lead consultant/evaluator will demonstrate the following set of competencies and experience:

1. Master's degree from a reputable university in a relevant field (social sciences, development studies, economics, management);
2. A minimum of eight years of relevant experience conducting evaluations;
3. Knowledge of the ILO's role and mandate, tripartite structure, gender and inclusion policies;
4. Strong experience in international development evaluation of social protection programmes, including humanitarian cash transfers. Understanding of garment supply chains, especially in terms of working conditions and OSH is desirable.
5. Experience in evaluating programmes focusing on the humanitarian development nexus is an asset;
6. Demonstrated experience, especially within the UN system, in project cycle management and logical framework approaches as well as on results-based management;
7. Experience in the evaluation function of national and international organizations and a full understanding of the UN evaluation norms and standards;

8. Technical background in social protection, cash transfers and OSH related matters is an asset;
9. Knowledge and experience of at least one of the countries and regions involved (Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Madagascar, Viet Nam);
10. Capacity to produce user-friendly, pragmatic and prospective recommendations in both operational and managerial terms;
11. Full proficiency in English. Working knowledge of French would be an advantage. All reports, including drafts will be written in English;
12. No involvement in the ILO-BMZ Project, including its design and implementation; and
13. No conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of the evaluation.

#### **6.18.1.1 Required qualifications for national consultants**

- First-level or higher degree from a reputable university in a relevant field (social sciences, development studies, economics, management), with a minimum of three years of relevant experience conducting evaluations
- Knowledge of the ILO's role and mandate, tripartite structure, gender and inclusion policies would be an advantage
- Good understanding of national policies on social protection and occupational safety and health context and familiarity with COVID 19 response measures of the national governments
- Prior experience of working on evaluation assignments
- Ability to speak local/national language and fairly advance level of English

## 6.19 ANNEX 1: RELEVANT ILO EVALUATION GUIDANCE

- [Code of Conduct Form](#)
- [Guidance Note on Evaluation lessons learned and emerging good practices](#)
- [Guidance Note on Integrating gender equality in monitoring and evaluation of projects](#)
- [Guidance Note on Stakeholder participation](#)
- [Checklist 3: Writing the inception report](#)
- [Checklist 5: Preparing the evaluation report](#)
- [Checklist 7: Filling in the EVAL title page](#)
- [Checklist 8: Preparing the evaluation summary for projects](#)
- SDG related reference material available at: <https://www.ilo.org/eval/eval-and-sdgs/lang--en/index.htm>
- [Lessons Learned Template](#)
- [Good Practices Template](#)
- [Protocol on collecting evaluative evidence on the ILO's COVID-19 response measures through project and programme evaluations](#)

## 6.20 ANNEX 2: CURRENT STATUS OF THE INTERVENTION

At the time of the evaluation, it is expected that in all countries implementation agreements with partners are finalised and that OSH as well as social protection activities are under way to be finalised by 31 March 2022.

In **Bangladesh**, the cash transfer component will be channelled through the employers in the form of an employment retention scheme. A tripartite RMG Technical Consultative Council (TCC) has created a sub-group, which provides overall guidance and oversight of the process. As of October 26<sup>th</sup>, the project cash component was still pending approval from the Government, implementation agreements with BKMEA and BGMEA were signed and cash is ready to be disbursed as soon as they get the go ahead. The TCC also started discussions on the development of an unemployment insurance. The ILO technical assistance for this initiative is jointly funded by the BMZ and the EC-DEVCO projects.

Under OSH component, Bangladesh developed need based training materials on COVID 19 prevention and developed a pool of 29 National Master trainers (11 female) on *COVID-19: Prevent and mitigate the spread of the disease in workplaces*. The training covered about 2000 infirmity staff and workers, including OSH committee members over 251 factories.

In **Cambodia**, the initial project design has been changed to better align the intervention with national policies. The government launched a new support programme, managed by the Ministry of Labour, to support workers who lost their employment as a result of the COVID-19 crisis. The cash for training intervention designed under the BMZ project, will link to this government initiative. Tripartite consultations took place and confirmed support for the intervention and an implementation agreement has been signed in October 2021.

In Cambodia, the OSH component focused on an innovative COVID-19 Behavioural change social media campaign, targeting workers, their families and communities. The campaign aimed at bringing changes at the level of attitude and behaviour, encouraging workers to keep themselves and their families safe and deal with mental stress with a positive attitude, raised morale and peer support. The campaign covered 450 factories employing over 400,000 workers. The social media based campaign reached out to nearly 1,800,000 people.

BFC reached out to garment workers who had the capacity to become “champions” for this campaign. They were profiled to spread the message on COVID-19 good practices, this was done through interviews, videos and social media.

In **Ethiopia**, the Council of Ministers designated the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (MoLSA) as the implementing agency for the cash transfers. MoLSA is supported by the Ethiopia Private Organization Employees’ and Social Security Agency (POESSA). The cash transfer is designed as a job retention scheme and will be disbursed directly to workers’ bank accounts. Payments have started in August 2021 and are going to last for 5 months, as until December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2021.

The OSH component in Ethiopia focused on awareness and behaviour change, complemented with strengthened inspection support for improved workplace level safety measures and capacity building of tripartite COVID-19 task-forces and OSH committees. Over 29,000 workers and 130,000 community members residing around industrial parks were reached through awareness and behaviours change campaigns. It further strengthened its existing

partnerships with labour inspectorates, industry associations and trade unions, the project facilitated dialogues, consultations, coordination, trainings and advisory services. It covered 126 garment factories through inspection, advisory, awareness and workplace level interventions such as disinfection training and services and provision of PPE kits and masks. The inspection visits also enabled bureaus to identify and provide on the spot recommendations beyond COVID-19, in improving working conditions and addressing key labour issues identified through inspection. 108 labour inspectors were trained on risk assessment and emergency preparedness plans and more than 345 OSH committee members and constituents were trained on COVID 19 awareness and prevention measures at work and beyond. In addition, media outreach activities conducted on regional TV channels, city administration's Facebook page and TIKVAH to promote prevention practices.

In **Indonesia**, the Partnership at Work Foundation (so-called, 'Better Work Foundation' or 'YKK') has implemented the cash transfer component. In a first round, wages subsidies were transferred to the workers through their employers. Only factories that had a collective agreement with workers in place were eligible to receive the subsidy. This requirement reflects the ILO principles, which put a strong emphasis on tripartite consultations and social dialogue. In a second round, an additional income support was also distributed to workers who had lost their jobs in partnership with their labour union representatives.

Under OSH components, in Indonesia context specific awareness materials were developed and disseminated along with masks and sanitisers across 198 factories to support compliance with health protocol during the pandemic. Using virtual means such as industry webinars and social media, awareness generation messages reached around 350,000 beneficiaries. In collaboration with Indonesia Employers Association, facilitated the COVID-19 vaccination program for around 10,000 workers in central Java. The project, in collaboration with the Ministry of Manpower, published Labour Inspection Manual in the time of Pandemic. This manual is one of the instruments to optimize the performance of labor inspectors in ensuring effective daily labour inspection assignments. The manual focuses on implementation of OSH protocol practice and contains information on the relevant regulations and tools that labour inspectors could use in doing the inspection in the pandemic and post pandemic situation.

In **Lao PDR**, the Lao Social Security Organization is already providing an unemployment insurance to its members. The LSSO, in collaboration with workers' and employers' organisations, has been in charge of transferring the subsidies to the eligible workers as well as to implement a outreach campaign on the project. Payments have started in April 2021 and will be finalized by December 2021. The project is expected to show the benefits of unemployment insurance and therefore contribute to increased compliance with the social security legislation in Lao PDR.

The OSH component in **Lao PDR**, focused on benefiting 19,108 garment workers (16, 185 female) across 55 garment factories from COVID-19 prevention equipment and cleaning material. Through Association of Laos Garment Industries (ALGI), OSH committee members from 44 garment factories received trainings on development and implementation of a Covid-19 emergency preparedness and response plan from trainers from Ministry of Health and University of Public Health. The trainings helped OSH committees in drafting

development and implementation of covid-19 preparedness and response plan. In addition, designated dormitory managers from 47 factories were trained on COVID-19 infection prevention measures in dormitories meant for workers in quarantine.

**In Madagascar**, the project directly strengthened the knowledge and capacities of nearly 2000 people (representatives of employer and workers' organizations, occupational physicians, labour inspector, journalists, etc.) on COVID-19 and mitigation measures. The project signed a partnership with the Ministry of Labour to design and implement, through the labour inspectorate, a strategic plan to response against Covid-19 in the textile sector. As part of the plan, team of 35 labour inspectors and controllers visited 113 companies employing almost 63 900 workers in three regions of Madagascar (Analamanga, Vakinankaratra and Atsimo Andrefana), shared their assessment findings with enterprise management and advised them for taking corrective measures as needed.

Through advisory and training services, Vietnam raised awareness and built capacity for employers, trade union and workers to prevent COVID-19 risks and develop response plans at the workplace. In collaboration with the Ministry of Health, it developed a set of training materials and delivered courses to participants from 60 enterprises in the northern and southern regions of Vietnam. Trade Union officials were also trained on virtual facilitation skills to enable them to further train their members using virtual means to promote safe and hygienic work environment. Nearly 400 factories receive active advisory support for sustainable improvement of working conditions, including safety and hygiene conditions at the workplace.

## ANNEX II. SUMMARY OF PROJECT EXPENDITURES

Summary of expenditures (including commitments) against total budget by country				
As of 6 June 2022				
Country		Expenditures	Budget	Ratio
<b>BANGLADESH</b>				
	Income support component			
	<i>Payments to Beneficiaries</i>	2 925,548 <sup>90</sup>	3 343 000	95%
	<i>Implementation activities</i>	202 065	210 000	96%
	OSH component	139 680	150 000	93%
	<b>Total country</b>	<b>3 512 411</b>	<b>3 703 000</b>	<b>95%</b>
<b>CAMBODIA</b>				
	Income support component			
	<i>Payments to Beneficiaries</i>	1 710 000	1 820 000	94%
	<i>Implementation activities</i>	197 500	220 000	90%
	OSH component	139 380	150 000	93%
	<b>Total country</b>	<b>2 046 880</b>	<b>2 190 000</b>	<b>93%</b>
<b>ETHIOPIA</b>				
	Income support component			
	<i>Payments to Beneficiaries</i>	4 500 000	4 500 000	100%
	<i>Implementation activities</i>	123 345	141 067	87%
	OSH component	159 671	190 000	84%
	<b>Total country</b>	<b>4 783 016</b>	<b>4 831 067</b>	<b>99%</b>
<b>INDONESIA</b>				
	Income support component			
	<i>Payments to Beneficiaries</i>	1 752 199	1 823 660	96%
	<i>Implementation activities</i>	104 211	39 368	265%
	OSH component	108 317	108 318	100%
	<b>Total country</b>	<b>1 964 727</b>	<b>1 971 346</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>LAO PDR</b>				
	Income support component			
	<i>Payments to Beneficiaries</i>	1 973 126	1 971 346	100%

<sup>90</sup> Converted to USD from BDT 272, 076.000 as per 05/07/2022 rate. Source: ILO, e-mail 30/06/2022.

<b>Summary of expenditures (including commitments) against total budget by country</b>					
	<b>Implementation activities</b>		130 079	137 465	95%
	<b>OSH component</b>		146 169	146 169	100%
	<b>Total country</b>		2 249 373	2 254 980	100%
<b>MADAGASCAR</b>					
	<b>OSH component</b>		245 346	260 700	94%
<b>VIETNAM</b>					
	<b>OSH component</b>		150 007	150 297	100%
<b>STAFF COSTS</b>					
	<b>Countries</b>				
	<i>Bangladesh</i>		127 387	127 387	100%
	<i>Cambodia</i>		47 368	46 721	101%
	<i>Ethiopia</i>		17 108	17 156	100%
	<i>Indonesia</i>		42 875	42 875	100%
	<i>Lao PDR</i>		0	0	
	<i>Sub-total</i>		234 739	234 140	100%
	<b>HQ</b>				
	<i>Income support component</i>		433 531	433 531	100%
	<i>OSH component</i>		421 747	423 493	100%
	<i>Sub-total</i>		855 278	857 024	100%
	<b>Total - Staff costs</b>		1 090 017	1 091 164	100%
<b>MONITORING AND EVALUATION</b>					
	<b>Income support component</b>		93 801	122 000	77%
	<b>OSH component</b>		116 084	118 500	98%
	<b>Total Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</b>		209 885	240 500	87%
<b>SECURITY COST</b>					
	<b>Bangladesh</b>		2 168	4 000	54%
	<b>Other countries</b>		0	6 210	0%
	<b>Total</b>		2 168	10 210	21%
<b>OPERATIONAL COST</b>					
			0	1 600	0%
<b>PROGRAMME SUPPORT COSTS</b>					
			373 667	430 354	87%
<b>PROVISION FOR COST INCREASES</b>					
			0,00	44 877	0%
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>			<b>16 627 497</b>	<b>17 180 095</b>	<b>97%</b>



## ANNEX III. PROJECT FRAMEWORK IN 7 COUNTRIES

### Bangladesh

Output 1.1: RMG sector's workers received wage subsidy and retained employment relation in response to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Sub-output 1.1.1: Database of potential underemployed and unemployed RMG workers developed

Sub-output 1.1.2: A mechanism to facilitate cash transfers in the form of wage subsidy from third parties to RMG workers is developed and made operational

Output 1.2: Policy options and e-payment mechanism available for the government and global supply chain partners to develop an Unemployment Insurance for the formal sector.

Sub-output 1.2.1: Policy advice on Employment and Social Protection Measures based on the experience from the wage subsidy disbursement to 45,000 workers and international best practices.

Sub-output 1.2.2: Support the constituents and the endorsees to the Call to Action in their advocacy with International Brands & Buyers.

Output 1.3. Reinforced OSH measures in the enterprises of the garment sector

Sub-output 1.3.1. Practical workplace prevention and mitigation measures

Sub-output 1.3.2: PPE and Disinfection

Sub-output 1.3.3 Awareness Raising and Communication

### Cambodia

Initially, the planned outcome was that female workers in the garments in particular would be better equipped to deal with the impact of the crisis. Maternity allowance was to be delivered through NSSF to every garment female workers (with children between 3 months and 27 months) in factories that had suspended operations. **This outcome was revised** to focus on sustaining livelihood of suspended maternity workers and enhance their knowledge on soft skills including social security, labour law, and financial management (new outcome 1).

#### *New outputs:*

- Output 1.1 A one-off payment of training stipend of USD 90 for each worker who meet the criteria
- Output 1.2 Operational capabilities of NEA in managing funding from donors and e-payments to beneficiaries are enhanced.
- Output 1.3 Workers' awareness of social security schemes is improved and capacity on soft skills including social security, labour law, financial management is improved through training.

*New outcome 2* : Employers and workers in the textiles, garments, footwear, travel products and bags sector benefit from better employment protection measures through RGC measures

- Output 2.1 Closer relationship between workers, employers and the NEA are fostered
- Output 2.2 Policy Options to improve Employment Policy Options (including wage subsidies) for workers, including those in the garment sector and informal sector, are developed and shared with the Royal Government of Cambodia

#### **Output 2.2 – Employers and workers in the garment sector benefit from better employment protection measures through RGC measures**

Sub-output 2.2.1 – Closer relationship between garment factory workers, garment factory employers and the social security provider are fostered

Sub-output 2.2.2 – Policy Options to improve Employment and Social Protection Policy Options (including wage subsidies) for workers, including those in the garment sector and informal sector, are developed and shared with the Royal Government of Cambodia

### **Output 2.3. OSH measures in the garment factories are reinforced**

Sub-output 2.3.1: Prevention of exposure to SARS-CoV-2 and transmission of COVID-19 in the workplace

## **Ethiopia**

### **Outcome 3- ETHIOPIA: Targeted garment and textile enterprises are able to sustain business continuity through retaining their workers**

#### **Output 3.1: Workers incomes temporarily protected from the impact of COVID-19**

Sub-output 3.1.1: Parameters and institutional set-up of the benefit package and communication on the benefit

Sub-output 3.1.2: Selection of factories, implementation agreements signed and cash payments to workers

Sub-output 3.1.3: Monitoring and evaluation reports and recommendations for scaling up

#### **Output 3.2: Selected factories are supported to repurpose their production to COVID-19 prevention products**

Sub-output 3.2.1: National and international standards of PPEs apply

Sub-output 3.2.2: Established demand for use of PPEs by workers in target factories and workers

#### **Output 3.3: Health and Safety of workers protected**

Sub-output 3.3.1 PPE to prevent COVID-19 procured and distributed

Sub-output 3.3.2 Practical workplace prevention and mitigation measures

Sub-output 3.3.3 Awareness Raising and Communication

## **Indonesia**

### **Outcome 4- INDONESIA: Workers in the garment and footwear sectors are better protected through wage subsidies**

#### **Output 4.1: Workers are protected through temporary and partial income replacement and employment retention in the garment sector in Indonesia.**

Sub-output 4.1.1: Design details of the scheme including criteria, operation flows and delivery mechanisms, and organize consultations with constituents

Sub-output 4.1.2: Communicate and identify beneficiaries through assessments of applications against requirements

Sub-output 4.1.3: Approve claims and deliver subsidies to employers that paid leave compensation and maintained employment based on collective agreements

#### **Output 4.2. Strengthened OSH measures in the garment industry**

Sub-output 4.2.1: Prevention of exposure and transmission in 220 factories

Sub-output 4.2.2: Policy development and guidance for future epidemics

## **Lao PDR**

### **Outcome 5- LAO PDR: Workers in the garment sector are better equipped to deal with the impact of the crisis**

**Output 5.1: All garment factory workers registered in NSSF (approx. 18'500) receive a wage subsidy**

Sub-output 5.1.1 : Two months wage subsidy to all working in the garment sector registered in NSSF

Sub-output 5.1.2 : A mechanism to allow transfers from third parties to garment sector workers are in place

Sub-output 5.1.3: Operational capabilities of NSSF in managing payments to beneficiaries are enhanced

**Output 5.2 : Employers in the garment sector are supported to maintain their operations during the crisis**

Sub-output 5.2.1 – Closer relationship between garment factory workers, garment factory employers and the social security provider are fostered

Sub-output 5.2.2 – Policy Options to improve Employment Policy Options (including wage subsidies) for workers, including those in the garment sector and informal sector, are developed and shared with the Government

**Output 5.3: Strengthened OSH measures in the garment industry**

Sub-output 5.3.1: Prevention of exposure and transmission in 220 factories (*changed to 50 in findings*)

Sub-output 5.3.2: Policy development and guidance for future epidemics

**Madagascar**

**Outcome 6 – MADAGASCAR: COVID-19 Response - Protection for Garment Factory Workers**

**Output 6.1: OSH Support**

Sub-output 6.1.1 Prevention of exposure to SARS-CoV-2 and transmission of COVID-19 in the workplace

Sub-output 6.1.2 Ensuring that policies are in place for future epidemics

**Outcome 7 – VIETNAM: COVID-19 Response - Protection for Garment Factory Workers**

**Output 7.1: OSH Support**

Sub-output 7.1.1 Prevention of exposure to SARS-CoV-2 and transmission of COVID-19 in the workplace

## ANNEX IV. PPT PRESENTATION IN STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP

### **The presentation addressed:**

- Purpose, evaluation criteria, scope & composition of evaluation team & methods
- Context, background and key facts about the Garment Sector project
- Key findings on achievements to date
- Cross-cutting issues – how were they addressed? Gender equality, non-discrimination (e.g. disability inclusion), ILO standards, tripartism & social dialogue
- What have “stood out” re. the cash transfer component? Issues to be concerned about
- What challenges were faced in implementing the COVID prevention & protection component?
- Some concluding remarks
- Question and Answer session

### **Evaluation purpose, criteria, scope, team, methods & sample selection**

Purpose: Provide an independent assessment of the project achievements.

Evaluation criteria: Relevance (and design), effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, impact and sustainability (OECD-DAC standards).

Scope: Assess progress, implementation, partnerships, achievements, challenges, good practices, and lessons learned. Geographically the scope is the project activities in Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Madagascar and Viet Nam.

Independent evaluation team of 8: One externally recruited team leader and 7 consultants (team members) based in the respective “project countries”.

Methods to collect data/information (quant. & qual.) with focus on participation and triangulation:

Review key documents (Project Document, progress reports, policy documents, budgets and expend. Statements & more).

About 100 key informant interviews with (global level and in-country interviews) with ILO; government; employers and workers organisations & private sector (factory representatives) (women and men).

A few FGDs done, including with garment factory workers.

Questionnaire survey only for the project staff based in the 7 countries.

Sample selection: Purposive selection (mainly) of interviewees and “sites” (factories and other sites).

### **Context/background & key facts about the project**

#### **Background**

In April-March 2020, the garment & textile producing industry experienced chaos because of the spread of Covid-19: Lock downs, cancellation of orders, great disruptions of global and domestic supply chains – resulting in many factories closing their businesses (at least temporarily), lost jobs and incomes - hitting women workers the most. Lack of severance payments and unemployment benefits.

ILO received a lot of requests for assistance to the industry in early 2020. A “Call to Action” (22/4/2020) was initiated calling for assistance to protect garment workers’ health, employment and incomes – and support employers/factories to survive during the pandemic.

In this situation, BMZ and VZF/ILO wanted to quickly respond to an emerging crisis and provide humanitarian assistance in the sector.

## **Key facts about the Project**

Project countries: Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Lao PDR Madagascar and Vietnam

Development partner: BMZ is the largest donor.

Budget: About 17m USD (€14.5 million, approx. \$ 17,180,095)

Start and end dates: 3 Sept 2020. Was to end 31/10/2021 - but “no-cost” extended to 31/3 2022.

Joint implementation: Social Protection Department (SOCPRO) and LABADMIN/OSH (Vision Zero Fund - VZF) with coordination at ILO Hqs, in collaboration with IFC-ILO Better Work programme, ILO-SIRAYE (with VZF) & partner organisations.

Project staff: Only one fulltime staff member - all other staff are working in VZF, BW, SP projects. Arrangement was made to enable a rapid and effective response to the pandemic, relying on existing relationships and trust built with tripartite partners.

Beneficiaries: Garment and textile factories AND workers (direct beneficiaries)- and their family members (indirect beneficiaries).

Two major project goals (the projects have slightly different outcomes & outputs):

Strengthening safety and health protection measures, to ensure that employers, workers, and their families are protected from the direct and indirect health risks of COVID-19

Cushioning enterprises against immediate income losses; and compensating workers for the loss of income due to COVID-19 by providing wage subsidies and other cash transfers

### **(Original) strategies**

*In Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Indonesia and Lao PDR:*

Implement cash transfer in the garment industry as Income support to enable employment retention and contribute to sustainable social protection systems (component with the major funding). To be adjusted to each country’s context (build on existing social protection mechanisms). To be done rapidly and aligned with the ILO principles.

Implement activities to prevent exposure to COVID-19 in the workplace & and contribute to policies being in place re. future epidemics (within OSH framework).

*In Madagascar and Vietnam, strategy is to implement only Component b): Prevent exposure to COVID-19..*

### **Preliminary findings**

*Income support comp. Highlights & status:*

This component was surrounded by quite some difficulties and challenges.

#### Bangladesh (ILO-IFC Better Work)

No payments made yet – as project not yet endorsed by authorities (ERD). However, a mechanism has been developed for employment retention through subsidy disbursement - a mechanism could be used in future pandemics/health crisis; even in other countries. (Small & Medium size Enterprises would benefit).

#### Cambodia (ILO-BFC Better Work)

18,783 female workers in over 400 factories will receive USD 90 each as training stipend (criteria: suspended female workers who took maternity leave). 4000 female workers were identified to participate in ILO training. There are complications surrounding the arrangements of this cash transfer support, including identification of beneficiaries. Nobody received any money to date.

#### Ethiopia (ILO-SIRAYE, incl. VZF)

Wage subsidies were disbursed directly into workers' bank accounts during a five months period to avoid administrative delays. A tripartite technical working group (headed by a consultant) was formed to help develop eligibility criteria tripartite.

#### Indonesia (ILO-IFC Better Work)

The initial "phase" was a wage subsidy scheme - reached 7 out of 16 enterprises; and 9,610 out of 15,631 workers. The second "phase" is a salary compensation scheme implemented with trade unions as partners.

LAO PDR (VZF): More than 20,698 workers from 47 garment factories (44 garment factories, 3 footwear factories) benefitted from subsidy payments (income support).

This was a one-time cash assistance amount of 900,000k (approximate US\$ 85) made to the beneficiaries between Feb to Nov 2021 through Lao Social Security Organisation (LSSO) – that already pays unemployment insurance to its members. Digital payment apps were used to pay the beneficiaries – a new mechanism for the LSSO to use. Good tripartite participation in the day-to-day planning and implementation.

#### *Covid-17 health protection & prevention comp. Highlights & status*

Less complicated than the Cash Transfer component – but also had implementation issues

#### Bangladesh

Reached out to 301 factories for workplace prevention and mitigation measures. Project trained 20 Master Trainers who in turn trained 2000 people (mostly virtual/online training) from health & safety committees; Nurses and Doctors in large BW factories (4-5 from each factory). Distributed personal protective equipment (PPE), disinfection. Distributed 5000 face masks & 5000 hand sensitizers to the garment industry connected to the national OSH Day in April 2021 and initiated a community awareness campaign.

#### Cambodia

Most garment factory worker population reached with covid protection messages: 2.3 million people (communication & behavioural change) & 2.4 million engagements on social media & 300 workers reached for a large scale survey via SMS & social media, onsite interviews with factory workers. Some outputs still remain (animated videos and IEC materials) to be done with MoLVT.

#### Ethiopia

Project led to increased labour inspections in the factories, resulted in increased Covid-19 awareness. Enabled the coming-together of OSH and labour inspectors, employers representatives and workers' organisations in the regions to carry out Covid-19 related inspections in the workplaces ("Unique undertaking"). Project Steering Committee & Technical Working Group worked "with dedication" and enabled implementation in a systematic way. Still to be done: Ensure replication and learning to be "cascaded" to other beneficiaries.

#### Indonesia

Provided hand sanitizers (80,000 litres); hand soaps (64,000 litres) and masks (60,000) to 198 factories registered with BWI & posters, campaign materials to encourage companies in complying with health protocol and promoting safety workplace for the workers during the pandemic in timely manner.

Facilitated the covid-19 vaccination program with Indonesia Employers Association to around 10,000 workers in central Java. Published (with Ministry of Manpower) Labour Inspection Manual in the time of Pandemic. Partnered with BWI & Better Work Indonesia and other related-OSH projects in Indonesia (e.g. HIV/AIDS program, ILO/Japan Covid-19 Program). Close coordination among the projects and commitment from Employers, factories and workers unions

#### Lao PDR

Raised awareness and strengthened knowledge of workers and staff of garment factories on Covid-19 prevention and protection measures. Mitigated the risk of the covid-19 infection and outbreak in garment

factories. Monitored and follow up. Engaged with the key stakeholders in project implementation (National Chamber of Commerce and Industry (LNCCI), Association of Lao Garment Industry (ALGI) and MOH and garment factories.

*Highlights & status of COVID-19 prevention component:*

#### Madagascar

Worked with Labour Inspectorate providing support to 113 enterprises (initial target: 77) which helped enabled continuation of production. PPEs & hygienic products to stakeholders including 14 organizations (tripartite) and almost 100 companies. Enabled access to Covid-19 vaccines to 6400 persons in cooperation with WHO and the Ministry of Public Health. Held training sessions and raise-awareness campaigns – capacity building involved nearly 986 persons (government, employers, workers' organizations, companies/other organizations).

#### Vietnam

Better Work Vietnam issued “Guidelines for prevention, control and assessment of COVID-19 infection risk for employees in the workplace and dormitory”. Built capacity and raised awareness among factories and workers on Covid-19. Worked with VIHEMA (MoH) and organised 2 training courses on risk assessment and developed a responsive plan for workplaces; and organized a seminar on Covid-19 with VCCI (Chamber of Commerce/Employer organization). The application of technology in supporting enterprises and workers to respond to Covid 19 has been successful.

#### Cross-cutting issues: Gender equality

- Majority of workers in the garment industry are women (80-85 %) – but in Bangladesh it's about 55 %. This is how country projects worked with gender equality:
- Ensuring equal opportunities and equal participation/representation of men and women in the project activities;
- Raising awareness among Labour Inspectors - through labour inspection manuals on the discrimination and violence/harassment issues that may be faced by the workers during the pandemic;
- Addressing gender issues when designing training modules and awareness-raising contents, (such as risk assessment, prevention/mitigation measures):
- Before distributing PPE - requesting the factories to supply gender/sex -specific information about beneficiaries (shoe sizes, size of fluorescent waistcoats);
- Producing materials that are gender sensitive and targeting risk groups, e.g. pregnant women and youth – who may be more impacted by the pandemic.
- Selection of participants in capacity building training activities ensure that equal opportunities were given to both male and female.
- Raising awareness among stakeholders that more women than men will benefit from the wage subsidy.

#### Cross-cutting issues: Non-discrimination (disability inclusion)

- In the majority of the project countries - disability inclusion had not been considered as an issue; or not addressed, or was considered “not applicable”;
- In some cases the issues of non-discrimination has been part guidance to factories and workers during Covid 19 pandemic.
- It has been pointed out that the issues could/should have been more clearly incorporated into the Project Document.

In at least one country, factories that hosted People with Disabilities (PWD) were targeted for support - the project requested the implementing partners to have separate data on People with Disabilities (PWD) who would receive subsidy through the project.

One country made efforts to educate the management of factories on the importance of inclusion of PWD as employees.

Other non-discrimination (cross-cutting) issues:

- Providing salary compensation scheme to workers outside Better Work Programme factories.
- Reaching all workers in the garment sector, not leaving out anyone for reasons like geographical distance;
- Addressing mental health issues including stress in the COVID-19 awareness raising campaign.
- Ensuring the project covers all workers within a factory, with no discrimination.
- Providing all staff and workers in garment factories COVID-19 prevention products and materials.
- Training all staff and workers on COVID-19 prevention and protection measures;
- Conducting COVID-19 awareness creation in communities where workers reside contributed to reducing stigma of the pandemic among community members.

Cross-cutting issue: ILO standards in relation to Covid-19

The country projects have promoted to some extent the following conventions:

- ILO C168 (in relation to the wage subsidy);
- ILO C155 & C187 (in relation to COVID-19 safety and health issues); and
- ILO C81 (in relation to Labour inspection, and equality and non-discrimination);
- Setting the cash benefit/wage subsidy amounts at the level of the national minimum wage;
- Some projects did not explicitly work on ILO standards as they regarded that the issue was “not applicable” to the work.
- Some viewed their campaign being mainly concerned about workers’ mental health and wellbeing during COVID-19 – and therefore did not focus on standards as such.

Cross-cutting issue: “Tripartitism” & Social dialogue

There has been a lot interaction and dialogue between ILO, government, employers and workers (tripartism) regarding both components.

Social dialogue in the sense of bipartite social dialogue (employers and workers) seems not to have been promoted for the work of this project.

Cash transfer issues of concern (examples)

*Bangladesh:*

No funds could be disbursed as authorities (Economic Relations Division -ERD) not endorsed the Project to date. ILO Country Office making a last appeal to accept the release of the funds.

*Cambodia:*

- Big changes in the design of the benefit package, target groups and implementation. Complications surrounding the arrangements of this cash transfer support, incl. identification of beneficiaries. Nobody received money yet.
- The ILO SP project handling the cash transfer component is aiming at system changes, targeting all sectors but this project’s emergency approach is perceived (by staff) as “contradictory” to SP aims - as it aims at quick disbursement of funds only in the garment sector.
- Potential partners (UN orgs, National Social Security Fund - NSSF) are reluctant to be associated with the (protecting garment) project as they see it as a support for the industry itself



& the government and not to the worker. This has posed a “political risk” to the work of the Social Protection project.

*Indonesia:*

Project’s initial wage subsidy scheme was effective, and an Assessment of the result was almost done by a University. The scheme was discontinued due to operational issues & no dedicated project staff.

2nd scheme, a salary compensation scheme, was set up that disbursed funds to workers quickly in BW programme factories and workers – but does not contribute to social protection system building.

Not continuing with the first approach (wage subsidy) could be a lost opportunity for ILO to help build a Social Protection system. Results from the wage subsidy scheme could have been used in policy discussion with government to reform its wage subsidy programme (based on the BMZ project design).

*Ethiopia – some challenges:*

The procedure of getting the money to workers took time (from ILO - to the bank - and then to workers). However, good support from the government who assisted the project in transferring the money to workers’ personal bank accounts without service charges. The online application process was a bit difficult for enterprises and it took some time. Contextualizing and updating the criteria took some time because all members of the committee needed to be in agreement with the updated eligibility criteria.

Challenges in implementing COVID protection component (examples)

*Ethiopia:*

- Workers were initially reluctant to apply Covid-19 prevention measures & vaccinations - demanded continuous engagement & took focus from other project activities.
- Slow response from implementing partners and ILO procurement process.
- Factories were not fulfilling all the required PPEs for Covid-19 prevention on time.
- Security situation during the project period led to some delays and some activities were discontinued in some areas, e.g. Amhara region, bordering the Tigray region.

*Cambodia:*

- Project launched a “behavioural change” campaign which ideally takes at least 8 months (up to a year) BUT this project had to be finalized within a short time –and had to be done “very quickly” (using two firms).
- Challenges in implementing COVID prevention & protection component (examples)continued

*Indonesia:*

- Enactment of the new Omnibus Law on Employment Creation impacted on social dialogue. During October 2020 – March 2021 tripartite partners did not want to meet and discuss any labour issues (the project mitigated by encouraging partners to focus on covid protection & OSH for the interest of the workers and employers).
- Project had to cancel the plan to pilot the Labour Inspection Manual in some BWI factories because of “lack of time”
- Covid-19 cases increased in Indonesia until August 2021 which caused delays & limited movement of the project – and obstructed new arrangements to be done in factories and regarding inspection.
- Project has no dedicated staff and depends on BWI and ILO Jakarta Office’s staff to carry out the project activities.

*Lao PDR:*

The administrative processing time on the part of the ILO/donor is perceived as a challenge.

### *Madagascar:*

- No project manager in place during the first period of the pandemic which limited the capacity of the project team on the ground in the VZF project (the Project manager has only been in his position since Nov 2020). T
- The autonomous Trade Union of Labour Inspectors (SAIT) went on strike in November 2020, which complicated the situation for the garment protection project, as it requested the PM to suspend collaboration with ILO - and requested ILO to suspend its activities with the Labour Inspectorate. A solution was found that helped to continue project activities while also reassuring inspectors who feared being stigmatized by their striking colleagues.
- Covid-19 and “State of Sanitary Emergency” (March-Oct 2020) led to closing of borders – resulting in difficulties in acquiring large quantities of PPE (Personal Protective Equipment)
- No online training was done - because of long process to develop training, difficult to do it during the crisis period and many project stakeholders have a very limited access to internet.

### **Some concluding remarks**

- Generally, the stakeholders have appreciated the project and cooperated in reaching the goals. All country projects staff have made good efforts to implement the project activities – for some staff it has been very challenging because of other duties in their “own” projects. Tripartite committees and technical working groups have been (temporarily) formed.
- Some countries have partnered with UN (e.g. WHO in the Covid protection component).
- Being responsible for added tasks perceived as time consuming and sometimes very difficult by many staff. Sometimes their “own” project activities have suffered.
- Implementing the income support/cash transfer component has been successful in some countries but very challenging in others.
- Implementing the Covid prevention/protection component (with a much smaller budget) has been more “straight forward” and met less reluctance from various stakeholders & partners – although also challenging in some countries.
- So far the evaluation has not identified instances where the project has substantially contributed to social protection policies or systems – but in a few cases, mechanisms developed by the project could be of use in future health crisis situations (e.g. processes of developing/updating eligibility criteria).
- In some countries the Project’s cash transfer approach is even seen as contradicting the ILO Social Protection approach to raise awareness and build long lasting (contributory) systems. The variations of income support (wage subsidy support/job retention, salary compensation, training stipends) are perceived as “one time mechanism” support that will end when the project closes on 31 March.

## ANNEX V. EVALUATION MATRIX: SOURCES OF DATA & METHODS

Sources of data:

- ToR and Project Document;
- Various agreements, including funding agreements (2020);
- Work plans and progress reports and results frameworks;
- Implementation agreements at country level;
- Key project finance documents and records (estimates of expenditures, and contributions by the Partners);
- Evaluability assessment – cum - Mid-Term Review report;
- Other reports and publications undertaken by the project including policy briefs, video clips, country case studies, promotional brochures, printed media articles;
- Better Work Programme annual reports and evaluation reports;
- UN reports;
- COVID-19 related documents/reports, including the Call to Action in the Garment Sector;
- Documentation on ILO principles for strengthening of social protection systems (C102, R202)

<b>Evaluation questions</b> 91	<b>Sources of data</b>	<b>Method</b>
1-10 relevance	Project Document; ILO P&B, national policy documents; UNDAFs; Vision documents; DWCP documents; BMZ strategy (draft), Information about other ILO projects, ILO and UN websites, Theory of Change matrix, LFA	Document review, KII, FGDs, observations, Triangulation,
1-10 of relevance	Project Document	Document review, KII, discussions and Questionnaire, Triangulation
1-14 of effectiveness 1-4 of efficiency	Technical progress reports, correspondence with donor, budget & expenditure statements, Project indicators in PMF, Trainers and assessment reports and MTE report	Document review KII with ILO, stakeholders and partners, and ILO staff (including non-project staff) FGDs with beneficiaries Correspondence, Document review, Triangulation
1-14 of effectiveness 1-6 of sustainability 1-4 of impact	MTE report, statements by stakeholders and partners, ILO and donor, Progress reports, statements by trainers and beneficiaries	KII with stakeholders, partners, and ILO staff (including non-project staff) FGDs with beneficiaries Correspondence, Document review, Observation, Triangulation

<sup>91</sup> This refers to the evaluation questions numbering, see section 3.2.

<b>Evaluation questions</b> 91	<b>Sources of data</b>	<b>Method</b>
1-10 of relevance 1-4 of efficiency 1-10 of effectiveness 1-4 of impact	Actual policy change Resource mobilisation by Governments and/or other relevant agencies	KII with stakeholders and partners, and ILO staff (including non-project staff and other UN Projects) FGDs with beneficiaries, Corresponding, Document review, Triangulation
<b>Evaluation questions</b> 92	<b>Sources of data</b>	<b>Method</b>
1-10 relevance	Project Document; ILO P&B, national policy documents; UNDAFs; Vision documents; DWCP documents; BMZ strategy (draft), Information about other ILO projects, ILO and UN websites, Theory of Change matrix, LFA	Document review, KII, FGDs, observations, Triangulation,
1-10 of relevance	Project Document	Document review, KII, discussions and Questionnaire, Triangulation
1-14 of effectiveness 1-4 of efficiency	Technical progress reports, correspondence with donor, budget & expenditure statements, Project indicators in PMF, Trainers and assessment reports and MTE report	Document review KII with ILO, stakeholders and partners, and ILO staff (including non-project staff) FGDs with beneficiaries Correspondence, Document review, Triangulation
1-14 of effectiveness 1-6 of sustainability 1-4 of impact	MTE report, statements by stakeholders and partners, ILO and donor, Progress reports, statements by trainers and beneficiaries	KII with stakeholders, partners, and ILO staff (including non-project staff) FGDs with beneficiaries Correspondence, Document review, Observation, Triangulation
1-10 of relevance 1-4 of efficiency 1-10 of effectiveness 1-4 of impact	Actual policy change Resource mobilisation by Governments and/or other relevant agencies	KII with stakeholders and partners, and ILO staff (including non-project staff and other UN Projects) FGDs with beneficiaries, Corresponding, Document review, Triangulation

<sup>92</sup> This refers to the evaluation questions numbering, see section 3.2.

## ANNEX VI. LESSONS LEARNED & EMERGING GOOD PRACTICES

### Project Title:

Independent final evaluation of the “Protecting garment sector workers: occupational safety and health and income support in response to the COVID-19 pandemic” project.

Project TC/SYMBOL: [GLO/20/20/MUL](#)

Name of Evaluator: Lotta Nycander

### Date:

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)	A lessons learned from the Project’s income support (cash transfer) component applied in the social protection component of the Project, is that in countries’ that lack national social insurance institutions (of some kind), the disbursement through other intermediaries can be very complicated, and not necessarily appreciated by the stakeholders. The mechanism of the latter can pose risks for the ILO for reasons related to accountability and transparency. It may also undermine ILO’s long term efforts of developing social protection (sustainable) systems.
Context and any related preconditions	This Project has a number of examples to learn from – related to the complexities inherent in providing assistance to employers and workers in an industry with the help of cash transfer. In hindsight, “quick fixes” are so much more difficult for the ILO to bring about - being a tripartite organisation made up of actors with often very different perspectives - than for some other international development organisations.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	Garment factories and garment workers
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	See above – the negative lesson
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	

ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	The lesson is related to project design.
--	--

**Project Title:** Independent final evaluation of the “Protecting garment sector workers: occupational safety and health and income support in response to the COVID-19 pandemic” project.

**Project TC/SYMBOL:** GLO/20/20/MUL

**Name of Evaluator:** Lotta Nycander

**Date:**

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)	<b>Lesson learned No. 2</b> In order to be perceived as ONE project/programme, not several projects put together, all ILO projects, even these large multi-country and inter-regional interventions, need to have <i>common outcomes</i> (but the <i>outputs/sub-outputs</i> can differ depending on the country context).
<b>Context and</b> any related preconditions	This project has no common LFA, or TOC, the reason for which may be the emergency nature of the project, which was also mentioned by the Mid term evaluation.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	ILO Hqs, Project management and staff
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	

ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	This is related to design – more efforts should be made to create common grounds as the project worked in one single sector (the garments).
--	---

### ILO Emerging Good Practice

**Project Title:** Independent final evaluation of the “Protecting garment sector workers: occupational safety and health and income support in response to the COVID-19 pandemic” project.

**Project TC/SYMBOL:** GLO/20/20/MUL

**Name of Evaluator:** Lotta Nycander

**Date:**

GP Element	Text
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	Working alongside or even within other established programmes (BWP and the VZF in this case) is a <b>good practice</b> per se.
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	The arrangement places extra burden on the staff in these projects at times (hence the recommendation that ILO in the future, should place an experienced Project manager/CTA in the field, to take the overall responsibility for the implementation).
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	
Potential for replication and by whom	
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO’s	

Strategic Programme Framework)	
Other documents or relevant comments	

## ILO Emerging Good Practice

**Project Title:** Independent final evaluation of the “Protecting garment sector workers: occupational safety and health and income support in response to the COVID-19 pandemic” project.

**Project TC/SYMBOL:** GLO/20/20/MUL

**Name of Evaluator:** Lotta Nycander

**Date:**

GP Element	Text
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	The <b>good practice</b> is the way that this project has been able to utilize ICT and spread learning and message via social media and enable the reach of huge populations. It has also developed appropriate apps where various documents and guidelines are up-loaded, easy to use by beneficiaries (but requires some basic educational level).
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	
Potential for replication and by whom	
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO’s Strategic Programme Framework)	
Other documents or relevant comments	



--	--

## ANNEX VII. SCHEDULE OF EVALUATION'S ACTIVITIES WORK

Table 2. Evaluation process: Activities, and time schedule (see section 3.3 Methodology for details)

Steps	Activities	Dec 2021	Jan 2022	Feb 2022	March 2022
0	TL's contract signed				
1	Briefing - Evaluation Manager (EM), SOCPRO				
2	Discussion on admin & practicalities (EM, Project mgt, Hqs)				
3	Contacts & briefings with consultants and project staff in 7 countries				
4	Desk review & <b>Inception report</b>				
5	KII Interviews with Project staff, stakeholders/partners (TL and consultants in 7 countries)				
6	Consultants visits factories; conduct interviews; FGDs & report to the TL				
7	<b>Mini questionnaire survey</b> (project staff) (timing to be TBD/flexible)				
8	Processing data, prepare <b>PPT</b> & workshop agenda				
9	Stakeholder workshop to present preliminary findings of evaluation				
10	Write & submit <b>draft evaluation report</b> (30-40 pps)				
11	Comments on the draft are consolidated by EM & sent to TL				
12	Submit <b>final evaluation report</b>				
13	Submit the <b>Evaluation summary</b> (in a separate EVAL template).				

**NB: The evaluation process was halted between April – May 2022, after the submission of the first draft evaluation report and after the evaluator had addressed the initial written comments received from ILO Headquarters. As instructed by the evaluation manager the evaluation started up again at end May/early June including new KII and e-mail correspondence to up-date the data and information, in particular regarding Bangladesh and Cambodia. The second updated evaluation (draft) report was submitted on 6<sup>th</sup> June. Written comments on this draft was received from the EM on 30<sup>th</sup> June. This report, addressing these latest written comments is submitted to the EM on 10<sup>th</sup> July.**

## ANNEX VIII. PERSONS PARTICIPATING IN INTERVIEWS, FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS & STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP

<b>Interviews done by the Evaluation Team Leader</b>		
No.	Name	Designation
1.	Karuna Pal	Head, Programming, Monitoring and Knowledge Management (Evaluation Focal Point), SOCPRO
2.	Mr. André Picard	Chief Technical Adviser, SOCPRO
3.	Ms. Rim Nour	Social Transfer Specialist
4.	Ms. Mini Thakur	Project Manager, LABADMIN/OSH
5.	Mr. Joaquim Pintado Nunes	Branch Chief, LABADMIN/OSH
6.	Mr. Ockert Dupper	Programme Manager (VZF), LABADMIN/OSH
7.	Mr. Hans Moller	ACT/EMP
8.	Ms. Ursula Kulke	ACTRAV (OSH)
9.	Mr. Kesava Murali Kanapathy	Senior Programme and Technical Officer, Better Work Programme, Sri Lanka
10.	Mr. Dan Rees	Better Work/ Call to Action
11.	Mr. Peter Rademaker <sup>93</sup>	(Former) Head, PARDEV
12.	Mr. Christianus Panjaitan	National Project Officer, SP, Indonesia
13.	Mr. Anis Agung Nugroho	National Operational Manager, Indonesia
14.	Ms. Pipit Savitri	Communication and Partnerships Officer, Better Work, Indonesia
15.	Ms. Julia Lusiani	Programme Officer, OSH, Indonesia
16.	Ms. Lien Pham Thi Hoang	National Operations Manager, OSH, Vietnam
17.	Ms. Loveleen De	Programme Manager, SP, Lao PDR
18.	Ms. Khemphone Phaokhamkeo	National Coordinator, Lao PDR
19.	Mr. Bounmy Bounthavy	Programme Officer, Lao PDR
20.	Mr. Bernard Foe Andegue	Programme Manager, VZF (OSH), Madagascar
21.	Mr. Lauréat R.	National Programme Coordinator
22.	Ms. Anissa	National Programme Coordinator (VZF project)

<sup>93</sup> E-mail correspondence.

<b>Interviews done by the Evaluation Team Leader</b>		
No.	Name	Designation
23.	Mr. Tuomo Poutiainen	Director, ILO Country Office, Bangladesh
24.	Mr. Abu Yousuf	National Operations Manager, OSH, Bangladesh
25.	Ms. Noushin Shah	National Programme Coordinator, SP, Bangladesh
26.	Ms. Sara Park	Programme Manager, Better Work Cambodia
27.	Mr. Jie Yu Koh (Finn)	Cambodia
28.	Mr Daramongkol Keo	Communications Officer, Cambodia (OSH)
29.	Mr. Evans Lwanga	Chief Technical Adviser, SIRAYE/VZF, Ethiopia
30.	Ms. Kidist Chala	Head, Textile and Apparel Programme, Ethiopia
31.	Mr. Adil Yassin	National Project Coordinator, Ethiopia
32.	Ms. Fantahun Melles	National Project Coordinator, Ethiopia, Social Protection

<b>45 min – 1 hr briefing talks (virtually) with the local consultants (by the team leader)</b>			
	Name	Occupation	Country
33.	Mr. Somith Sok	Consultant	Cambodia
34.	Ms. Meaza Nega	Consultant	Ethiopia
35.	Ms. Masy Andriamparanony	Consultant	Madagascar
36.	Ms. Indah Budiani	Consultant	Indonesia
37.	Ms. Latsany Pakdisoth	Consultant	Lao PDR
38.	Ms. Tran Thi Phuong	Consultant	Vietnam
39.	Mr. Arafat Khan	Consultant	Bangladesh

<b>Bangladesh: Interviews by the evaluation team member (consultant)</b>		
Name	Designation/Occupation/email	Organisation
Mr. Abu Yousuf yousuf@ilo.org	National Operations Manager OSH	ILO Bangladesh
Ms Noushin Shah shahnoushin@ilo.org	National Programme Coordinator SP	ILO Bangladesh

Mr. Humayun Kabir kabirmh70@gmail.com	Joint Secretary	Ministry of Labour and Employment (MoLE)
Mr. Rashadul Alam Raju ralam.raju@gmail.com	Secretary General	IndustriALL Bangladesh Council (IBC)
Mr. A N M Saifuddin saifuddinbgmea@gmail.com	(Former) Director	BGMEA

**Cambodia: Interviews by the evaluation team member**

Name	Designation/Occupation	Organisation
Ms. Ing Kimsrun	Chief of Sewing Unit Contact via ILO BFC	Berry Apparel Factory
Mr. Hay Hunleng	Director General	National Employment Agency (NEA), the Implementing Partner
Ms. Sara Park	Programme Manager	ILO Better Factories Cambodia (BFC)
Mr. Finn Koh Ms. Heng Sokgech	Programme Manager	ILO SOCPRO
Mr. Ken Loo (PhD)	Secretary General	Garment Manufacturers Association Cambodia (GMAC)
Mr. Athit Kong	Union President	C.CAWDU
Dr. Yi Kannitha	Deputy Director	Department of Occupational, Safety and Health (OSH), Ministry of Labour

**Persons participating in FGDs conducted by the evaluation team member (physical meeting)**

	Name	Designation/Occupation	Factory
	<i>Focus Group Discussion No.</i>		
1.	Ms. Joy Chantha	Sewing Worker, Quality Control, Sample Production	Kyung Cambodia LTD. Russian Federation Blvd (110)/AH11 and 58P/Street 58P
2.	Ms. Veng Srey Leak	Ditto	Ditto
3.	Ms. Nheng Phari	Ditto	Ditto
4.	Ms. Som Simoan	Ditto	Ditto
5.	Ms. Chuob Sreymom	Ditto	Ditto
6.	Mr. Soeng Sokheang	Legal Compliance Officer	Ditto
	<i>Focus Group Discussion No. 2:</i>		

7.	Ms. Seng Thida	Worker	DSL2 Factory ISI Group
8.	Ms. Sim Sokuntheary	Worker	Ditto
9.	Ms. Khim Sina	Chief of Sewing Department	Ditto
10.	Ms. Tun Phai	Quality Control	Ditto
11.	Mr. Sinan Branha	Admin Assistant	Ditto
12.	Ms. (Sewing Worker)	Quality Control, Supervision	Ditto

<b>Ethiopia: Interviews by the evaluation team member</b>		
<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation/Occupation</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Mr. Girma Sisay	Legal Service Director	Private Organizations Employees Social Security Agency
Mr. Saud Mohammed	Project Manager	Employers' Confederation
Dr. Zerihun Kebede	MOLSA Senior Advisor (Technical Committee Chair person)	Ministry of Women and Social Affairs
Mr. Gebeyaw	Researcher	Confederation of trade union
Mr. Ayele Mekassa	Harmonious Industrial Relation Director	Oromia region Berou of Labour and social Affairs (BOLSA)
Mr. Mulugeta Enserno	Harmonious Industrial Relation Expert	SNNP Region Berou of Labour and social Affairs (BOLSA)
Mr. Fitsum Altaye	Project Coordinator	Hawassa Investors Association

<b>Lao PDR: Interviews by the evaluation team member</b>		
<b>Name of interviewee</b>	<b>Designation/position</b>	<b>Organisation/Establishment</b>
Mr. Bountham Chanthavong	Head of ALGI Office	Association of Lao Garment Industry
Mr. Phetsamone Soukthaviphone	Deputy Director General	Lao Social Security Organization
Ms. Phaengsouk Likayya	Director of Planning and Cooperation Division	Lao Social Security Organization
Ms. Tae	Director of Registration Division of LSSO	Lao Social Security Organization
Ms. Philavieng	Deputy Director of Claim Davison	Lao Social Security Organization
Ms. Duangdueng Chanthavong	Director of Public Relation Division of LSSO	Lao Social Security Organization
Mr. Bounthanvy Bounmy	ILO Project Coordinator	ILO
Khemphone Phaokhamkeo	ILO Lao PDR Coordinator	ILO
Mr. Athilath Oudomdeth	Deputy Director of labour protection Department	Lao Federation of Trade Unions

<b>Madagascar: Interviews by the evaluation team members</b>		
<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation/Occupation</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Mr. Jerson Razafimanantsoa	Secretary General	(Ministry of Labour)
Mr. Botoudi Emi Henri	National Coordinator	Madagascar Labour Conference (CTM)
Ms. Agnes Onana	Director of Development and Partnership	National School of Administration of Madagascar (ENAM)
Dr. Maddy Rabeniary	Public Health Specialist	WHO Madagascar
Dr. Holy RABEMIHOATRA	Head of Occupational Safety and Health	Organisation Sanitaire Tananarivienne Inter-entreprise
Mr Randrianirainy Heriniaina arsene	Director	National Institute of Labour
Mr. Rafidy Fidelis Randriamaromisanarivo	National President	National platform of Informal Economy

<b>Madagascar: Persons participating in FGDs conducted by the evaluation team member</b>			
	<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation/Occupation</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
1.	Mr. Bernard Foe Andegue	Project Manager/ ILO - VZF	ILO – VZF
2.	Mr. Lauréat Rasolofoniainarison	National Project Coordinator / ILO VZF	ILO - VZF
3.	Ms. Anissa Rakotoarisoa	Coordonnatrice Nationale de Projet en SST-BTP (observatrice)	ILO – VZF II
4.	Ms. Beatrice Chan	Vice President of the Social Commission,	Madagascar Export Processing companies and Partners Association (GEFP)
5.	Ms. Eva Razafimandimby	Executive Director, Madagascar Export Processing companies and Partners Association (GEFP)	Madagascar Export Processing companies and Partners Association (GEFP)
6.	Ms. Voahanginirina Ranaivosone	Executive Director adjoint, Madagascar Export Processing companies and	Madagascar Export Processing companies and Partners Association (GEFP)

<b>Madagascar: Persons participating in FGDs conducted by the evaluation team member</b>			
	<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation/Occupation</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
		Partners Association (GEFP)	
7	Ms. Hanitra Fitiavana Razakaboana	Director General of Labour and Social Law	(Ministry of Labour)
8	Ms. Miamina Rajoely	Director of Worker's Social Security	(Ministry of Labour)

<b>Indonesia: Interviews by the evaluation team member</b>		
<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation/Occupation</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Mr. Danang Girindrawardana	Executive director	APINDO (Indonesia Employer Association)
Ms. Sri Nurma	Compliance Officer	PT. Mulia Cemerlang Abadi
Mr. Irawan Ristyanto	Sustainability Coordinator	PT. Mulia Cemerlang Abadi
Ms. Linda Effendi	Compliance Specialist, HR & Compliance Departement	PT Citra Abadi Sejati
Mr. Seno Basuki	HR & Compliance Manager	PT Citra Abadi Sejati
Ms. Sri Sayekti	Recipient of cash transfer	Ex-worker at PT Golden Flower
Mr. Christianus Panjaitan	Officer, Social Protection Programme	ILO CO Jakarta
Mr. Sudi Astono	Directorate of OHS Norm Inspection Development	Ministry of Manpower
Mr. M. Fertiaz	Directorate of OHS Norm Inspection Development	Ministry of Manpower
Mr. Ipepi Tsuruga	Manager, Social Protection Programme	ILO CO Jakarta
Ms. Pipit Savitri	Communication & Partnership Officer	Better Work Indonesia - ILO
Ms. Lusiani Julia	Programme Officer	ILO CO Jakarta
Mr. Moh. Anis Agung Nugroho	Operations Manager	Partnership at Work Foundation/YKK
Mr. Dodi Sodri	Recipient of cash transfer	Ex worker at PT. Tuntex Garment Indonesia
Mr. Nur Arifin	Senior Human Resource and Compliance Manager	PT. Ungaran Sari Garment
Ms. Maria Joao Vasquez	CTA Better Work Indonesia	ILO CO Jakarta



<b>Indonesia: Persons participating in FGDs conducted by the evaluation team member</b>			
	<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation/Occupation</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
1.	Mr. Edi Kustandi	Official	TSK-KSPSI-AITUC
2.	Mr. Helmy Salim	Chair	TSK-KSPSI (Reconciliation)
3.	Mr. Ary Joko Sulisty	Chair	GARTEKS-KSBSI

<b>Vietnam: Interviews by the evaluation team member</b>		
<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation/Occupation</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
Ms. Nguyen Hong Ha	Bettwork Vietnam – CTA	ILO Vietnam
Mr. Nguyen Ngoc Trieu	CO Project Officer	ILO Vietnam
Ms. Nguyen Huyen	Officer at VIHEMA	Ministry of Health
Ms. Bui Thi Ninh	Director of Bureau for Employer’s Activities	VCCI Hochiminh
Ms. Nguyen Thi Hong Nga	HR Manager	Maple Apparel

<b>Persons participating in FGDs conducted by the evaluation team members</b>			
	<b>Name</b>	<b>Designation/Occupation</b>	<b>Organisation /company</b>
1.	Ms. Bui Thi Hong Lien	Trade Union Chairman	Maple Apparel
2.	Ms. Nguyen Thi Nhai	Printing worker	Maple Apparel

#### **PARTICIPANTS IN THE STAKEHOLDERS’S WORKSHOP 10 March 2022**

	<b>First name</b>	<b>Second name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
1.	Adil	Teragi	ILO
2.	Fantahun	Melles	ILO
3.	Henrik	Moller	ILO
4.	Christianus	Panjaitan	ILO
5.	Paul	Wallot	ILO
6.	Mini	Thakur	ILO

	<b>First name</b>	<b>Second name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
7.	Valerie	Schmitt	ILO
8.	Lotta	Nycander	Evaluation team leader
9.	Maria	Vasquez	ILO
10.	Maddy	Rabeniary	WHO
11.	Anissa	Rakotorisoa	ILO
12.	Pipit	Savitri	ILO
13.	Meaza	Hagos	Eval team member
14.	Latsany	Phakdisoth	Eval team member
15.	Masy	Andriamparanony	Eval team member
16.	Tran	Phuong	Eval team member
17.	Arafat	Khan	Eval team member
18.	Indah	Budiani	Eval team member
19.	Sokgech	HENG	ILO
20.	ANM	Saifuddin	Former Director, BGMEA
21.	Noushin	Shah	ILO
22.	Abu	Yousuf	ILO
23.	Wenny	Mustikasari	Interpreter
24.	Béatrice	Chan Ching Yiu	Vice President, Madagascar Export Processing Zone Association (GEFP) President of the Social Commission of the "Groupement des Entreprises de Madagascar - GEM"
25.	Bountham	Chanthavong	Head of Association of Lao Garment Industry (ALGI) Office
26.	Vouchcheng	Ly	National Employment Agency (NEA)
27.	Pov	Mom	National Employment Agency (NEA)
28.	Ouch	Cheachanmolika	National Employment Agency (NEA)

	<b>First name</b>	<b>Second name</b>	<b>Organisation</b>
29.	Engneang	Sreu	Planning and Cooperation Unit, NEA
30.	EN-IND Interpreter	Hasan	Interpreter
31.	Yi	Kannitha	Deputy Director, Department of OSH, Ministry of Labour
32.	Rim	Nour	ILO
33.	Laetitia	Dumas	ILO
34.	Gebeyaw	Nega	Researcher, Confederation of trade union
35.	Somith	Sok	Evaluation team
36.	Sara	Park	ILO
37.	Erlie	Wubs	ILO
38.	Andre	Picard	ILO
39.	Lien Pham	Hoang	ILO
40.	Ninh	Bui	Director of Bureau for Employers' Activities, VCCI (HCMC Branch)
41.	Finn	Koh	ILO
42.	Jerson	Razafimanantsoa	Secretary General, Ministry of Labour
43.	Jaqueline	Klos	Donor representative for Ms. Theresa Schumacher, Textil-Lieferketten / Nachhaltiger Konsum, Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung (BMZ)
44.	Ha	Nguyen	ILO
45.	Damongkol	Keo	ILO
46.	Murali	Kanapathy	ILO
47.	Botoudi	Emi Henri	National Coordinator, Madagascar Labour Conference (CTM)
48.	Lantoi	Ratsida	
49.	Miamina	Rajoely	Director of Worker's Social Security, Ministry of Labour
50.	Yoshie	Ichinohe	Evaluation Manager

## ANNEX IX. DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

- Project Document “*Protecting garment sector workers: occupational safety and health and income support in response to the COVID-19 pandemic*”
- Project progress reports
- ILO Checklists for evaluations
- P&B Policy Outcome 8. and Outcome 7 (7.2 in particular), ILO.
- Decent Work Country Programmes in Bangladesh 2017-2020; Cambodia: 2019-2023; Ethiopia 2021-2025; Indonesia 2020-2025; Lao PDR: 2017-21; and Vietnam 2017-2021 (Madagascar does not have a DWCP).
- Midterm Evaluation of the Protecting garment sector workers: occupational safety and health and income support in response to the COVID-19 pandemic project, June 2021,
- *Disability-Inclusive Social Protection in Vietnam: A National Overview with a Case Study from Cam Le District*: London: International Centre for Evidence in Disability Research by Banks, Lena Morgan, Matthew Walsham, Hoang Van Minh, V. Duy Kien, V. Quynh Mai, T. Thu Ngan, B. Bich Phuong, et al. 2018.
- Better Work Programme, ILO:
  - New Better Work program in Madagascar starting in apparel industry 2022: <https://betterwork.org/2021/11/03/new-joint-ilo-ifc-eu-programme-launched-in-the-apparel-industry-in-madagascar/>
  - <https://betterwork.org/2022/01/21/ilo-german-government-wrap-up-landmark-project-granting-2-million-usd-in-wage-subsidies-compensation-and-vaccinations-to-workers-in-indonesia/>
  - <https://betterwork.org/2022/01/13/covid-recovery-fund-bolsters-laid-off-workers-to-stay-afloat/>
  - New program planned in Vietnam in close collaboration with BWP Vietnam (Netherlands funded): [https://www.ilo.org/hanoi/Informationresources/Publicinformation/Pressreleases/WCMS\\_832059/lang--en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/hanoi/Informationresources/Publicinformation/Pressreleases/WCMS_832059/lang--en/index.htm)
- Rapid Needs Assessment and Response Plans: Preparation Guidelines for Country Level Interventions. Protecting workers: occupational safety and health in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, ILO Headquarters (developed by VZF for use by all German-funded project countries and then adapted as a generic ILO tool for broader use).
- *Ethiopia COVID-19*, a Case study by Vision Zero Fund, ILO.
- *Developing a shock responsive national social protection system to respond to the COVID-19 crisis in LAO PDR*, by UN LAO PDR, ILO July 2020.
- ILO Secretary-General’s *Policy Brief Investing in Jobs and Social Protection for Poverty Eradication and a Sustainable Recovery*, 28 September 2021.
- *Garment Worker Sector Focus*, ILO: <https://16dayscampaign.org/campaigns/garment-worker-sector-focus/>
- *World Social Protection Report 2020–22: Social protection at the crossroads – in pursuit of a better future* (Geneva), ILO. 2021: <https://www.ilo.org/global/research/global-reports/world-social-security-report/2020-22/lang--en/index.htm>.
- *Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation*, 2020 ([https://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS\\_571339/lang--en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS_571339/lang--en/index.htm)).

- *The supply chain ripple effect: How COVID-19 is affecting garment workers and factories in Asia and the Pacific.* ILO research brief, 2020.
- *Cash transfer programmes, poverty reduction and empowerment of women: A comparative analysis.* Experiences from Brazil, Chile, India, Mexico and South Africa, Working Paper 2013, ILO; and *The employment situation in Latin America and the Caribbean, Number 10, Conditional transfer programmes and the labour market,* ECLAC/ILO May 2014.
- *Linking humanitarian cash and social protection for an effective cash response to the Covid-19 Pandemic,* ILO.
- *The strategy for building social protection floors for all* (the ILO Global Flagship Programme Strategy) for the second phase 2021–2025.
- Mid-term evaluation of the ILO project titled “Inclusive growth through decent work in the Great Rift Valley project – a Public Private Development Partnership (PPDP)” by Lotta Nycander and Silas Ocheng, April 2021.

## ANNEX X. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

These are examples of the questions developed during the data collection phase, posed to the different categories of stakeholders:

### **Development partner (donor agency)**<sup>94</sup>

- To date, how satisfied are you regarding the Garments project performance vis-à-vis its plans?
- To what extent is the Project relevant to your (BMZ, other) strategies for development cooperation in the (respective country)?
- To what extent has ILO/the Project been responsive to your comments/concerns (if any) regarding the current Project's progress/performance?
- To what extent has this Project complemented other BMZ supported initiatives in the (respective country) and/or in the region?
- Are there any particular issues or concerns that you have, or have had, regarding the Project's implementation, reporting and/or accountability?
- To what extent has the Project, from your perspective, delivered value for money as planned? If not please explain.
- Are you planning, or expecting to provide further financing for a continuation of this Project, or to start up another similar Garment project - under ILO)? If yes, which countries would you like to see involved?
- Is there anything that should have been different regarding this Project (design, staff recruitment, implementation, follow-up/evaluation, cooperation with stakeholders/international partners and/or reporting - in order to successfully deliver on the overall outcomes and goals?

### **ILO Staff**

- To what extent have representatives of (donor, constituents, partners) been involved in the Project design?
- Looking back - which were the main hurdles and challenges of this Project? How were they addressed/solved? Which have been the main successes and highlights?
- Which were the successful aspects of the Project?
- According to you - to what extent has the Project *achieved its planned outcomes/outputs* (qualitatively and quantitatively?). (10, 30, 50, 70, 100 %) Or: not at all/partially/a lot/completely.
- According to you – to what extent has the Project partnered with other ILO or UN organisations; and/or government or non-government initiatives in the area of garments industry, social protection, income support/cash transfer?
- Are you aware of any unplanned effects (negative or positive)?
- To what extent have the key stakeholders/constituents (government, and employers and workers organisations) been active in contributing to the outcomes of the Project? Have they taken part in follow-ups or evaluations of the Project?
- Are there any particular gender issues that have been considered in the Project design and implementation? If yes, what are these? If no – why not?

---

<sup>94</sup> These could not be posed to the donor, but a BMZ representative (staff member) contacted the evaluation team leader by phone during the data collection phase.

- How has the Project addressed issues relevant for Persons with Disabilities (PWD)- especially women with disabilities? If not being adequately addressed – what would be the reason/s? Please explain.
- To what extent has the Project been able to (involve/communicate with/engage/consult) with the ILO constituents/social partners? What is the extent of their (respective) ownership of the Project's activities?
- If constituents/social partners have not been much involved/engaged – what is the reason do you think?
- To what level have you (Project staff) received adequate technical and administrative support from the ILO (country-, regional- and/or headquarters in Geneva)?
- Have you identified or noted any particular lessons learnt?
- According to you, what impact has the Project had so far? Could there be any longer term impact of the Project?
- Looking back – is there anything that should have been differently regarding this Project (more relevant, effective, and/or sustainable) - in order to successfully deliver on the overall outcomes and goals? (examples: design, staff recruitment, implementation, follow-up/evaluation, cooperation with stakeholders/international partners and/or reporting).
- Do you have any suggestion for ILO, and stakeholders, for future similar projects in the garments sector?

**Key stakeholders (government, employers, workers organisations, training institutions, garment sector managers NGOs)**

- What is your organisation's role in the implementation of the garments project? Is your role in contributing to the project clearly defined?
- To what extent has your collaboration with the project team been satisfactory (very/quite/not very/not at all)?
- To what extent have there been drawbacks, or obstacles (if any) that have slowed down implementation, or impeded the progress? Please explain.
- Does your organisation have any dedicated liaison staff (focal point) to follow/monitor this Project's activities?
- To what extent were you involved in the design and implementation of the garments project?
- If you were consulted at an early (design) stage of the garments project - do you feel that your inputs/views were appreciated and taken into account by the ILO?
- According to you, how has the Project managed to undertake the activities and produce intended results?
- Could you mention any lesson learnt that you have learnt from the Project?
- If you have been involved in building capacity or developing skills of the Project beneficiaries or factory management/staff - which subjects have you trained on?
- According to you, to what extent have the trainees benefitted from the training - Do you have any knowledge about how they have use new learning?
- Are you aware of any achievements or results coming out of the Project?
- What factors (if any) have contributed to satisfactory achievements or results?

**Garment factory workers (beneficiaries)**

- Are you aware of the ILO garments project? Yes/No.

- Are you currently employed in the (garments factory/industry)? Yes/No

#### **OSH component**

- Have you participated in any training on occupational safety and health from this Project? If yes, explain the type/s of training you received. //NB: Here it must be made clear that the questions relates to the ILO OSH training – not any other OSH training//
- If you did *not* participate in any training on occupational safety and health – do you know what you were not asked to participate?
- How practical/relevant was the training to you?
- What did you like most about the training?
- Could the training have been done better to be more useful? If yes, what could have been done better?
- How has the learning from the training improved your work environment and helped make your work more sound and “safe” from COVID-19?
- If your work environment has not become more “safe” from COVID-19 after the training, please explain why not.
- Apart from training – in what way have you benefitted from the ILO garment project?

#### **Income support/cash transfer component:**

- Are you employed and if yes, what job do you do now? Is it fulltime or parttime?
- If you have had employment in the garments industry/factory but *lost* your job – what is the reason? Have you received any unemployment benefit/insurance?
- Have you received any income support/wage subsidy/employment retention (through the ILO garments project)?
- If yes, how many times have you received it? How do you/did you receive the money (mobile phone/digital, bank account/other)?
- How satisfied are you with the (income support/wages/other) provided? (Very satisfied/Rather satisfied/Medium/Not satisfied)?
- Has the income support (wage subsidy) you received made any difference in your, or your family’s daily life/wellbeing? *How* has it made a difference? Please explain.
- If “not satisfied” what should have been different?
- If you have *not* received any (income support/wage subsidy/employment retention) have your employer/manager informed you that such support *will* be provided to you? Yes/no



## SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

(This was sent only to the involved Project staff in the 7 countries)

### 1. Project's design

To what extent have you taken part in the design of this project?

**Very much    A little    Not at all**

### 2. Project's achievement

a) Could you mention three key achievements of the Project that are you most satisfied with?

.....

b) What factors contributed to the (mentioned) achievements

.....

c) Could you mention any components (activities/outputs) that were *not* satisfactory – or where the Project did not achieve as planned, and any reflections as to why those components were considered not satisfactory?

.....

### 3. Cross-cutting issues

The **cross-cutting issues for the project are:** gender equality, disability inclusion and other non-discrimination issues, ILO standards, social dialogue and the “tripartite approach”:

To what extent has this **Project given attention to, or integrated in the Project**, any of the above-mentioned issues, in particular gender equality and non-discrimination, and inclusion and persons with disabilities?

a) **A lot of attention    Some attention    No attention**

b) **Cross-cutting issues                      Please give brief examples**

Gender equality  
Disability inclusion, i.e. inclusion of people with disabilities (PWD) and or specific activities directed at PWD?  
Other non-discrimination issues  
ILO standards  
Social dialogue  
Tripartism

If these issues were *not* adequately addressed in the Project – what do you think are the reasons?

.....

### 4. Obstacles and/or challenges

a) Have you faced any particular obstacles/challenges in performing your role in this Project? If, yes, please describe:

.....

### 5. Cooperation with tripartite and other partners

a) Is there any aspect of cooperating with the tripartite partners (government, employers, workers) that has *not* worked as well as could be expected to implement this Project?

Please explain:

.....

b) Have you had cooperation/partnership with any other organisation/s to implement *this* project (for instance UN, Non-Governmental Organisations, or Community-based Organisations?)

If yes, which ones?.....

### 6. Support received

How do you rate the overall technical and finance/administrative support that you have received at the field level (RO, CO, DWT) or from the headquarters to implement work on this Project?

Excellent                      Good                      Satisfactory                      Not satisfactory

Please    explain    if    not  
satisfactory:.....

### 7. Is there anything that should have been done differently?

In hindsight, what could the Project have been done differently to reach the Project Outcomes and Objectives?

*(This could refer to the project design, implementation, monitoring system, cooperation within the Project and with the Partners – or any work related aspect of the Project that you wish to highlight)*

.....

### 8. How do you rate the Project’s achievement to date?

Excellent                      Good                      Satisfactory                      Not satisfactory

Comments if any.....

### 9. Finally - do you have any additional comments or suggestions, e.g.

- Any other areas (or recovery measures) that you think ILO should support in the future;
- Sustainability of the project achievements beyond the implementation period; and/or
- Any particular lesson learned from this project for future project development in linking social transfer to Covid-19 health safety issues and “regular” OSH measures?

.....