



Evaluation Summary



International
Labour
Office

Evaluation
Office

P&B Outcome 17 (Discrimination in employment and occupation is eliminated) - Final evaluation

Quick Facts

Countries: *Global – India, China, Mongolia, Senegal, El Salvador, Macedonia, Jordan, Occupied Palestinian Territories, Argentina, Hungary, Thailand, Costa Rica, France, India, Indonesia, Montenegro, South Africa*

Final Evaluation: *3 August 2017*

Mode of Evaluation: *Independent*

Administrative Office: *WORKQUALITY*

Technical Office: *GED*

Evaluation Manager: *Natanael Lopes*

Evaluation Consultant: *Magali Bonne-Moreau*

Project End: *December 2015*

Project Code: *GLO/14/58/NOR; GLO/12/52/NOR*

Donor & Project Budget: *SIDA (SEK 3,920,000)*

Keywords: *Gender equality, women's empowerment, discrimination*

Background & Context

Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure. Present Situation of the Project

In 2011, the ILO renewed its partnership agreement with Norway (Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs) covering a four-year period (Phase I: 2012-13 and Phase II: 2014-15). Meanwhile, the ILO entered with Sweden (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency - SIDA) a second phase of its partnership agreement (Phase I: 2010-11 and

Phase II: 2012-13). With the exception of PRIDE, funding under the agreement is no longer for projects – but outcome-based and aligned with the ILO's Strategic Policy Framework 2010-15 (SPF) and the Programme and Budget (P&B) for 2010-11, 2012-13 and 2014-15.

Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

The evaluation findings are destined primarily to the donors, Norway and Sweden, the ILO as executor of the projects, project management and staff, and tripartite constituents.

Methodology of evaluation

This final independent evaluation was conducted through a range of data collection methods, including a review of the incomplete Draft Evaluation Report, a desk review of relevant project documents, products, and other documents related to Outcome 17, as provided by EVAL, GED and other key persons; a review and assessment of the Management Responses to the Recommendations from the previous Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2012-13); and semi-structured interviews with key ILO personnel and other actors involved in the initiatives.

The evaluation framework was guided by the key questions identified in the TOR. All aspects of this evaluation were guided by the ILO evaluation policy which adheres to the OECD/DAC Principles and the UNEG norms

and standards, and ethical safeguards were followed.

Main Findings & Conclusions

- This evaluation has found that the interventions supported by Norway and Sweden to promote gender mainstreaming, as well as the BASIC and PRIDE Projects, were strategically relevant to Outcome 17, and coherent with the wider ILO P&B strategy.
- The flexible approach to gender mainstreaming, based on creating synergies and complementing work from other Outcomes (5, 9, 10, 11, 14, 18, 19) and the Area of Critical Importance (ACI 2) was found to lead to positive results, both in terms of achieving specific outputs in collaboration with constituents, and in sensitizing ILO officials to gender issues.
- Most of the initiatives reviewed in this evaluation built on existing work by the ILO, through funding of previous phases by the donors, and responded to demands from constituents, thus maximizing the potential for success, and allowing for the replication, and up-scaling of certain activities and approaches, including through knowledge-sharing between countries. This was particularly the case for the BASIC project, as well as certain activities under the Global Product, which furthered work initiated in specific countries.
- Funding from Norway and Sweden led to changes in legislation, policies, and a shift in attitudes of workers, employers, governments and civil society regarding gender equality and discrimination in the workplace, leading to important impacts in the countries and regions involved. While progress may be incremental, these shifts in perspective will help create the base for further change and promote sustainability.
- The PRIDE Project was innovative and highly relevant to the mandate of the ILO, as well as the priorities of the donor and the UN community. It brought the ILO at the forefront of the United Nations organizations with regards to the advancement of Gender rights and non-discrimination in the world of work. Funding PRIDE has also given Norway a positive reputation as being the sole ILO donor focused on rights issues as they relate to these communities. Considering that the monetary outlay for PRIDE programming over the course of Norway's PA was not overly cumbersome, funding future related initiatives provides both the ILO and donor with considerably more positive visibility, at limited cost, while ensuring that the rights of minority communities are respected.
- Related to these efforts, the work done at the ILO internally should also continue. In particular, the recommendations from the PRIDE internal survey should be acted upon by HRD and the Staff Union, in order to foster a culture of inclusiveness within the organization.

- In terms of project management, several shortcomings related to the design, implementation, and monitoring and reporting of the interventions associated with Outcome 17 under the Norway and Sweden PAs, were identified during the evaluation process.
- In the majority of cases, the use of comprehensive workplans linked to the different Outcomes supported (as relevant), logframes and detailed results framework was limited, creating challenges to evaluate the work achieved. The programme documents and reporting documents do not show clear links between the different levels of progression, from the activities, to outputs, to outcomes, and the risks and assumptions were very generic, thus limiting their value.
- Although the donors' requirements regarding monitoring and reporting are limited, the ILO could benefit from having more rigorous and more frequent reporting frameworks in place. The use of annual progress and final reports to the donors and Programme Implementation Reports do not allow for critical and comprehensive analysis of results achieved, nor the identification of opportunities, and challenges. This limits the scope for improvement and discussion around possible synergies.
- Finally, the development of an adequate understanding of gender mainstreaming requires clarity on the related concepts of gender and equality. It seems, however, that there is some confusion regarding these concepts in the ILO, and that the different terminologies used

in the context of the advancement of Gender rights and non-discrimination in the world of work would benefit from clarification at the institutional level.

Recommendations & Lessons Learned

Main recommendations and follow-up

1. The first two phases of the PRIDE project have laid the groundwork for positive change regarding the rights of LGBT men and women in the workplace. GED and PARDEV should secure new funding to keep the momentum going, so that the ILO remains a champion of human rights in the world of work. Funds could also be sought at the Country Level, with technical assistance from HQ and the Regional Offices, as needed.
2. GED should encourage HRD to follow-up on the PRIDE Internal Survey Recommendations, to allow the ILO to provide a more inclusive work environment for its staff. This could be done with the support of the Staff Union.
3. To facilitate autonomy in the allocation of funds, and lessen the administrative burden on GED staff at headquarters, GED should consistently consider the possibility of further decentralizing funds to regional offices in the case of initiatives promoting gender equality and non-discrimination at the country level, when the local capacity to administer these funds is available.
4. Although gender issues have been addressed to a certain extent in the

development of the 2016-17 P&B, more work needs to be done by building on the work done through PRIDE, so that an inclusive approach to gender be taken within the ILO, and operationalized through the P&B. In particular, the understanding of concepts related to gender mainstreaming and equality could be more systematically introduced and clarified at an institutional level through HRD and the International Training Centre courses, with inputs from GED. This should subsequently be fully reflected in the ILO's Programme and policy documents. The current ILO Action Plan for Gender Equality 2016-17 includes indicators on capacity building and training but could go further, by also systematically defining such terms for the users, and considering specific references to challenges faced by LGBT women and men in the workplace.

5. GED should provide more substantive guidance and technical advice to colleagues in the field, in order to fully incorporate gender concerns into their work, and assist them in considering opportunities and challenges associated with specific country-contexts more systematically.
6. Project design and implementation, including monitoring and reporting mechanisms, should be strengthened. While some work has been done to incorporate theories of change and logical frameworks in project and programme documents, systematically defining and describing a clear causal chain in these documents, having baseline information, and identifying

specific risks would improve the design and implementation of interventions. This should be included as an institutional requirement in monitoring and reporting – even when this is not required by the donor – so that areas of strengths and weaknesses can be identified, reviewed, and updated, leading to a more critical analysis of the situation and better management of the interventions. As a result, a better RBM approach can be implemented at all levels of the ILO's results frameworks.

7. To support institutional memory, knowledge management, and access to information and avoid to duplication of efforts, the reporting systems at headquarters and in the field, should be reviewed at all levels. To this end, a simple document management system and repository would facilitate this work.
8. The Management Response mechanism to Recommendations from Evaluations should be updated periodically by EVAL, until recurring recommendations (i.e. those which are highlighted repeatedly in the Annual Evaluation Reports) have been addressed.

See full report for lessons learned and good practices