



# Evaluation Summary



International  
Labour  
Office

Evaluation  
Office

*Sida-ILO Partnership Programme (Phase I) 2018-2019 Outcome-based funding, Outcome 7, with a focus on Social Dialogue, Industrial Relations and Collective Bargaining*

## Quick Facts

<b>Countries:</b>	<i>Global</i>
<b>Final Evaluation:</b>	<i>May 2020</i>
<b>Evaluation Mode:</b>	<i>Independent</i>
<b>Administrative Office:</b>	<i>INWORK</i>
<b>Technical Office:</b>	<i>INWORK, FUNDAMENTALS, DIALOGUE, Labour Law &amp; Reform Unit</i>
<b>Evaluation Manager:</b>	<i>Sharon Chitambo</i>
<b>Evaluation Consultant:</b>	<i>Marleen Rueda</i>
<b>Project Code:</b>	<i>GLO/18/59/SWE</i>
<b>Donor &amp; Budget:</b>	<i>Sweden (US\$781,163)</i>
<b>Keywords:</b>	<i>Labour relations, Employers and Workers Organizations, Trade Unionism, Workers Education, Collective Bargaining, Labour Disputes, Workers Participation.</i>

## Background & Context

### Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure

Phase I of the Sida-ILO partnership agreement provided lightly earmarked thematic funding to the ILO, to advance its strategy for Outcome 7 of the 2018-19 Programme and Budget (P&B), “Promoting safe work and workplace compliance including in global supply chains”.

The overall strategy of the outcome-based intervention (OBI) was to develop global tools to assist ILO Tripartite Constituents to improve the effectiveness of their Social Dialogue institutions and to develop sound Industrial Relations practice at national, sectoral and workplace level.

The OBI focused on the delivery of four outputs:

- Updating and expanding IRLex, an existing database on national laws and regulations concerning Industrial Relations (IR) in ILO member States;
- Updating and expanding IRData, a database on Industrial Relations statistics;
- Developing an online self- assessment tool for national tripartite Social Dialogue institutions (SAM-SDI) for ILO Constituents; and
- Developing an IR Toolkit, a policy resource package on Industrial Relations.

The strategy envisaged an extensive cross-office partnership establishing a clear coordination mechanism by INWORK, with one or more lead units for each of the outputs planned. The four global tools built upon previous work done by the ILO and responded to identified priorities as contained in target Country Programme Outcomes (CPO). The approach comprises of a first phase for the 2018-19 biennium focused on the development of the tools, and a roll-out of the tools at the country level in its second phase.

The OBI had a 16 month duration plus a three-month no-cost extension.

### Present Situation of the Project

The Phase I of the OBI concluded on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2020 and the following results were achieved:

- The country profiles for IR Lex were concluded and were to be uploaded in April;
- The Guidelines on data collection and use of industrial relations statistics (IR Data) was developed and translated into French and Spanish;
- The SAM-SDI was concluded, however, the global launch was postponed due to the impact of Covid-19 measures;
- The IR Toolkit was finalised and pilot tested in four countries.

### Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

The evaluation has aimed to assess the results achieved through Sida's support to the ILO's 2018-19 P&B Outcome 7. The evaluation has covered the duration of Phase 1 of the OBI since its inception in May 2018 to March 2020, taking into account the three-month no-cost extension.

The major clients of the evaluation are:

- The Swedish International Development Cooperation (Sida), donor of the OBI;
- The ILO Constituents
- INWORK and all collaborating units -DIALOGUE, STATISTICS, LabourLaw, FUNDAMENTALS, NORMES, ACTRAV, ACT/EMP, PARDEV and PROGRAM;
- ILO offices in target countries.
- The ITCILO and ILO development cooperation programmes and projects, including Better Work, Sustaining Competitive and Responsible Enterprises (SCORE) and other decentralised projects in the field of industrial relations.

The goal of the final evaluation of the Phase I of the OBI is to review its performance and enhance learning within the ILO and among stakeholders.

### Methodology of evaluation

The evaluation has applied a theory-based

approach and has been participatory. The methodological framework has been primarily qualitative in nature through the review of project documents and reports, and ILO programming frameworks. The primary data was collected directly from stakeholders through interviews conducted in-person and via Skype. In total, 26 people were interviewed.

A main limitation of the evaluation has been the capacity to reach out to all internal and external focal points, particularly as many interviews - and the report drafting - were affected by the COVID-19 crisis.

### Main Findings & Conclusions

**Relevance and strategic fit:** *Strategic fit and relevance of the project have been rated high. The OBI was designed to respond to the needs of Constituents identified in the CPOs. These include CPOs in Ethiopia, Sri Lanka or Myanmar among others, where the OBI engaged in country-level activities.*

The evaluation revealed the links established between strengthened industrial relations and development objectives such as social inclusion, economic growth and productivity, or flexibility for business to adapt to globalization.

**Validity and coherence of project design:** *The validity and coherence of the OBI design has been rated high. However, the evaluation found that there is no clear organisational programming guideline to inform the design of outcome-based interventions.*

The OBI design included neither a logical framework nor a theory of change (ToC) However, some elements of a strategy and internal workplans for each output were developed. The OBI design established a clear sequence of inputs-outputs-outcomes, but missed indicators and failed to identify risks. Based on the 2018-19 P&B, the evaluation constructed a ToC to highlight the contribution of the OBI to the overall strategy for Outcome 7. The ToC showed coherence and consistency of the OBI with the overall ILO strategy to achieve that policy outcome. The OBI filled identified gaps in knowledge and capacity building.

Gender was poorly addressed at the design phase and the existing link of the intervention with the poor and vulnerable was not clearly made.

**Effectiveness:** *On the whole, the OBI proved to be effective though some targets proved to be overambitious.*

The implementation timelines initially foreseen were substantially shortened largely due to delays in the internal approvals of the OBI programming and subsequent allocation of funds. Overall, important outputs have been delivered, including unexpected results. Standards have been a cross-cutting issue in all outputs, but gender and disability were addressed unequally.

**Efficiency of resources use:** *The OBI resource utilisation has proved to be efficient, including resource allocation across outputs and for coordination.*

The OBI made extensive use of in-house expertise, implying a substantial contribution from the ILO's regular budget in the form of professional and administrative staff. Further, the OBI leveraged resources from the International Training Center (ITC-IL) and Development Cooperation (DC) projects creating economies of scale.

**Impact orientation and sustainability:** *The OBI shows high potential of achieving significant long-term results if all planned activities are implemented and adequate exit strategies are formulated and implemented.*

The pilot test activities of the IR Toolkit showed already some initial impact in Myanmar, Indonesia, Sri Lanka and Ethiopia. In the medium term Long-term commitment of key ILO Programmes to use the IR Toolkit will ensure the sustainability of the standards-based approach in promoting workplace relations. With the exception of the IRData and partially for SAM-SDI, the outputs produced have not been translated into French and Spanish, which severely limits the use of the tools in non-English speaking Constituents.

## Recommendations

1. The ILO should carefully plan a strategy to roll-out the tools at the national level; these plans should be designed with the close involvement – and leadership- of the field specialists. Specific sustainability plans for the databases should be designed.
2. For IRLex, explore how the network of academic institutions created could be institutionalised; assess cost implications to involve them in future regular updating.
3. For IRData, engage in sub-regional workshops with statistical offices for capacity building and integration of the collection methods in national collection systems. Prepare a sustainability plan for the database.
4. For IRToolkit, focus on dissemination and capacity building with a variety of stakeholders and create synergies with IR projects; explore national and sectoral adaptations.
5. For SAM-SDI, explore the possibility to simplify the tool before publication or develop a simpler version.
6. The ILO should ensure a better regional balance in the next phase of the OBI.
7. Collaboration amongst the various units should continue to be promoted in the next phase of the OBI, including convening a follow up meeting to assess the use of the tools. This could be organised at the end of 2020 and involve units and projects that were involved in the development and implementation of the tools in the first phase of the OBI.
8. With probably the exception of IRData, all tools should strengthen the gender dimension; it is suggested that specific gender expertise is sought for gender analysis.
9. The forthcoming design of the intervention in the next phase should include a clear ToC and a results-based framework, including indicators of progress and impact.

10. Procedures for the approval of internal planning proposals under the outcome-based funding modality should be revised to ensure better alignment with the timelines of the P&B. The signature of partnership agreements that include outcome-based funding should be aligned with the P&B cycle, allowing sufficient time for implementation within the given biennium.

11. Considering the potential role of ILO databases for policymaking, the ILO should hold a high-level discussion on how they could be institutionalised and funding secured. Discussions should include whether and how a single labour law database could gather existing databases – for instance under NATLEX- allowing thematic searches.

12. To secure donor funding in the field of industrial relations, the ILO should put a greater effort to demonstrate the existing link between strengthening social dialogue and industrial relations institutions and processes and development objectives such as equality, poverty and stability, often in the development agenda of the donors. The crisis stemming from COVID 19 might make this effort even more necessary.