



# Evaluation Summary



International  
Labour  
Office

Evaluation  
Office

## *Swedish and Norwegian Partnership Programme - Outcome 14 - Freedom of association and Collective Bargaining - Final Evaluation*

### Quick Facts

**Countries:** Global

**Final Evaluation:** March 2014

**Mode of Evaluation:** Independent

**Administrative and Technical backstopping:**  
DECLARATION

**Evaluation Manager:** Wamiq Umaira

**Evaluation Consultant:** M.G. Anna Feminia

**Project Code:** Including GLO/11/57/SID and  
GLO/12/59/NOR

**Donor:** Norway and Sweden, Partnership  
Evaluation

### Summary extracted from the report

Freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining are fundamental rights that make it possible to promote and realize decent conditions at work. The ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, adopted in 2008, noted that freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining are particularly important to the attainment of all ILO strategic

objectives. The ILO's strategy in promoting these rights is addressed under Outcome 14, "The right to freedom of association and collective bargaining is widely known and exercised". The existence of strong and independent workers' and employers' organizations, and effective recognition of their right to engage in collective bargaining, are major tools for labour market governance. Collective bargaining is a way of attaining beneficial and productive solutions to potentially conflicting relations between workers and employers. It provides a means of building trust between the parties through negotiation and by articulating and meeting the differing needs and interests of the negotiating partners. Collective bargaining plays this role by promoting peaceful, inclusive and democratic participation of representative workers' and employers' organizations.

Since 2011, partnership agreements with Norway and Sweden are now outcome-based rather than project-based, in accordance with the ILO Strategic Policy Framework (SPF) 2010-15. The SPF focuses upon four strategic objectives, providing the framework for the Programme and Budgets (P&B) for 2012-13 and 2014-15.

These contain nineteen Decent Work Outcomes, each comprised of one or more indicators. Outcome 14 has been identified as a priority outcome in partnerships with Norway and Sweden and subsequently two technical cooperation projects have been funded: “Promoting Freedom of Association and the Right to Collective Bargaining”, under Norwegian cooperation, and “Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining in the Rural, Export Processing and Domestic Work Sectors” together with a project to develop “Global diagnostic tools on freedom of association and collective bargaining rights in the rural, export processing and domestic work sectors”, under Swedish cooperation. The ILO’s Programme for the Promotion of the Declaration of Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work managed the implementation of both projects, which fell under the responsibility of the coordinator of Outcome 14.

A joint final independent evaluation has been commissioned for the two projects, the primary purpose of which has been to determine to what extent the projects achieved their stated objectives, and how and why these objectives have or have not been achieved. The evaluation has also sought to reflect on the extent to which the project outputs are applicable as global tools, with specific attention having been given to the tool developed by the Swedish project - providing recommendations on how to build on the achievements and lessons learned, as well as identifying and documenting good practice to be used in any further project phases or other relevant areas of ILO work.

The evaluation took place in March and

April 2014 and focussed on the results achieved by both projects through the activities implemented from January 2012 to March 2014. The principal clients of this evaluation are the donors of both projects, the “Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining” programme teams, ILO offices in target countries and other relevant HQ staff, and tripartite constituents in target countries.

The evaluation has aimed to assess the effect and impact of the support provided by Sweden and Norway to the ILO’s Outcome 14. It has done this by evaluating the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact of their activities, including an evaluation of the projects’ outcomes for beneficiaries. In accordance with the methodology of Outcome Based Funding (OBF) evaluations, the key question to have been addressed was the extent to which the donor(s) contribution has allowed the ILO to make progress on the targets established for Outcome 14.

A master list of key evaluation questions contained in the terms of reference has been included in the Evaluation Matrix. The methodological approach for data collection was primarily qualitative in nature. The evaluators reviewed project documents, developed data collection instruments and interviewed representatives from ILO HQ and the field, as well as national stakeholders. Country visits took place in Indonesia, Jordan, the Philippines and South Africa. A total of 103 stakeholders were interviewed, of which 41 were women.

The findings and conclusions below address the key questions listed in the terms of reference and are presented

according to the evaluation's principal criteria: relevance, coherence of projects design, project management, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

Under the new outcome-based partnership approach, the projects comprise an important contribution to Outcome 14. They were designed as coordinated interventions, but the design of the two projects as a single strategy highlighted two main weaknesses. Firstly, it assumed that coordination would take place without establishing a clear and coherent common logical framework. Secondly, it planned, as part of the same intervention, to develop a new global tool, to achieve tripartite national plans of action of a political nature in specific countries, in addition to implementing and reviewing these. This was far too ambitious.

The Swedish project applied a new sociological approach to the ILO's strategy and expertise in promoting rights to FoACB. Both the Swedish and Norwegian projects fell under the technical coordination of the Outcome 14 coordinator, based in NORMES, while the management responsibility fell under FPRW. A formal mechanism for coordination between the two project teams was not established and attempts at cohesion of the two projects with a view to creating a single intervention was weak, mainly due to flaws in the projects' design. All these elements represented significant challenges for the projects in terms of the effectiveness of their management processes.

The design of the global diagnostic process for the Swedish project was initially documented in two project documents -

one global, and one country-specific. Neither the objectives nor the strategy regarding how each of them was to contribute to the development of the global tool were clear, whilst the Swedish project had a flaw in its design that affected the process throughout. However, through a methodical and rigorous process of gathering quantitative and qualitative data from individual workers and employers, the project succeeded in developing a very innovative methodology, which not only utilized a new sociological approach but also effectively complemented existing ILO knowledge on the practice of FoACB.

Accordingly, the Norwegian project faced substantial delays in its delivery, given that, as initially conceived, it depended upon the achievements of the Swedish project. Nevertheless, after some strategy adjustments, it was able to achieve a reasonable rate of delivery, by building up existing ILO work in the field. With regard to the Swedish project, it met with new challenges and complexities concerning fieldwork management, in particular those which concerned diagnostic missions. As a consequence of challenges that emerged in drafting the diagnostic reports and in approving national plans of action, the delivery rate of expected outputs was slow.

Nevertheless, the Norwegian project was particularly effective when it sought to complement existing strategies at the national level and when it cooperated with other ILO projects, including Better Work. Timely responses to the identified needs of the tripartite constituents also contributed to an achievement of project outcomes. Outcome 1, which centred upon concrete steps having been taken towards the

introduction of legislation and/or policies to improve the framework for the realization of FoACB, was achieved in China and Jordan. Outcome 2, which focussed upon the government and social partners demonstrating that they were better equipped to implement FoACB, was achieved in Benin, China, Jordan, Ivory Coast, Niger, the Philippines, South Africa and Zimbabwe, among other countries. With regard to Outcome 3, which centred on the wide dissemination within the Office of good practice and lessons learned to inform future activities with constituents, the project supported the development of two global tools to support this that are currently being finalized. Norway's change in strategy in 2013, disassociating it from the achievements of the national plans of action, noticeably improved its efficiency and effectiveness.

The Swedish project made some progress towards the achievement of its three outcomes, such that governments and social partners were more aware of freedom of association and collective bargaining rights and were better able to address gaps in law and practice in the rural, export processing and domestic work sectors. This was achieved by preparing diagnostic reports on the export processing sector in Indonesia and Jordan, by developing action plans for EPZs in Bangladesh and Indonesia and for the rural sector in South Africa, and by conducting a diagnostic mission for the domestic work sector in Brazil.

The impact of the global tool developed by the Swedish project will be measured in the long term. Throughout the process, employers and workers who took part in the diagnostic work demonstrated

increased knowledge of FoACB, and social dialogue was shown to have strengthened in countries where national plans of action had been agreed. General improved awareness on these fundamental rights was also reported in some countries.

With regard to the global tool, the lack of clear buy-in from technical departments at the HQ, coupled with insufficient involvement of the field technical staff dealing with FoACB in the diagnostic process, puts use of the diagnostic methodology by the ILO in future at risk. With regard to the Norwegian project's intervention, a number of activities have contributed to a change in the existing framework for freedom of association and industrial relations, and to a shift in knowledge and mindsets. New processes integrated in labour administration have also been reported, whilst the establishment of links between the Swedish and Norwegian projects and national decent work agendas, CPOs and existing ILO strategies has been shown to contribute to the sustainability of achievements made by constituents, an approach which should accordingly be promoted.

More summary is available in the full report "Executive Summary".