



ILO/PBSO Programme to sustain peace and foster development through employment creation in conflict-affected situation

QUICK FACTS

Countries: Global

Evaluation date: 13 May 2022 – 30 January 2023

Evaluation type: Combined independent final (phase 1) and mid-term (phase 2)

Evaluation Timing: 13 May 2022 – 30 January 2023

Administrative Office: DEVINVEST

Technical Office: DEVINVEST

Evaluation manager: Johannes Weiss

Evaluation consultant(s): André Kahlmeyer, Kristian Svendsen, Conflict Management Consulting (CMC)

DC Symbol: GLO/18/04/CHE and GLO/20/43/CHE

Donor(s) & budget: Switzerland 1,050,330 USD (phase 1) and 800,076 (phase 2)

Key Words: [Use themes as provided in i-eval Discovery](#)

BACKGROUND & CONTEXT

Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure

The programme aims to raise awareness and building internal capacities and knowledge on the “employment and decent work for peace”-agenda across the ILO, PBSO and the Geneva-based organisations. The evaluation covered two phases:

Phase 1 of the Programme (2018-2020): ILO/PBSO Programme to sustain peace and foster development through employment creation in conflict-affected situation (Budget: 1,050,330 USD). The objectives of phase 1 were the following:

- 1) Greater peacebuilding impact of employment interventions in conflict-affected countries by strengthening the employment expertise of PBSO, the peacebuilding expertise of ILO and ability to attract additional sources of funding for country-based employment interventions
- 2) Enhance ILO and PBSO capacity to document, collate and analyse the peacebuilding outcomes of employment programmes and share this knowledge through different facilities including the Geneva Peacebuilding Platform and events, e.g., the annual Geneva Peace Week
- 3) Strengthen the link between PBSO and Geneva-based peace initiatives

Phase 2 of the programme (2021-2023): Promoting employment and decent work for peacebuilding in the framework of the Humanitarian-Development-Peace Nexus (Budget: 800,076 USD). The objectives of phase 2 are the following:

- 1) Reinforce ILO’s and partners’ capacities to include, document and build evidence on approaches to build peace, social cohesion, and resilience through employment for young men and women, including forcibly displaced persons and host communities
- 2) Implement and monitor innovative and integrated “employment and decent work for peace” programmes jointly with partners in at least five countries
- 3) ILO’s role among the Geneva Peace-Building Platform is consolidated and systematically mainstream decent work and employment in sustainable peace strategies (both at national and international level)

Present situation of the project

Phase 1 and Phase 2 of this programme have been completed.

Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

The purpose of this evaluation was to assess phase 1 of the programme (2018-2020) and the first year of implementation of phase 2 (2021), by indicating to all programme stakeholders the extent to which the programme has achieved its aims and objectives and to determine the relevance, coherence effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability of programme outcomes. The evaluation combined the required final evaluation of phase 1 and the initial implementation of phase 2. This will allow the knowledge generated by the evaluation to feed into the ongoing implementation of phase 2 and inform the design of relevant future strategic intervention in the areas of decent work for peacebuilding. In particular, the evaluation served the following main purposes:

- a) Give a final assessment of phase 1 and a mid-term indication of the implementation and delivery of the ongoing phase 2 in achieving its objectives and delivery of results; strategies and implementation modalities chosen; partnership arrangements, constraints, and opportunities; and
- b) Provide recommendations for the ongoing phase 2 and inform key stakeholders in terms of strategies, institutional arrangements, and specifically on mainstreaming the learning into country-level operations as well as sustainability and exit-strategy considerations.

The primary clients of this evaluation are the ILO (both HQ and selected field offices), the PBSO, the donor, ILO constituents and other peacebuilding actors, especially, but not exclusively, those based in Geneva.

Methodology of evaluation

The evaluation's methodology was guided by the two main purposes mentioned above in combination with the internationally agreed standard evaluation criteria (OECD/DAC), namely relevance, coherence, validity of design, effectiveness, efficiency of resource use, impact orientation and sustainability. The evaluation assessed the extent to which the ILO/PBSO programme has succeeded in influencing staff and implementing partners, raising awareness, and building internal capacities and knowledge on the employment contribution to peace across the ILO, PBSO and beyond.

The evaluation team, composed of two international evaluators, conducted the evaluation from May to August 2022. All data collection was conducted remotely using online communication tools. The evaluation adhered to the "ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation", ILO evaluation norms and standards and respected ethical safeguards described in the ILO's evaluation procedures in line with the United Nations (UN) system of

evaluation norms and standards as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.

MAIN FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS

The main findings and conclusions of this evaluation are:

- ILO has positioned itself as a key player in the employment and decent work for peace and played an important role in global agenda-setting.
- The ILO global vision (Rec. 205) for employment and decent work for peace has yet to be fully mainstreamed across the organization.
- ILO has achieved mixed results in supporting peace and social cohesion.
- ILO has not yet leveraged its strategic partnerships behind a clear “employment and decent work for peace” strategy.
- The ILO results framework and monitoring systems are not currently able to adequately measure and demonstrate its results in “employment and decent work for peace”.
- The major challenge of resource mobilisation for “employment and decent work for peace” work and the question about sustainability of the programme approach was not yet sufficiently addressed by the program.
- The COVID-19 pandemic and the lockdowns and travel restrictions that followed negatively affected ILO’s work, as well as this programme (and nearly all aid projects globally).

RECOMMENDATIONS, LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES

Main findings & Conclusions

CONCLUSION 1. The ILO is now better positioned as a key player in the employment and decent work for peace work area with a competitive advantage compared to other UN agencies based on its long-standing experience in promoting employment and decent work and played an important role in global agenda-setting.

CONCLUSION 2. The ILO global vision (Rec. 205) for employment and decent work for peace has yet to be mainstreamed fully across the organization.

CONCLUSION 3. ILO and PBSO have achieved mixed results in supporting peace and social cohesion.

CONCLUSION 4. ILO and PBSO have not yet leveraged their strategic partnerships behind a clear “employment and decent work for peace” strategy.

	<p>CONCLUSION 5. The ILO results framework and monitoring systems are not currently able to adequately measure and demonstrate its results in “employment and decent work for peace”.</p> <p>CONCLUSION 6. The major challenge of resource mobilisation for “employment and decent work for peace” work and the question about sustainability of the programme approach was not yet sufficiently addressed by the program.</p> <p>CONCLUSION 7. The COVID-19 pandemic and the lockdowns and travel restrictions that followed negatively affected ILO’s work, as well as this programme (and nearly all aid projects globally).</p>
<p>Main lessons learned and good practices</p>	<p>Lessons learned (LL) and emerging good practices (GP) are:</p> <p>LL1: The cooperation between PBSO and ILO led to a more common “peacebuilding language” being developed and ensured both organizations to better see their individual roles and common goals in the field of “employment and decent work for peace”. Cooperation with both PBSO and other peacebuilding organizations has permitted the acquisition of valuable instruments.</p> <p>LL2: Utilizing complementary instruments (the handbook, trainings/workshops, direct advisory, and additional material) all aiming at assisting ILO project staff to think through how to integrate peace and social cohesion issues in their work must be strategically timed.</p> <p>LL3: For an objective assessment of project’s impact on peacebuilding and social cohesion, a proper and systemic results framework must exist and contain baseline, indicators and targets that are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART). Use a Monitoring work-plan to determine how the project’s specific activities and results are contributing to the achievement of peace and social cohesion as part of the overall project’s outcomes and final impact.</p> <p>LL4: Producing frameworks, guides (like the Handbook) and trainings for “employment and decent work for peace” mainstreaming works best when it is a part of a strategy enjoying support from top managers and utilizes other tools as well. Offering trainings in building peace and social cohesion to the country-based staff, while there is no apparent place for ‘peace’ in the proposal evaluation procedure, sends a contradictory message, unlike in the PBF proposal preparations facilitated by the ILO/PBSO programme team, which required a focus on peace and social cohesion indicators. The project experience also confirms that “employment and decent work for peace” training should not be offered on an ad hoc basis but should instead be available on a permanent basis to all actors involved: ILO HQ staff,</p>

evaluators, national contact points, ILO project officers and ILO's social partners.

GP1: The ILO PROSPECT programme (Partnership for improving prospects for forcibly displaced persons and host communities), provides among others a good practice example of how to integrate peace and social cohesion in its result framework. With help from the ILO/PBSO programme they recognised the important role of social cohesion as a basis for the programme and are now including this in their results framework and programme designs.

GP2: Conducting conflict driver analysis and assessments before the programme design and/or implementation is a good practice for increasing the success and potential impact of all projects (beyond projects with a specific focus on employment and decent work for peace). The joint Interpeace/ILO conflict assessment in Libya is an example of this. More and more of ILO's work is taking place in contexts of conflict and fragility and the ILO/PBSO programs approach has proved promising as a component in generating long-term economic opportunities under difficult circumstances (working in fragile and conflict-affected contexts). This is corresponding with the ILO/PBSO programs focus on conflict-sensitivity and conflict assessments.