Evaluation Summary

International Labour Office

Evaluation Office

Promoting indigenous peoples' human development and social inclusion in the context of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development – Independent Midterm evaluation

Background & Context

Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure

The projects, 1) Improving indigenous peoples' access to justice and development through community-based monitoring (GLO/16/24/EUR); and 2) Promoting indigenous peoples' human development and social inclusion in the context of the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (GLO/16/23/EUR)-(Indigenous Navigator pillar 1 and 2) aim to further consolidate the Indigenous Navigator framework and related tools, and to scale-up capacity building for indigenous peoples' communities and networks to use the framework to undertake community-based monitoring in eleven countries. Complementary outputs around the supply of Indigenous people' disaggregated data of right holders (pillar 1), and the engagement with duty bearers for the uptake of data (pillar 2) feed into complementary outcomes with the use of the Indigenous Navigator web portal informing development programming. The results-chain finally leads to a common impact for both projects: the empowerment of indigenous peoples and the responsiveness of national laws, policies and development programmes to indigenous peoples' rights and needs.

The projects' governance arrangements are complex and multi-layered. The ILO manages the projects, with a Steering Committee in place for strategic guidance and decision-making. Regional coordination partners backstop country implementation partners.

Present Situation of the Project

Under pillar 1, 132 indigenous communities in 11 countries are targeted. In nine out of 11 countries, data were collected in the majority of communities. The total coverage amounts to 75% communities where

community questionnaires were applied. Data was published from 26% of communities (34) and for 50% of communities (66) data validation is ongoing.

Under pillar 2, communities interviewed have documented and prioritized their development needs. The preparation of country fact sheets and briefings is still ongoing in most countries as data is still being collected or validated. The consortium partners have engaged with the Indigenous Peoples' Major Group of the United Nations High-level political Forum.

Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

The main purpose of this independent mid-term evaluation was to improve project performance; and to enhance learning with the ILO and key stakeholders. The evaluation is expected to cover the project period from 1st February 2017 until present and across all the project components implemented. Main evaluation clients are the ILO, project partners and the donor.

Methodology of evaluation

The evaluator used a *theory-based evaluation approach* to address the time-lag between the results of the two projects and change to materialize for indigenous peoples at the policy and community level. This seems particularly pertinent at mid-term when results achievement is likely to be in its early stages.

The evaluator applied a range of tailored evaluation tools and processes for the mid-term evaluation to ensure rigorous triangulation of data, including focus group discussions with communities during field visits. Project implementation partners and regional coordinators were contacted through telephone interviews and Steering committee members and beneficiaries from capacity building workshops through on-line surveys.

Main Findings & Conclusions

Relevance: The projects are relevant for indigenous peoples' communities and the ILO. The projects' intervention logic (Theory of Change, ToC) is largely valid. The projects are closely aligned with the ILO Convention 169, the 2018-2019 ILO Programme and Budget, and Decent Work Country Programmes where applicable. The level of inclusiveness of projects' design was very high. The projects' governance arrangements are complex and multi-layered, with each layer demanding part of the projects' budget.

Efficiency: Overall, the projects use resources reasonably well, with room for improvements

Management arrangements: ILO project management engages with the relevant stakeholder, but the frequency of meetings could be enhanced. Due to infrequent meetings of the Steering Committee, decision-taking is delayed and leadership put in peril. The performance of regional coordination partners was sufficient, with one exception where frequent staff turnover and limited technical capacities caused dissatisfaction.

Value for money:

The projects' value for money is enhanced where projects coordination and implementation partners operate in the same country, with the ILO appreciated as a neutral stakeholder. Coordination of multiple countries in parallel by multiple coordination partners on a part-time basis shows inefficiencies. Funds leveraged are not systematically tracked by the partnership. For Bangladesh, evidence emerges that the country budget was doubled through leveraging funding.

Effectiveness: At mid-term, the Indigenous Navigator (pillars 1 and 2) are making progress in the achievement of projects outputs.

As baselines, milestones or targets are missing for the projects, the expected achievement of results at mid-term is only an estimation.

- The participation of indigenous peoples' communities in data collection using the community questionnaire was very strong;
- Indigenous peoples' communities got informed about their rights often for the first time as a result of the Indigenous Navigator;
- The evaluation finds changes in the knowledge of indigenous peoples about the UNDRIP, the SDGs and the ILO Convention 169, with examples emerging to apply that knowledge.

Sustainability: At mid-term, the likelihood of sustainability for the Indigenous Navigator is mixed.

The degree of ownership of the Indigenous Navigator concept has shifted and deceased since the design and launch of the projects. Under its current governance structure, the partnership would be unlikely to sustain projects' results; Stakeholders are looking towards the sustainability of the projects' early on at country level but funding issues remain. An exit strategy has not been made explicit.

Gender and labor rights: The projects use a gender perspective. ILO Convention No. 169 figures in the projects at country level.

Gender balance is aimed for in selecting and training community facilitators. Female community facilitators engage with female community members concerning gender-sensitive issues in specific focus group discussions without the participation of male community members. The projects provide a rare space for indigenous women to get together as actors, rather than bystanders, for analyzing their livelihoods, related need, and priorities.

In Bangladesh and Kenya, the ILO Convention 169 has not been ratified. The projects serve as an initiative to lobby for ratification, but this is not a high priority on the governments' agenda.

Conclusions

Based on the above key findings, a range of conclusions emerge around the projects' high relevance; good progress, with the projects' implementation reflected in high effectiveness ratings; and positive results concerning the use of a gender lens in the projects' implementation. Conclusions also entail challenges in the efficiency of governance arrangements and shortcomings in some design aspects of the projects, accompanied by a mixed picture about the likelihood to sustain projects' results.

Recommendations

The following recommendations of high to very high priority emerge:

<u>Efficiency</u>

R2: To the projects team at the ILO

The Steering Committee modalities require more flexibility to enhance its effectiveness. It is recommended to: i) Establish a rolling program of three (3) Steering Committee meetings per year, with proposed dates to be set by the projects team in January 2019; ii) Establish a quorum to enable the meetings even without the full participation of all members; iii) Minute the meetings rigorously including action points; iv) Follow up of action points in subsequent meetings. **Prioritization: Very high (next month).**

R3: To the projects team at the ILO

The monetary value of funds leveraged through projects partners should be systematically tracked, including in-kind contributions. To stimulate that process, the projects team might wish to launch a mini competition for partners to present their results in the next technical workshop in 2019 and to be published in the next annual progress report. **Prioritization: High (next 3 months).**

Effectiveness

R4: To the projects team at the ILO

To enhance the evaluability of the projects, it is recommended to establish a monitoring framework for each project, including baselines, indicators, time-bound milestones, and targets. **Prioritization: High (next 3 months).**

R5: To the projects team at the ILO

Despite limitations, the community data uploading to the web portal should be finalized as planned to enable pillar 2.

Further investments in the current web portal are not recommended during the remaining project cycle but looking into options to create a new web tool under a new governance structure involving a counterpart with in-house IT expertise is highly recommended. **Prioritization: High (next 3 months).**

Sustainability

R6: To the projects team at the ILO

It is recommended to develop an exit strategy, involving the Consortium partners, outlining: i)

Options for the analysis and use of community data at country level combined with an outlook to a new web portal after the end of the project; ii) Funding options to sustain the use of the community questionnaire. **Prioritization: High (next 3 months).**