



Evaluation Summary



International
Labour
Office

Evaluation Unit

Alternatives to migration: Decent Jobs for Filipino youth Final Evaluation

Quick Facts

Countries: *Philippines*
Final Evaluation: *Jan 2013*
Mode of Evaluation: *Independent*
ILO Administrative responsibility: *CO-
Manila*
Technical Area: *ED/EMP/MSU*
Evaluation Management: **Joint MDG
Project**
Evaluation Team: *Carlos Carravilla*
Project Code: *PHI/08/50/UND*
Donor: *e.g. Japan (US\$ 6 million)*
IOM: 1,822,439 UNFPA: 324,606
UNICEF: 1,585,337
ILO: 2,267,618

Keywords: *Migration, youth employment,
job creation*

Executive summary of the joint evaluation report

1. This is an individual and final evaluation of the joint programme (JP) entitled “Alternatives to migration: decent jobs for Filipino youth” (MDG-F 1942), which has two expected outcomes: (1) to improve policy coherence and implementation on youth, employment and migration (YEM) through full stakeholder participation; and (2) to increase access to decent work for poor young women and men

through public – private partnerships, vocational training, and entrepreneurship, employment facilitation and safe migration, more inclusive basic education and life skills.

2. The evaluation was carried out following a qualitative design. The fieldwork in the Philippines was conducted between 21 October 2012 and 9 November 2012 including visits to Antique, Maguindanao and Masbate. The evaluator has promoted a learning process essentially participatory and inclusive, giving voice to different population groups and institutions involved in the programme through the application of the common data and information collection tools in qualitative research (desk review, one-on-one interviews, Focus Group Discussions and workshops with the Programme Management Committee on preliminary findings and preliminary conclusions and recommendations); additionally, quantitative data were also analyzed to assess progress to planned targets.

3. Youth, Employment and Migration (YEM) is a multifaceted issue that would require multi-sectoral interventions. A joint programme, thus, seems to be a wise option where agencies contribute its own expertise and mandate. While the logic of joint programming stands, there appear some complexities of such initiative. Chiefly, working in a joint manner requires high

transaction costs for the partners in terms of the efforts that have to be invested in coordinating with other partners, especially when the number of agencies and/or national partners is high as in the case of the JP under study.

4. The design of the joint programme was conducted in a joint manner by the UNCT agencies; however, a full joint design should have involved national and provincial agencies not only in consultations to validate the proposal prepared by the UNCT agencies but since the elaboration of the concept note. In addition, the design lacked a gender needs assessment in order to get the most accurate picture of gender based inequities and gaps relating to the work areas. It's highly recommended to design and implement future interventions in the Philippines making use of the Gender Mainstreaming Resource Kit (GMRK) developed by the Philippine Commission on Women (PCW) and the National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA).

5. The JP YEM is relevant to national priorities and to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2005-2009 (extended until 2011); contributes to MDGs 1: target 1 B and 3 and also to the first, second, third and fifth outcomes of the YEM Thematic Window. The simultaneous consideration of several development problems (poverty, youth unemployment, migration, school dropout) led to some inconsistencies in the selection of the provinces included in the programme.

6. The overall implementation strategy (especially the strategy to influence policy coherence, which is very well suited to national processes) seems to be well conceived and internally coherent. The programme has succeeded in mainstreaming gender sensitivity in many outputs, components and activities but it would have been more strategic to have overarching plan, which would have required the already mentioned gender needs assessment during the design phase.

7. The management structure of the programme has been extremely effective and very efficient. Different levels have been taking comprehensive care of different aspects of implementation from operational details to strategic issues. Decision-making processes and information flows have been timely and accurate.

8. DOLE is clearly leading the programme and appropriation of the programme by provincial agencies can be assessed as outstanding. Both situations have had a positive influence on the effectiveness of the program since it is being implemented primarily through national and provincial structures.

9. NSC and PMC have been concerned about financial progress during the implementation phase, and some decisions were made to address the slow start of the programme, like implementing a catch-up plan to counterbalance the delays. According to the financial progress report as of September 2012 it can be stated that the measures taken have been completely effective and apparently every UN agency will spend its budget by the end of the programme.

10. Partners are working in very good coordination and UNCT agencies have been able to deliver a number of activities jointly in collaboration with their corresponding national partners. Provincial agencies are also demonstrating a successful joint implementation.

11. UNFPA and UNICEF are using the (1) funds downloading (direct cash transfer) financial management modality following the (2) Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT) recommendations, and delivering their components making (3) extensive use of organic structures of the implementing partners, three elements that can be assessed as important contributions to Harmonization, Alignment and Mutual Accountability (Paris Declaration) and to the One Set of Management Practices principle (Delivering as One).

12. 81% of the planned Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI) in the Results Framework were totally achieved or measured (some of them don't have specific targets to be met at the end of the programme) and 21 % have been partially met (four out of twenty-one). Complete fulfilment of two indicators partially achieved is out of reach of the programme since it depends on political will. So it can be stated that the programme has operated with good effectiveness, which would have been higher if (1) the design of the OVI would have been more realistic and (2) the programme design would have included a comprehensive analysis of risks and assumptions and alternative strategies.

13. Key elements for sustainability: (1) the implementation of the National Action Plan on Youth, Employment and Migration (NAP YEM) requires a financial plan agreed by the Interagency Coordinating Structure (ICS), which is formed by the seven agencies responsible for implementing the seven strategies of the plan. It would be advisable to support this process to the extent possible. Additionally, the members in the Interagency Coordinating Structure need the continuous commitment in terms of staff and top management support during the process. (2) Local governance is essential for the sustainability of the main result delivered at provincial level through the institutionalization of the One-Stop-Resource-Centers (OSRC) and the Provincial Public Employment Services Offices (PESO). Any further support from the programme to advocate for the institutionalization of the PESO-OSRC in Masbate would be advisable. Additionally, it would be interesting to monitor the inclusion of the PESO-OSRC in the Provincial Development Plans of Antique and Maguindanao.

14. MDG-F joint programmes have served as a model for some other initiatives in the Philippines: (1) the new UNDAF (2012-2018) includes a programme management structure based on NSC and PMC; (2) the Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el

Desarrollo (AECID) is funding an emergency joint initiative in Mindanao led by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) with participation of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the World Food Programme (WFP) and UNICEF; (3) the Australian Agency for International Development is funding a joint initiative on Maternal Health involving UNFPA and UNICEF.