



Evaluation Summaries

Promoting sound industrial relations at the workplace and strengthening the capacity of industrial relations actors in Viet Nam: PHASE 2

Quick Facts

Country: Viet Nam

Final Evaluation: September 2008

Mode of Evaluation: Independent

Technical Area: Industrial relations and collective bargaining

Evaluation Management: DIALOGUE

Evaluation Team: Mr. Robert Heron (independent evaluator); Mr. René Robert (DIALOGUE, evaluation manager).

Project Start: March 2007

Project End: March 2009

Project Code: VIE/06/M01/NOR

Donor: Royal Norwegian Embassy, Hanoi (US\$1,309,328)

Key Words: Industrial relations; collective bargaining

Background & Context

Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure

The project intended to strengthen Viet Nam's industrial relations system by focusing on improving collective bargaining at enterprise level, as well as supporting legal reform and establishing an industrial relations data base and information system.

Present situation of project

The project is scheduled to end in March 2009. Immediate objectives relating to collective bargaining and capacity building have been

achieved to an acceptable level but it is unlikely that objectives relating to law reform and the industrial relations data base will be achieved to the planned extent. The project is an extension of a previous project with two 'add-on' objectives that are important but do not relate closely to the project's main thrust.

Purpose, scope and objectives of the evaluation

The evaluation aimed to determine whether the project had achieved its immediate objectives and delivered benefits to target beneficiaries. It also sought to assess project design, performance monitoring, and identify practices suitable for replication in other projects.

Methodology of evaluation

Information on the ILO's concept and policies of evaluation was accessed prior to commencement of field activities. The evaluation examined the project document, project reports, conducted semi-structured interviews with direct recipients, and interviews with the CTA and project staff. The draft evaluation report was distributed for comment by ILO specialists.

More contact with direct recipients in pilot enterprises would have been beneficial.

Main Findings & Conclusions

The project delivered improvements in collective bargaining for the small number of

pilot enterprises, and a number of non-pilot enterprises through its multiplier effects. The project's training interventions were of a high quality but participants indicated a need for more training materials, particularly related to Viet Nam's situation. At the time of evaluation, the project's impact on law reform and data collection was virtually zero.

The project design missed an opportunity to relate more closely to the industrial relations actors in Viet Nam's informal industrial relations system. External performance monitoring was limited, and the project failed to consider gender and equality issues. The project appraisal process was poor.

design limitations. High efficiency does not necessarily maximize effectiveness and impact.

Recommendations & Lessons Learned

Main recommendations and follow-up

The project should document in detail enterprise level collective bargaining experiences from both pilot and non-pilot enterprises, produce additional training materials, produce gender materials relating to collective bargaining, and adopt more of a 'wholesale' approach to training including the production of distance learning materials making use of ICT.

The ILO's technical and logical framework appraisal processes need to be improved.

Follow up action should focus on the preparation of a comprehensive industrial relations policy to provide a platform for law reform. The policy should consider collective bargaining issues, including bargaining at enterprise and industry/sector levels, address the issue of minimum wages, consider how the informal and formal systems of industrial can integrate, and give attention to dispute prevention.

Important lessons learned

Competent project management, high quality training deliverables, and dedicated project staff cannot really compensate for project