



Evaluation Summary



International
Labour
Office

Evaluation
Office

Strengthening HIV Prevention, Care, Treatment and Social Protection in the World of Work – Final Evaluation

Quick Facts

Countries: *Global, Ethiopia, Kenya, Senegal, Bolivia, Haiti, Honduras and Paraguay*

Final Evaluation: *November 2015-February 2016*

Mode of Evaluation: *Independent Final*

Administrative Office: *ILOAIDS*

Technical Office: *ILOAIDS*

Evaluation Manager: *Rasha Tabbara*

Evaluation Consultant: *Chris Morris*

Project End: *December 2015*

Project Code: *GLO/13/06/OPE*

Donor & Project Budget: OFID: \$1,500,000; ILO: \$2,921,833

Keywords: HIV/AIDS; right to work; discrimination; gender equality; labour protection; labour rights; labour standards

Background & Context

Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure

The ILOAIDS project; “Strengthening HIV Prevention, Care, Treatment and Social Protection in the World of Work” is the third phase of a project funded by the Office for International (OFID). The project was implemented in 7 countries, Ethiopia, Kenya, Senegal, Bolivia, Haiti, Honduras, and Paraguay.

The project was implemented between 2014-2015. A global proposal was developed in 2013. The global proposal identified the strategy of the project as being: “to provide quality HIV-related services

in and through the workplace, reaching individuals, couples, their families and the communities adjacent to remote worksites (such as mining and construction operations and transport corridors currently not covered by national HIV programs).” The global proposal aligned itself with UNAIDS 2011-15 “Getting to Zero” strategy. In particular, the project aimed to contribute to three main strategic goals; “reducing the sexual transmission of HIV by 50%; eliminating mother-to-child transmission; and ensuring universal access to antiretroviral therapy for people living with HIV and in need of treatment.”

Each country developed their own proposal in coordination with the tripartite constituents which was roughly aligned with the global proposal. Each country was allocated a budget of between \$138,000 and \$200,000. The average length of the project was about one year and three months. All countries with the exception of Haiti were in at least the second phase of the project. Each country, apart from Paraguay had a national project coordinator (NPC) or equivalent to implement the project. The Paraguay project was remotely managed from the Santiago office.

The project targeted the HIV response in the world of work. It aimed to reach vulnerable and marginalized groups who had traditionally been excluded from HIV/AIDS services. Each country had individual goals, but prevention of HIV, reducing discrimination in the workplace, increasing access to services and social protection, and strengthening national, sectoral and individual enterprise policies and laws were some of the key features.

Main Findings & Conclusions

Relevance

The evaluation found that the project was relevant to the needs of the tripartite constituents and other key stakeholders in the countries of intervention. ILO heavily involved the tripartite committees in designing the projects and this supported a strong sense of ownership in the project.

The project targeted groups who traditionally have been excluded from HIV services including female miners in Senegal, the construction and horticulture sector in Ethiopia, the informal sector in Kenya, and truck drivers in Paraguay.

The evaluation also found that the project was relevant to national HIV/AIDS priorities and strategies, UNAIDS' "Getting to Zero", and ILO's Recommendation 200 and Code of Practice. Evaluation participants regularly referred to ILO Recommendation 200 and the Code of Practice as being important to developing policies and practices in the target countries. Government stakeholders in particular were keen to stress that the project fitted into their national strategies.

The relevance of the project was lost to a certain extent by its short-term nature. This is addressed more completely in the impact and sustainability criterion. However, it is a cross-cutting concern. A number of outputs could not be turned into sustainable outcomes because the project did not have the time or resources to support further work with constituents. As a result, the relevance of the project is reduced to an extent.

Coherence

The project's coherence was strongest at the country level. The project followed a general overall framework that focused on three goals of UNAIDS "Getting to Zero". However, ILO allowed a considerable degree of flexibility to the individual countries to design a project relevant to their needs. Although, this may have reduced the global level of coherence, it should be seen as a strong success of the project because it allowed national tripartite constituents to identify key needs for the project to address. As a result, there is a high level of

compatibility between the project and national level policies and the project's activities.

There were clear synergies between the previous phases of the project and the current phase. In particular, the country projects built on policy and legislative developments and worked to ensure implementation in this phase.

A weakness of the project was that there were very limited interactions with other country-level ILO projects, with the exception of Haiti and Kenya. Potential synergies in areas such as the informal sector were lost as a result.

Effectiveness

The ILO projects achieved most of the outputs projected in the original country level project proposals. The immediate objectives of the countries were for the most part achieved. The project addressed issues of prevention of sexual transmission in particular, as well as non-discrimination, mother to child transmission, and access to anti-retroviral medicine.

The project management structure has been generally effective. The NPCs reported being satisfied with the technical support they received from Geneva. The tripartite constituents also reported satisfaction, both with the consultation visits by ILOAIDs during the design of the projects, and the communication with ILO during the project. The reporting and monitoring systems were effective in reporting progress towards outputs and identifying particular challenges that existed. A standard quarterly reporting format was used that adequately covered these areas. The monitoring system is less well equipped to report on outcomes and impact. Although KAP surveys have been completed in limited sectors in certain countries, there has neither been the time nor the resources to follow up on these surveys to identify change and impact.

Efficiency

The projects at the country level have been efficiently run with good value for money being extracted from the resources made available by OFID. However, ILO has not provided detailed

information about its contribution of \$2.9 million has been spent. An overall number of staff months was provided and some information on the positions included in the calculation, but not detail on the number of months per position, the cost per month and the percentage of time spent on the project. ILO has calculated 73% of its contribution was spent in the field, but without more detail this is impossible to verify.

Based on information provided it is possible to calculate the average monthly staff cost in ILO's contribution to be \$20,289 which is considerably higher than the staff costs charged by each country under OFID's contribution (\$4,141 in the case of Honduras). It is recommended that ILO ensure a more detailed budget is developed at the start of future projects for their contribution and tracking of this via a financial management system. This will allow an assessment of the cost-efficiency of the distribution of ILO's contribution to be made.

The overall efficiency of the project was probably reduced by the number of countries involved. Each country only received around \$200,000 of the OFID contribution, and very limited in-kind contributions from tripartite partners. In many cases meant the project had to be implemented over a limited period of time. The number of countries the project tried to reach was too many with the resources involved.

Impact

The evaluation was able to identify a number of impacts, particularly those related to policy change, and capacity building. It is not possible to measure longer term impacts because the scope of the evaluation does not allow it and it would be too early to identify long-term impact anyway for many of the activities. However, it is possible to speculate that behavioural change and increased knowledge of ultimate beneficiaries described by evaluation participants has begun to contribute to the project's goals. In particular trainers working within the world of work related stories that suggest increased condom use and demonstrate a reduction in discrimination and stigma towards persons with HIV.

Other notable impacts include the improved relationships between trade unions and businesses.

ILO has been able to present the fight against HIV in the world of work as a 'win-win' for businesses and workers that leads to healthier and happier workers and greater profitability for businesses.

The long-term impact of the project has been reduced by issues relating to the length of the project and sustainability.

Sustainability

Sustainability is a concern for some areas of the project. The short-term nature of the projects led to sustainability being raised as a concern by tripartite constituents in a majority of countries. Evaluation participants were concerned that the gains made during the project would not be sustained without further support from ILO. More training and activities were needed to solidify capacity gains and expand them to more sectors or companies, and they indicated the resources at a national level were not available. This was not the case in all countries, Honduras and Kenya in particular showed stronger levels of sustainability, and certain sectors or outputs demonstrated more sustainability in other countries.

The evaluation mission demonstrated considerable differences between the sustainability of work in Honduras and Senegal. In Honduras, at least a partial level of sustainability could be seen in most of the activities. This was particularly the case in the manufacturing sector and in the implementation of the 2013 HIV law into certain medical professions. In Senegal sustainability could be seen in the work on developing a mutual social fund for female miners in the south of the country, in the application of HealthWise, and to a lesser extent in the capacity building of labour inspectors. However other gains, such as the adopting of HIV policies in the tourism and transport sector were at risk of being lost because of a lack of capacity to implement the policies unless ILO was able to guide them in a future project. A number of evaluation participants expressed disappointment that the project had stopped operating just at the point when they have developed policies and action plans that they felt unable to implement without the support of ILO.

Overall sustainability was strongest in sectors where there was a strong national partner to take forward an action plan or where ILO had persuaded organizations or industries to use holistic OSH tools that include HIV as part of a broader approach, to strengthen their health and safety at work policies. Additionally, it appeared that countries where ILOAIDs was able to maintain some continuing presence offered greater potential for sustainability than other countries.

Gender Concerns

The evaluation found that the project was generally effective in responding to gender concerns. Although none of the countries conducted a specific gender needs assessment during the design, the project did respond to gender specificities by targeting sectors where the majority of the working population is female, expanding social protection to vulnerable female groups, such as the informal sector in Kenya and female miners in Senegal, and ensuring that topics specific to women's health were included in training and awareness materials. In Latin America, particularly in Paraguay, the project addressed the gendered construct of masculinity which makes discussing topics such as HIV very difficult. By addressing issues such as society's expectation of males, respect for women and violence, the project addressed key gendered needs in innovative ways.

Recommendations & Lessons Learned

1. Continue to involve the tripartite constituents in designing project interventions. This should include sharing feedback from ILO on the successes and challenges of the previous projects and sharing evaluation reports, findings and recommendations with the tripartite constituents
2. Make use of holistic OSH methodologies such as SOLVE and HealthWise. These provide a strong entry point because they offer institutions a tool that provides an integrated OSH approach which covers more than just HIV/AIDS
3. The length of the projects should be sufficient to allow capacity gains to become sustainable and ensure that gains made in a project are not lost. ILO should consider reducing the number of countries involved if funding is limited and should also consider not accepting funding if it is not sufficient for a project long enough to achieve sustainability.
4. Continue peer education system that uses persons living with HIV and other workers to Ensure workers can lead the process- by identifying what materials they want, the types of activities, and the mode of delivery that are relevant to their peers.
5. Improve collaboration and identify synergies among ILO's projects. As an example, working to mainstream HIV into projects focused on the informal sector, gender, or disability projects would ensure wider reach of ILOAIDs work. The provision of technical support on HIV to other projects would further this goal.
6. Support programs that will require tripartite constituents to provide only limited resources to continue after the project to implement work-based HIV policies. This will help improve sustainability if ILO can demonstrate to companies and industry groups that developing and implementing an HIV policy does not require a large financial outlay.
7. Identify areas where impact can be measured on a long-term basis. Examples of this include the KAP survey conducted in the manufacturing and sugar sector in Honduras. Revisiting these surveys in 2-3 years would give a clearer idea of impact. ILO cannot do this for all activities but picking a sample, ensuring a usable baseline and committing to returning for a post-intervention survey is advised.
8. Ensure clear budgets for ILO's contribution are developed and a financial management system implemented that tracks ILO's contribution. The development of the budget should consider how to ensure a cost-effective split of salaries between national, and regional/HQ levels.
9. Try to mobilize public-private partnerships. Potential exists for identifying funding opportunities with private enterprises, particularly large international corporations.
10. Develop a sustainability plan and clear exit strategy.
11. Prioritise projects in countries where ILO can continue to offer at least some technical support after the project.