



Evaluation Summary



International
Labour
Office

Evaluation Unit

Extending social security to African migrant workers and their families - RBSA Evaluation

Quick Facts

Countries: Burundi, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia

Final Evaluation: May 2012

Mode of Evaluation: Independent

ILO Administrative responsibility: ILO Regional Office for Africa (ROAF) - Technical Unit: MIGRANT

Technical Area: Migration, Social Security

Evaluation Management: RO Africa, Addis Ababa

Evaluation Team: Stanley A. Asangalisah

Project End: June 2012

Project Code: RAF/08/02/RBS

Keywords: Migrant worker, social security

Background & Context

The project, herein referred to as MIGSEC was financed with RBSA-Funds provided by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, and implemented by the ILO Regional Office for Africa (ROAF) in Addis Ababa under the technical guidance of the International Migration Programme (MIGRANT) in Geneva.

The independent evaluation exercise — carried out from 12th to 23rd December, 2011, involving desk research and field investigations in Addis Ababa and Dakar — was designed to measure the extent to which project objectives have been met, and assess how the project outcomes have contributed to the overall ILO's P&B strategic objectives.

Due to time and budgetary constraints, the evaluator was able to visit only 2 of the project countries, travelled to Ethiopia for meetings with the Project Management Team, and to Senegal for interviews with project stakeholders. The meetings with the Chief Technical Advisor and the International Migration Specialist in Addis Ababa gave the evaluator deeper insights into MIGSEC than could have been possible through desk research. The interviews with stakeholders in Dakar, Senegal were also very useful in shedding light on the Senegalese experience.

Main Findings & Conclusions

Project Relevance and Strategic Fit

1. MIGSEC was very relevant to the policies and efforts of, particularly, the EAC countries towards enhancing social security coverage in their Community. Considerable collaborative work was also done with CIPRESS, particularly,

in Senegal and Mali in the area of capacity building and preparing draft social security agreements. But there was practically no direct collaborative work between MIGSEC and ECOWAS, the reason being that ECOWAS was not quite responsive to initial contacts made by MIGSEC. SADC, on the contrary, showed keen interest in tapping the resourcefulness of MIGSEC to address social security coverage challenges amongst its member states.

2. MIGSEC's outcomes are directly linked to the achievement of the Decent Work Agenda for Africa, which acknowledges that social protection is a powerful instrument to reduce poverty and improve people's lives.

3. Some important ILO projects in developing countries may not necessarily be of interest to donor countries. That makes it important to have supplementary funds such as RBSA-funds available to finance projects of low donor interest. This was most probably the case with MIGSEC, which sought to address the social security challenges of African migrant workers. The ILO utilized RBSA-funding provided by Germany.

Logical Framework

4. The activity line-up of MIGSEC was in all cases relevant to the attainment of the target output, and the outputs in their turn were mostly relevant to the attainment of the set outcomes. The project outcomes worked together to attain the development objective or project purpose "To improve national and regional strategies for the extension of social security coverage to African migrants and their families" These linkages reveal the practical logic of MIGSEC. The project, however, did not outline any objectively verifiable indicators (OVIs), and that was not good enough for monitoring and evaluation purposes. The mid-term review process provided a real

opportunity to formulate OVIs, but that opportunity was not utilized.

Project Progress and Effectiveness

5. MIGSEC succeeded in achieving nearly all planned project activities, outputs and outcomes. The few unachieved activities and outputs were mainly due to inactivity or non-responsiveness on the part of project countries, or due to constraints. MIGSEC, therefore, creditably performed its duty of providing the technical assistance required to prepare social security agreements. The responsibility rested with the project countries to decide, develop, conclude and execute social security agreements.

6. In the light of the foregoing, it is fair to conclude that MIGSEC was very effectiveness in reaching out to its indirect beneficiaries, i.e. government officials and representatives of employers' and workers' organizations who participated in capacity building training programmes, attended workshops, had hands-on training in drafting agreements, etc.

Resource Efficiency

7. From contract negotiations, through ticket reservation, to the modest office settings of the project in Addis Ababa, the evaluator concluded that the management of MIGSEC applied project resources cautiously and conducted prudent management of the financial resources of the project.

Project Management

8. The CTA and the Migration and Social Protection Specialist showed enthusiasm, resilience and deep knowledge about the project; and expressed keen interest in the evaluation findings. They were full of extolment for the reliable technical backstopping from MIGRANT in Geneva.

9. A second phase of MIGSEC may require the services of a second project officer with good trade unionism and collective bargaining background to focus on the integration of migrant workers in the Labour Unions of host countries. Migrant labour integration in the labour unions of host countries will go a long way to help ensure that migrant workers' social security rights are protected in practice.

Reporting System

10. The RBSA-funding notwithstanding, MIGSEC's reporting system should have been more structured than it turned out to be. A well-structured reporting system is good for several reasons other than meeting the reporting requirements of the donor(s). For instance, quarterly progress reports generated by the project management team are critically important for the effective internal monitoring and evaluation of project implementation. It is therefore important that future RBSA-funded projects take into account the need for quarterly narrative reporting for internal consumption.

11. Generating basic quarterly narrative reports on project implementation should not require more time input than the routine time input of the project management team, and would not take more stationery and logistical inputs than available for project implementation. Clearly therefore, there is no significant economy in avoiding quarterly narrative reports. Besides, the internal monitoring and evaluation significance and benefit of such reports far outweigh the savings in not having them.

12. The mid-term progress report did a good job citing concrete country experiences to drive home the complementary role MIGSEC played to enhance the results of the DWCPs. However, its failure to identify challenges and

to suggest ways of overcoming them reduced its values as a mid-term report.

Capacity Building

13. MIGSEC's training programmes in Turin and in Dakar helped strengthen the capacity of tripartite partners in Africa to plan, develop, and implement specific measures to extend social security coverage of migrant workers and their families based on international standards and good practices.

14. Action plans prepared and presented by participants at the training programmes and the expression of national priorities during subsequent missions constituted useful guidelines for MIGSEC's implementation, as the project refocused on countries that were more in a position to define their national strategy for the extension of social security to migrant workers and their families.

The Overall Picture

15. MIGSEC by its design was a good project with very ambitious but realistic targets and a wide geographical coverage. It was also the first of its kind, and so quite clearly needed to have been given the benefit of learning from the findings of a mid-term evaluation conducted by an independent evaluator midway into project implementation.

16. In recent times, female migration is on the increase almost levelling off 50-50 with male migration, and, in Africa, that brings to the fore the problem of the high vulnerability of female migrants to abuse, including human trafficking for such socially unacceptable practices like child prostitution.

Recommendations & Lessons Learned

1. MIGSEC Phase-I kick-started the processes that pave the way for the conclusion of bilateral and multilateral social security agreements in Africa, between and amongst

African countries, and with countries outside Africa. It is recommended that MIGSEC Phase-II be sponsored and implemented to consolidate the gains of the Pilot Phase.

2. MIGSEC Phase-II should zero in on the countries and economic communities that showed real optimism and determination to conclude bilateral and multilateral social security agreements, and see them through to the actual signing of social security agreements; and may have to play the role of coordinator and international administrator of the operating agreements.

3. The second phase of MIGSEC will require the services of another project officer with a good background in trade unionism and collective bargaining to focus on the integration of migrant workers into the Labour Unions of the host countries. Their integration into labour unions is one of the surest ways of ensuring that migrant workers' social security rights are protected in practice.

4. A potent alternative to the multiplicity of bilateral agreements is the establishment of sub-regional social security conventions, with attractive incentive packages such as payment of a proportion of the migrant worker's social security benefits to the country of origin.

5. The campaign for equal treatment of migrant workers is beginning to yield positive results in the EU. In December 2011, The EU Parliament and the EU-Council passed the "Single Permit" Directive, directing member countries to, within 2 years, adapt their individual national laws to guarantee equal treatment of legally employed migrant workers. This is with regard to conditions of work, social security rights, including the right

to have their pensions transferred to the migrant workers' countries of origin. With the support of the ILO, African countries must position themselves to take full advantage of this progressive development in the EU.

6. A detailed logical framework is an integral component part of a well-planned project. It justifies resource allocation by showing the linkages between project activities, outputs and outcomes. A logframe also facilitates monitoring and evaluation during project implementation, and comes in handy during final/terminal project evaluation. Therefore, more attention should be paid to the development of good logical frameworks in the planning of future projects, traditionally- or RBSA-funded.

7. RBSA-funding is flexible in many ways including the relaxed reporting requirements. This is probably the reason why there was no narrative quarterly reporting under MIGSEC. Quarterly narrative reports are useful for project monitoring and evaluation, and the benefits in having these quarterly reports during project implementation far outweigh the savings in not having them. It is therefore recommended that all future RBSA-funded projects endeavour to deliver quarterly narrative reports for ILO's internal consumption.

8. Throughout its implementation, MIGSEC had the benefit of working with many different experts and consultants. It is strongly recommended that MIGSEC creates a database of African experts on social security and migration before June 2012, when the project formally comes to an end. As MIGSEC does not have its own Website, the database could be posted on the Website of ILO-Migrant.