INDEPENDENT EVALUATION

ILO’s programme of work in four selected Southern African Development Community member countries – Lesotho, South Africa, the United Republic of Tanzania and Madagascar, 2014–2018
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Each region is the subject of a geographic evaluation once every five years. This year Africa was due and the ILO Evaluation Office examined the ILO’s programme of work in four selected Southern African development community (SADC) member states of Lesotho, South Africa, the United Republic of Tanzania and Madagascar, from 2014 through 2018.

These countries are all covered by the sub-regional dimension of the SADC Decent Work Programme (DWP); however, each of them also has their own Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP).

A DWCP is the main vehicle for delivery of ILO support to countries. It has two objectives: promote decent work as a key component of national development strategies, and; to organize ILO knowledge, instruments, advocacy and cooperation for tripartite constituents to advance the Decent Work Agenda.
SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION
SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

• The **evaluation** examined the ILO’s programme of work from 2014–18 in four selected southern African Development Community member countries – Lesotho, South Africa, the United Republic of Tanzania and Madagascar.

• The **main purpose** of the evaluation is to determine how well the SADC and its member countries of Lesotho, South Africa, the United Republic of Tanzania and Madagascar achieved the outcomes planned in their respective DWP (Decent Work Programme) and DWCPs (Decent Work Country Programmes), how they were achieved and under what conditions.

• The evaluation assessed their relevance to country needs, coherence and validity, effectiveness and efficiency, the impact of the results and the potential for sustainability.

• The evaluation also attempts to contribute to organizational learning by identifying lessons learned, emerging good practices and recommendations.
METHODOLOGY
THE EVALUATION ADOPTED A **MIXED METHODS** APPROACH

- **Comprehensive document review**
  - DWP and DWCPs documents
  - Country Programme results documents
  - Synthesis review of ILO’s Programme of Support to SADC and to selected SADC Member Countries
  - Official development assistance-related data
  - Documents related to ILO P&B, finances and procedures
  - ILO Evaluation Office (EVAL) guidelines and other relevant material from secondary sources

- **Key informant interviews**
  - 167 interviews with the following stakeholders:
    - ILO backstopping and technical officials at headquarters, regional office and country offices
    - Technical cooperation projects’ chief technical advisers and project teams
    - Tripartite constituents
    - Grass-roots organizations representing informal workers.

- **Countries visited**
  - The evaluators visited Lesotho, Madagascar, the United Republic of Tanzania and South Africa

- **Surveys**
  - A web-based survey was administered to ILO staff to better understand the results of DWCPs in Lesotho, South Africa, Madagascar and the United Republic of Tanzania.
FINDINGS
The four DWCPs were highly relevant for addressing the needs of the constituents. The country programmes were a product of extensive consultations between the national constituents: government, employers’ and workers’ organizations, and the ILO.

National ownership remains a challenge: for instance in the United Republic of Tanzania, the 2013–16 DWCP was never officially signed by the government.

Regional decisions need to be trickled down to the national level, with tripartite follow-up of the outcomes of regional decisions at country level.

The ILO DWCP approach did not always fit in all circumstances with the current national models, or with the actual national priorities.
RELEVANCE

• The four DWCPs considered by this evaluation are well aligned with national development frameworks and are strongly aligned with regional and international frameworks, such as: (a) the SADC DWP, 2013–19; (b) the ILO’s decent work agenda in Africa 2007–15; and (c) the respective United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs) across countries.

• The DWCPs were aligned with the SPF for 2010–15 and to the ILO’s P&B outcomes.

• The ILO and the constituents in the four case study countries adapted their DWCPs to changes in the context to different degrees.
COHERENCE AND VALIDITY OF DESIGN

• The DWCPS and DWP strategies were presented using a results-based framework.
• There was absence of a theory of change explaining how proposed interventions would lead to desired outcomes.
• Linkages or chains of causality between priorities, activities, outputs and outcomes were not always solid.
• Except in the case of the United Republic of Tanzania, the ILO supported the creation and/or strengthening of tripartite national structures in charge of coordinating DWCPs/DWP implementation and monitoring its progress.
• Several factors hindered effective DWCP and DWP monitoring.
• Hindrance in the evaluability of the DWCPs/DWP.
EFFECTIVENESS

• Common challenges: Constituents’ limited technical capacity and budget constraints, limited capacities of the DWCPs steering committees for effective implementation and monitoring, lack of understanding of tripartism by some government ministries and agencies, and limited collaboration with other government and UN agencies.

• Inability to fully implement what has been agreed on and approved in the DWCPs is perceived as lack of effectiveness.

• Collectively, the DWCPs addressed P&B outcomes 1–9.
EFFECTIVENESS

• The most relevant results were obtained in regard to International Labour Standards and social dialogue.

• Gender equality and non-discrimination, overall, much remains to be done.

• Environmental sustainability as a cross-cutting policy driver remained limited under the DWCPs’ implementation across countries.

• Conversely to Lesotho, the United Republic of Tanzania, South Africa and Madagascar did not participate extensively in ILO-supported SADC programmes.
EFFICIENCY

• ILO project spending in the four case study countries was largely cost-efficient.
• Efficient resources mobilisation through development cooperation projects.
• In all four countries’ DWCPs were strongly influenced by donor priorities and less so by the priorities set in the DWCPs.
• Absence of significant resource allocation for workers’ and employers’ organizations in all case study countries except for South Africa.
• Different types of funding (XBTC, RBTC and RBSA) do not necessarily promote different levels of efficiency.
IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY

• Achievements: better understanding of the decent work agenda among constituents, a greater capacity of workers and employers to analyse and mainstream their needs into the DWCP, and the improvement of relevant institutional capacities to generate further progress towards decent work country objectives.

• The likelihood of the DWCP achievements to be continued/implemented/scaled up largely depends on full national ownership, the constituents’ institutional capacities, effective governance and continued ILO support.
CONCLUSION
FINDINGS OF THE HIGH-LEVEL EVALUATION: SCORING
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The DWCPs were a product of extensive consultation between the ILO and national constituents.

Absence of sound monitoring and reporting tools and processes made adaptation of the DWCP a challenge.

The main constraint to sustainability is a weak enabling environment.
RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The ILO should reinforce the capacities of social partners.

2. The ILO should consider a more custom-made approach to countries’ DWCP.

3. The ILO should improve efforts to coordinate and promote involvement of stakeholders in all aspects of DWCP (e.g. steering, implementation, resource mobilization, and monitoring and evaluation).

4. The ILO should make additional efforts to promote gender equality and non-discrimination.

5. The ILO should provide nuanced technical assistance focused on both substance and process.

6. The ILO should update the SADC DWP to respond more effectively to present conditions and challenges, both at the regional level and the level of the SADC member States.
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