



Evaluation Summary



International
Labour
Office

Evaluation Unit

Community-Based Emergency Employment (Cash-for-Work) and Reconstruction Project – Final Evaluation

Quick Facts

Countries: *Philippines*

Final Evaluation: *November 2013*

Mode of Evaluation: *Independent*

ILO Office Administratively backstopping the Project: *CO-Manila*

ILO Technical Backstopping Office: *DWT-Bangkok*

Evaluation Manager: *Richard Howard*

Evaluation Consultant: *Jonathan Price*

Project End: *30 November 2013*

Project Code: *PHI/12/01/AUS*

Donor & Project Budget: *AusAID and ILO (US\$1.5 million)*

Keywords: *Livelihood, employment creation, employment intensive investment, crisis response, Philippines*

Background & Context

Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure

Typhoon Sendong [Washi] passed through Mindanao in mid-December 2011, killing more than 1,470 people and injuring 2,020. The cities of Cagayan de Oro and Iligan were the worst hit and livelihood was identified as a top priority. The ILO response built on extensive expertise and experience in responding to crises. Responding to DOLE requests ILO allocated funding of US\$ 300,000 and requested AUD 1,250,000 from AusAID. The project targeted 2,400 vulnerable workers aiming to provide them with emergency employment

transitioning to livelihood recovery whilst restoring essential infrastructure. The project, executed over 18 months, collaborated with national and regional government agencies, LGUs and local communities through the livelihood cluster.

The project objective was to assist communities affected by the Sendong disaster to recover through emergency employment creation and livelihood recovery.

The project aimed to improve the living environment and essential infrastructure, injecting cash into the local economy. Supporting the livelihood cluster, employment impact assessments were to be carried out. A total of 2,400 workers were to be employed generating 72,000 work days. Technical manuals and guidelines were also to be developed to mainstream lessons learned and enhance policy formulation.

The project was executed by ILO CO-Manila over a period of 18 months [starting in April 2012 and ending in November 2013], jointly with DOLE, LGUs and local communities, also collaborating with DSWD [Department of Social Works and Development], WFP [World Food Programme] and the city government led Livelihood Clusters.

It centred on the cities of Cagayan de Oro and Iligan, providing immediate income with jobs through short-term emergency employment [cash-for-work]. This was to transition to medium-term employment, livelihood development and recovery, where workers would acquire practical skills needed for the repair and rehabilitation of infrastructure and where they could eventually be engaged as community-based labour contractors.

Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

The evaluation aims to assess whether the project has delivered expected outcomes whilst providing key insights into achievements, challenges, impacts, sustainability, stakeholder involvement, capacity and possible replication.

The scope of the evaluation includes the entire Sendong project, in all strategic components as specified in the project document, including both ILO and AusAid resources.

Client of the evaluation is ILO CO-Manila, DOLE and other key stakeholders in the Philippines, DWT-Bangkok, ILO DEV/INVEST and the donor.

Methodology of evaluation The evaluation used standard quantitative and qualitative methods such as reviewing available documents and products, key informant and focus group interviews. A series of evaluation questions based on the criteria and framework were utilised.

Main Findings & Conclusions

RELEVANCE AND STRATEGIC FIT

The technological approach taken and the type of sub-projects identified matched with beneficiary needs, built on existing skills and suited local conditions. The ILO decent work agenda was addressed through physical and social protection and emergency employment has become an accepted norm. The project collaborated with local agencies and organisations through the livelihood cluster, providing support through the commissioning of livelihood impact studies.

VALIDITY OF DESIGN

The project approach built on local resources and knowledge, partnering with established associations and collaborating with city government agencies. Beneficiaries' knowledge and confidence in environmental protection was bolstered by project activities. Risks and assumptions foreseen in the project set up did not impact on implementation except where staff were temporarily reassigned to another disaster response project.

GENDER EQUALITY AND PROMOTION

The project did not meet normal targets for gender equality. Although data was available during implementation the shortfall was not detected and acted upon.

IMPLEMENTATION EFFECTIVENESS, PROGRESS AND CHALLENGES

The project employed 28% more workers than expected but fell short by 14% on targets for work days generated. The cash-for-work component was easily and harmoniously managed in collaboration largely with DOLE. All beneficiaries appeared to be satisfied with their wages and social and health protection measures. The remoteness of some project sites posed a challenge which was well tackled. Successful community contracting was also a challenge and required significant efforts from the project team. However DOLE is interested in further exploring this component.

EFFICIENCY OF RESOURCE USE

The project was managed by a minimal number of staff in the field, though temporary reassignment of the two key staff members resulted in a significant lull in project activities. The management of potential savings in PhilHealth coverage could have been better anticipated.

MANAGEMENT, COORDINATION, MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The project faced challenges with liquidation of PPE and material purchases, which was addressed through adopting a direct purchasing approach. Implementing partners faced challenges with liquidating the first tranches and more direct assistance had to be given by the project team. Some confusion on monitoring unexpended budget resulted in sub-projects being held up and at least one being cancelled unexpectedly.

LGUs and agricultural agencies effectively collaborated with the project by providing technical assistance and materials, although resources were scarce and some differences of opinion regarding design, inconsistencies in technical design and concerns about financial influence, were flagged. The project developed effective monitoring systems and provided needed technical assistance combining efforts with the agricultural agencies. The implementing partners effectively and efficiently managed the sub-projects, although they did not always discriminate between cash-for-work/emergency employment and livelihood recovery. Reporting and project documentation was lacking.

IMPACT, SHARING AND SUSTAINABILITY

Livelihood impact assessments carried out can be used as a baseline for future impact evaluations. Close work with agricultural agencies and the good possibility of local replication, sharing and expansion of SALT activities will enhance the sustainability of the activities. However sustainable community contracting and supporting sustainable livelihoods for IDPs in relocation sites still poses the biggest challenge. Sub-projects provided a supplementary income for beneficiaries with the more established associations having clearer future plans. The project did not meet expected targets for cash injection into the local economy. Guidelines and manuals have been prepared but need to be finalized.

Recommendations & Lessons Learned

Main recommendations and follow-up

1. A sub-project monitoring system could be developed as standard practice [ILO to address].
2. Continuing efforts are needed to address the challenge of livelihood in relocation areas for IDPs. [ILO and other Livelihood Cluster members to address]
3. More advocacy on procurement laws is needed to develop community contracting. [DOLE & ILO to address].
4. Future projects should plan for the technical assistance in agriculture. [ILO to address]
5. ILO should avoid reassigning key project staff to other emergency response projects.
6. Although procurement standards in Manila-CO must adhere to UN common practice, some adjustment to more flexible approaches in the field would help efficiency. Alternative and more flexible procurement approaches could help project efficiency. [ILO to address]
7. Clearer finance monitoring systems and closer work between administration and finance staff on the project and in Manila-CO is needed. [ILO to address]
8. Given the lack of resources in local agricultural agencies ILO could continue to follow-through with support to initiated sub-projects. [ILO to address]
9. An impact assessment, after 1 or 2 years, is needed to assess project success. [ILO to address]
10. When considering the replicability of the project approaches the focus should be on the local resource based and green works/jobs approach, rather than on replicating the same type of sub-projects. [ILO to address]

Important lessons learned

1. SALT or contour farming was a technique that successfully made use of untapped arable land while neatly matching with the resources, environmental/organic concerns and financial capacity of local associations and local agricultural agencies.
2. Community contracting and IDP involvement in infrastructure reconstruction, while a challenge to implement, could be successfully replicated in many post disaster situations and could prove to be a significant source of new livelihood.