



Evaluation Summaries

Evaluation: Workers Education Programme on Social Dialogue and Youth Employment

Quick Facts

Countries: Armenia, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Haiti, India, Niger, Palestine, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Indonesia, Nepal and Uganda

Final Evaluation: October 2007

Mode of Evaluation: Independent

Technical Area: Social Dialogue

Evaluation Management: Bureau for Workers' Activities (ACTRAV)

Evaluation Team: Robert Salomon, Helge Løvdal, Else-Marie Osmundsen

Project Start: January 2004

Project End: September 2007

Project Code: INT/04/M09/NOR and INT/06/54/NOR

Donor: Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Norway)
US\$ 2.436.306

Keywords: Social Dialogue, Youth Employment, Worker's Education

Background & Context

Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure

This evaluation deals with two phases of the ILO-Norway Framework Agreement. Phase one: "Workers Education Programme on Social Dialogue" - was operational in 2004/05 in Armenia, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Haiti, India, Niger, Palestine, Vietnam, Yemen and Zambia.

Phase two: "Social Dialogue and Youth Employment" - started in 2006 and is still ongoing September 2007. This programme covers the following countries in Asia: Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Nepal, Vietnam; and Uganda in Africa

The main objectives of the first phase of the Programme (2004 – 2005) were:

- Develop a rights-based approach to sustainable development and poverty alleviation with a specific emphasis on the ILO Declaration on fundamental principles and rights at work promoted.
- Decent work deficits prevailing in the informal economy identified and activities aimed at alleviating them initiated.
- Trade unions in project countries have formulated policies and strategies for dealing with the concerns of vulnerable groups of workers.
- Focus on Corporate Social Responsibility, Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers and HIV/AIDS.

In the second phase of the Programme (2006 – 2007), the purpose was to continue the previous work, but with a shift of focus to following objectives:

- Workers' and employers' organizations influence policies related to decent work and employment in Programme countries in general and to youth employment in particular.
- To create bipartite, permanent or ad hoc forums where worker and employer representatives can exchange views on decent work and youth employment policies, seek compromises and prepare for tripartite discussions.

In brief, the programme was to 1) contribute to strengthening workers' organizations and their influence on national policies relevant to decent work through enhanced industrial relations and social dialogue, and 2) to enable workers' organizations to contribute to job creation and poverty alleviation through the implementation of

practical measures and initiatives aimed at bringing young men and women into decent work where their rights are protected.

Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the validity of the overall strategy and approach to programming funds sponsored by the Norwegian Government, to assess the processes of planning and implementation, as well as to obtain a better understanding of the impact and the results of the programme of assistance and the lessons learned during the transition process of project to programme design.

Methodology of evaluation

The evaluation consisted of a review of the background material and field visits to New Delhi and Chennai in India and Phnom Penh and Siem Reap in Cambodia. During these missions, interviews were conducted with the key officials in the workers' organizations as well as with ILO officials in the Sub-Regional Offices and other relevant stakeholders.

Main Findings & Conclusions

- The main objectives of the Programme were to promote social dialogue and youth employment.
- Many of the activities of the first phase were a continuation of ongoing activities of Danish sponsored projects on "Workers' Education", and the Norwegian sponsored Programme continued the approach of the Danish projects.
- The Policy Document reflecting the Agreements with the Donor does not correspond entirely with the Project Country Documents. The activities that have taken place according to these documents have been partly well implemented. However, the focus on social dialogue is lacking, and the Programme activities were terminated after one year of operation in many of the countries involved.
- There are different opinions within the ILO on what is meant by social dialogue in operational terms. Some argue that all types of support to unions will empower them and enable them to take part in social dialogues, while the view of the Norwegian Donor is that social dialogue is a joint learning exercise among two or the three social partners where the partners seek solutions on issues of common interest.
- Diverged opinions on the social dialogue approach, created confusion and some tensions among the ILO staff responsible for implementation of the Programme. Three different Chief Technical Advisers (CTAs), some of them with different opinions on how to run the Programme, have been involved. After clear signals from the Donor, the present CTA changed the approach from basic trade union training to activities establishing social dialogue forums and processes.
- The shift of CTAs and also late release of funds from the Donor and the IRIS system in the ILO delayed the implementation of the Programme and caused difficulties for the recipients and the project staff.
- The achievements of the Programme vary a lot. It is unclear why some of the countries taking part in the Programme were selected in the first place. In eight of the eleven countries taking part in the Programme, the projects were terminated at the end of the first phase. The selection of countries for the second phase was based on compromises between the interests of ACT/EMP and ACTRAV.
- So far the move towards a social dialogue approach has been most successful in India and Cambodia probably due to the presence of Project Offices and National Project Coordinators in these countries and their efforts over years. Previous workshops on child labour in Tamil Nadu, Vietnam and Nepal have demonstrated how different unions can work together towards common goals. This learning experience seems to have increased the knowledge and interest of social dialogue to the benefit of the implementation of the present Programme.
- The rural women project was really empowering the beneficiaries. Participation in training courses were dominated by men, but also women took part in the courses. There are relatively good records on the ratio of men and women among participants in training courses. There are also some signs that women are taking active part in the work of the unions, but there is still a long way to go to ensure a broader participation of women in the union leadership.
- According to the budgets almost 50 % of the funds were planned for administration while the other 50 % was planned for project activities. The Evaluators consider the

administration costs as too high and also question the high expenditure of equipment at local offices.

- During the four years of the Programme, bi partite activities were carried out at local level. Some training took place at state level and national level. But there have been limited tripartite consultations at national level.
- Going through the total Programme portfolio the collaboration and coordination of activities with international trade unions and other national development projects was quite limited.
- It is too early to assess whether the achievements in the Programme are sustainable. But it is a potential for developing the achievements further in India, Cambodia, Nepal and Uganda, possibly also in some of the other countries.

Recommendations & Lessons Learned

Main recommendations and follow-up

1. The Evaluation Team recommends that the Programme continues for an additional period, but the focus on social dialogue has to be defined and highlighted more clearly than in the present Programme.
2. Since social dialogue is a methodological approach, future programmes should not be linked to any particular subject. Subjects for social dialogue should rather be identified by the parties in the field since interests and priorities vary from country to country and within the countries. Topics for social dialogue could be youth employment, child labour, HIV/AIDS, gender issues, productivity, skills training, environment, and so on.
3. It may be a good strategy to develop further coordination and cooperation with relevant international organizations to assist in development and implementation of social dialogue.
4. The implementation period of two years for these type of programmes is too short, and the Donor and the ILO should jointly see if it is possible to enter into three or four year agreement. Both the Donor and the ILO should ensure that the allocated funds are released so early that it is possible for the implementation to follow the planned operational period.
5. If this strategy is to be followed, it would be necessary to continue the collaboration between ACTRAV and ACT/EMP in

identifying countries and subjects where the social partners have sufficient skills and experience to succeed in social dialogue. In planning of a possible new phase of the Programme on social dialogue, ACTRAV and ACT/EMP should have a joint search for countries and stakeholders in order to identify their real needs. It is essential that The Workers' and Employers' Activities Specialists have a real influence in these processes.

6. If the Social Dialogue Programme continues it will be reasonable to include the child labour component into the Social Dialogue Programme when appropriate. Close cooperation with the ILO's International Programme for the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) will be crucial in order to strengthen trade union participation in the work of IPEC.
7. There is strong need for strengthening participation of women in union leadership. Therefore, special union leadership programmes should be developed in cooperation with trade unions and Gender Department in ILO.
8. The administration costs for the Programme are too high and the management of the Programme seems to be overstaffed. ACTRAV should prepare a plan in order to slim the programme administration and reduce costs. In preparation for such a plan, the need for local resource persons should be taken into consideration.