i-eval THINK Piece, No. 2

National Evaluation Systems

Engaging ILO Social Partners

Mr. Tim Dyce

National Evaluation Systems

Engaging ILO Social Partners

Tim Dyce

International Consultant

Prepared for the Evaluation Unit of the International Labour Organization

ABBREVIATIONS

CSO	Civil Society Organization
CTA	Chief Technical Adviser
DCWP	Decent Work Country Programme
DfID	Department for International Development (UK)
ECD	Evaluation Capacity Development
ES	Evaluation System
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IFI	International Finance Institution
ILO	International Labour Organization
IOCE	International Organization for Co-operation in Evaluation
M & E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MfDR	Management for Development Results
NES	National Evaluation System
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Aid and Development
OECD-DAC	Organization for Co-operation and Development -- Development Assistance Committee
RBM	Results-based Management
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNAIDS	Joint United Nations Programme on HIV / AIDS
WHO	World Health Organization

CONTENTS

PURPOSE OF STUDY

The study aimed to contribute to a greater understanding of how national evaluation systems (NES) can assist governments of developing countries to better manage for results when implementing inclusive policies and programmes to lift their people out of poverty.

- In particular it explored the significance and extent of including in these systems national agencies, such as social partners which, while operating outside government systems, can partner with them and with international development agencies.
- An assumption of the study was that evaluations should not be seen as international agencies carrying out evaluations of their own programmes (as valid as that is for accountability to their donor stakeholders), but as helping to build national systems that allow countries to evaluate their own work and "own" their own development.
- This in turn should be broken down into an objective for both government and non-government actors to better evaluate their own work and so be better equipped to evaluate each other's programmes.
- The International Labour Organization (ILO) has a particular perspective on this issue. Since 1919 it has had a tripartite structure where governments dialogue on labour issues with employers' and workers' representatives. The survey aimed to discover the extent to which different member countries of the ILO were realizing the potential of this structure both to evaluate the results of the development dimension of their work with their own constituents and contribute to the better evaluation of the development work of the nation as a whole.
- At the same time, it sought to understand how other UN agencies worked with their non-government partners to improve their evaluation capacity so as to contribute to their respective national evaluation systems.

METHODOLOGY AND LIMITATIONS

This study should be seen very much as a taster to see whether and how further research needs to be carried out. The preparation of the study encompassed:

1) Preparation by EVAL of an initial concept paper;

2) Sample review by the consultant of the literature as initially selected by EVAL from several key UN agencies and International Financing Institutions (IFIs) on the inclusion of non-government actors in specific NESs;

3) Web-based survey (designed by EVAL using Survey Monkey and collated by the consultant), of ILO experience in five countries (comprising ILO Country offices and social partners) and six UN agencies (FAO, UNDP, UNICEF UNESCO, UN-Women, and WHO-UNAIDS). On the basis of available literature, EVAL selected one country each from the five ILO regions: India (Asia-Pacific), South Africa (Africa), Mexico (the Americas), Jordan (the Arab World), and Albania (Eastern Europe);

4) Interviews by the consultant with Geneva-based ILO experts, ITC Turin training experts, ILO Country Directors and Specialists, and a small number of evaluation experts in international agencies.

The limited level of participation in the survey and the limited focus and detail in the case studies meant it was difficult to make comprehensive comparisons.

These limitations indicate the difficulty of collecting data on this aspect of ECD, including the appropriateness of web-based technology, the discourse in which this issue is expressed and the challenges of "marketing" such a study to the agencies that can best contribute to it.

LESSONS LEARNED FROM PREVIOUS UN AGENCY AND IFI ANALYSIS

Good evaluation systems tend to develop along with the overall maturity of governance systems, and in particular an environment of accountability. This is as true of a business as of a government and, as ILO Employers' specialists pointed out, much of the skills component of capacity evaluation was already part of the strategic management skills provided to employers' organizations. Here, as elsewhere in the study, it was seen that ECD is often being done but under a different name.

Significant summaries of lessons learned on building NES already exist in publications of the evaluation units of pioneer ECD agencies: UNDP, UNICEF, World Bank, regional IFIs, and of coordinating agencies such as the OECD. However, these have largely focussed on

building evaluation capacities in government systems. Nonetheless, some key lessons drawn are:

Build on what is already there. Even in the most underdeveloped government structure there is a rudimentary M&E system as for example in an audit office.

Identify key players: These could be an agency (e.g. Treasury or National Planning Council), a political champion (influential Minister, or Reserve Bank Governor, etc.) or a cadre of managers within the lead agency and necessary partner agencies.

Make change attractive -- not threatening -- to all levels of personnel.

Ensure ECD is being owned and led locally. Facilitate this ownership by involving local personnel in meaningful roles in externally sourced evaluations.

Develop South nation capacity by facilitating shared evaluations of and by South nations, with other South -- or with a combination of North and South -- nations.

Start evaluation at the beginning, not at the end. Ensure, from the outset of a new policy or programme, the benchmarks and processes for its evaluability are built into and budgeted for, as part of a policy-implementation-evaluation cycle.

- Support local evaluation skill base in evaluator associations or university partnerships.
- Balance provision of evaluation with demand. This is where Civil Society and Market-based partners are important, as well as informed journalists and opinion leaders who understand the role of evaluation and know how to use its outputs.

LESSONS LEARNED FROM CASE STUDY DOCUMENTATION

ALBANIA

Reducing costs, removing corruption and improving efficiency of border trade

- Keep the pace of change slow enough to build consensus among the staff that are required to implement change particularly by providing a flow of information about the beneficial effects of the changes.
- Ensure that co-operation between local management and external support is sustained long enough to consolidate local ownership of the process.

- Involve representatives of the private sector (e.g. demonstrate lower costs or greater efficiency) so that they work to reinforce political commitment to the reform.

INDIA

Initiation of a government performance monitoring and evaluation system

- Each year set out each department's expected results as well as the performance requirements from other departments needed for the originating department to deliver its own results.
- Facilitate a cultural change to ensure staff performance appraisals are not seen as negative threats to status but positive tools for career development.

JORDAN

Developing a monitoring and evaluation culture

- Demand that international agencies move from evaluations largely concerned with their own MfDR systems, to helping Arab countries develop theirs.
- Boost evaluation skills in the Arab world, including training the media in understanding the evaluation process and using its products.

MEXICO

Show politicians how evaluations help them deliver successful economic <u>and</u> social policies

- Recognize that different evaluation methods are needed for different constituencies and different stages of the policy implementation cycle.
- Evaluate social outcomes as well as economic outcomes but with different methods.
- Use informative impact studies to educate legislators in the usefulness of high quality (and, if necessary, high cost) evaluations that help deliver sound law and policy.
- Involve non-government bodies in order to improve diffusion of evaluation reports.
- Ensure that reports to legislators and government managers are concise and readable.

SOUTH AFRICA

A complex government system needs a sophisticated and well-managed M&E system

---

- In a complex multicultural political system, ensure that the M&E system is multi-layered and multi-sectoral.
- Ensure a coherent discourse across the whole M&E system and ensure agreements for each department to get the data it needs.
- Prepare officials for what is coming so that they are less likely to resist change.
- Ensure key information about the achievement of results in implementing government policy is available to universities, NGOs, the media and general public to encourage greater involvement of non-government actors in the evaluation process.
- Ensure the evaluation system has a high prestige champion (e.g. President's Office) and is backed by the authority of legislation, regulation or decree.
- Improve the effectiveness and credibility of government by using the M&E system to give early warnings of bottlenecks -- or dangerous fragility -- in specific areas of the government system.
- Develop sufficient political and managerial maturity in key personnel to deal with politically sensitive and potentially embarrassing information.

LESSONS LEARNED FROM WEB-BASED SURVEY

1) Is there a National Evaluation System (NES)?

Fifty per cent of UN agencies and ILO country offices, and 75 per cent of ILO partners, recognized there was a system in place to monitor and evaluate public sector performance in national development in the country where they worked. Of some concern is that 21 per cent of UN agencies and 25 per cent of ILO country offices were no aware of any NES.

2) Where does the NES get its mandate?

UN agencies surveyed saw the mandate coming from equally a Government executive order and the demands of civil society. ILO offices saw government modernization as the main source of an NES mandate, and civil society and social partners as secondary sources.

3) Which agencies are parts of the NES or accountability framework?

Most UN agencies surveyed saw the demand of CSOs as second only to the Ministry of Planning as the accountability framework to monitor public sector performance. But this did

not translate into building evaluation capacity in CSOs. Nor do UN agencies see workers' and (but marginally less so), employers' - organizations playing as significant a part in an NES as other CSOs.

4) Is Evaluation Capacity Development (ECD) being carried out in the NES?

Other UN agencies were more aware than ILO country offices whether national ECD was being carried out, which may mean that ILO is not as close to national evaluation systems as it could be. However, the majority of ILO country offices felt that national evaluation capacity development should be the norm for ILO country programme activities, while a minority believed it should be included only when requested by social partners.

5) What kind of ECD is being carried out?

ILO country office priorities were to measure progress towards achieving DWCP goals and achieve consensus among the social partners for these goals. The offices also provided a range of capacity building activities to the social partners.

UN agencies had broader concerns, with priority given to improving national performance data collection, strengthening evaluation capacity and, in particular, evaluation training to the national ministries.

UN agencies gave relatively low priority to building evaluation capacity in CSOs in general and even lower for ILO's social partners. In policy design, UN agencies saw public sector accountability as a high priority, though involving CSOs in monitoring public sector performance was also a relatively high priority.

6) How do the evaluation systems of UN agencies harmonize with the NES?

In this survey the ILO's DWCP still seems something of a stand-alone system not completely aligned to the United Nations Development Framework (UNDAF) or the NES. The UNDAF itself was only moderately aligned to the NES.

7) What are the challenges still ahead for ECD?

UN agencies saw the main challenges as: lack of an evaluation culture, lack of resources and insufficient public sector accountability with other challenges including RBM skills and technology and lack of political will. ILO country offices saw the main challenges being RBM knowledge and technology, though lack of evaluation culture, political will, and adequate

human resources were also important. ILO Partners saw human resources as the main challenge to ECD, followed by public sector accountability, access to information, participation, financial resources, and lack of evaluation culture.

8) *How do ILO partners assess their own evaluation capacity and results-based management?*

The ILO partners saw their M&E systems as moderately effective in serving RBM and a quarter saw them as highly effective. Reporting to their members on the success of their activities in achieving outcomes is clearly the most rudimentary form of evaluation carried out by ILO partners and most believed they did this effectively. They reported externally mostly to the Ministry of Labour. But none sent their reports to the Ministry of Planning. Only 40% also sent these reports to their members. None sent them to the media. They also reported to the ILO and other international agencies mostly annually.

9) *How do UN agencies and ILO offices assess the ECD inputs they provide?*

UN agencies think they are doing a moderately effective job in capacity building. ILO country offices think they are not using all their capacity to build capacity effectively in themselves and in their partners. They averaged a low impact in most categories of support.

10) *How do ILO partners assess the ECD inputs they have received?*

ILO's close relationship with its constituent partners is shown in the priority they give to ILO as a source of support (which the partners rate between highly and moderately effective in most inputs).

ILO's partners also acknowledge support from other international agencies including IFIs Significantly they acknowledge support from local evaluator associations.

11) *How do ILO country offices assess the evaluation capacity of ILO constituents and of the national evaluation system?*

ILO offices' evaluation of Workers and Employers are almost level pegging in evaluation effectiveness as seen by ILO Offices, though Government is seen as more effective.

12) *How sustainable is the Monitoring and Evaluation capacity in place so far?*

ECD inputs delivered so far by the ILO and other agencies to its constituent partners to contribute to their sustainable capacity to carry out evaluation activities were judged by the

partners to be at a high level (100%), though this was slightly undermined by the lower judgement (25%) of their capacity to generate their own funds for these activities (either from their own organizations or from the national budget), and by the average judgement (50%) that there was an adequate exit strategy for this external assistance.

The ILO partners also judged (75%) that the capacity they had received would ensure that they could participate in the NES, though ILO Country offices (12.5%) did not have the same confidence at least for the social partners. Nor were they confident that the social partners could hold the public sector accountable for results. Of concern also was that only 12.5% of ILO country offices had articulated an exit strategy for their ECD inputs to social partners, and 75% said they didn't know whether they had, or said the question was not applicable.

UN agencies judged that they had reinforced evaluation capacity particularly in RBM and in data gathering and analysis; but less capacity in evaluation methods and evaluation management skills. They were moderately confident (42.9%) that their inputs had created a pool of qualified human resources for the NES and less confident (35.7%) that civil society could continue evaluation and public sector accountability activities after support ended. Only 21.4% had articulated an exit strategy for their support.

CONCLUSIONS

1. NATIONAL EVALUATION SYSTEMS

While UN agencies are helping put a National Evaluation System in place in many developing countries, the concept of a "system" may not yet be fully understood or accepted particularly by Civil Society Organizations.

Evaluation systems borrowed from the modern democratic systems of developed countries are not always immediately replicable in countries whose governance institutions are still maturing. National evaluation systems often started as audits of government financial management systems but are now moving to include non-government agencies and social objectives. The relevance of both public and private sector evaluation models from developed countries needs to be attuned to the absorption capacity of the developing country.

Access to evaluations of public policies should be seen as a right not a privilege for citizens.

ILO's Decent Work Country Programmes are being increasingly integrated with the respective country United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAF) and help facilitate linkages with, and between, the Ministry of Labour and other government ministries.

2. INCLUSION OF CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS (CSOS)

CSOs can provide a more active channel of data about the needs of the ultimate beneficiaries of government services than formal requests (through procedures such as form filling), complaints (through whatever complaint procedures are in place), or by personal representation to members of the legislature (where these are feasible).

The Busan process has given emphasis to building networks of local evaluation experts. Local demand for quality evaluation will grow when such evaluations are seen as highly useful for both governments and civil society to monitor their country's development and so motivate allocation of appropriate resources. Civil Society's access to evaluation information is slowly increasing, but CSOs should be active not just passive recipients of information.

CSOs will be better able to provide persuasive data to their governments if they practice results-based management themselves.

The cultural caution of many bureaucracies, to release information that can be used "against" them, should be acknowledged and addressed strategically.

3. MANAGING EVALUATION PARTNERSHIPS

Too many UN agencies see the purpose of partnerships with local agencies as carrying out the UN agency's activities rather than increasing the evaluation capacity and usefulness of the local partners to their governments by involving them in joint evaluation work or programme design.

4. ILO AND ITS SOCIAL PARTNERS

ILO has increased the relevance of its DWCPs to national results frameworks.

ILO carries out a range of strategic management training for its constituent employers' and workers' organizations. The ILO International Training Centre (ILO-ITC) in Turin offers courses for employers' organizations among others.

However, if social partners are to be included in evaluation systems their motivation for doing so will arise from the felt needs of the partners' membership.

Some ILO models are proving successful, for example: with ILO Employment and Trade Union specialists providing resource inputs, such as training, in stages --- with delivery of further support dependent on quality reporting on the results of earlier inputs. DCWPs are already developed as a comprehensive but sectoral national evaluation system involving government and non-government constituents.

The DWCP process could further enable the social partners in their respective dialogues with parliamentarians, government departments and the media by contributing readable information and policy positions that are seen to be of real benefit to these actors.

5. THE CAPACITY TO RECEIVE CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

For national evaluation systems to fulfil the civil society inclusion aims of the Busan conference while ensuring international evaluation standards will require a massive effort to build capacity within CSO partners.

To do so, there needs to be a basis of capacity and motivation on the part of the CSOs to answer their own evaluation needs, supported by UN agencies and donors.

ILO could expand twinning arrangements with other social partners or other local agencies with management expertise, and within South-South or South-North / tripartite partnerships.

6. CULTURE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The logic of some local cultures may be that protecting the dignity of senior persons is more important to political stability and social order, than the frank disclosure of mistakes.

Traditional systems however are likely to have their own more subtle forms of accountability and UN interventions should work with national stakeholders to strengthen these with skills and approaches borrowed from other systems. Local cultural attitudes may also become compounded by the corporate culture (e.g. of secrecy and caution) of their government systems.

7. LANGUAGE OF EVALUATION AS INCLUSIVE RATHER THAN EXCLUSIVE

Feedback to the study was that the language of evaluation is overly abstract and technical. ILO is constitutionally structured to include business people and workers that operate in more practical worlds and often use language in different ways from that of high bureaucracy or academia.

There has been progress in shaping standard discourse among evaluation experts. However overlapping concepts such as Aid Effectiveness, Results Based Management, and Evaluation Capacity Development still need to be synthesized and simplified. ILO experts need to have scientific depth but be able to share their expertise in ways accessible to "lay" publics.

Evaluation capacity is already seen as a subset of management capacity and should be part of any strategic management training. If an organization cannot evaluate its policies and activities after management training, the training hasn't worked.

8. EVALUATION: SUPPLY AND DEMAND

Better analysis of the demand identification tools that led to the capacity development initiative may assist in better impact of the training: for example managers of both training and evaluation need to ask: Is the training being delivered to the right beneficiaries and are the mechanics of the training (timing, location, technology, language1) fit for purpose.

9. THE MEDIA AS PARTNER IN RESULTS-BASED MANAGEMENT

In discussions around the inclusion of CSOs, the emphasis is still largely on supply rather than demand; yet capacity building for CSOs, including ILO's social partners, is intimately connected with capacity building for the media.

If journalists do not have access to -- or cannot interpret the significance of – evaluation outputs, then civil society cannot properly exercise its leverage of informed scrutiny on government nor often can beneficiaries understand the full scope of what is being done ostensibly for their benefit.

---

[1] Is the formatting of the training appropriate? (Power point presentations are not always useful still less truncated printouts as a replacement for proper manuals). Are they being presented in the beneficiaries' first language or if not is there the chance during the training for them to discuss it in that language?

10. MANAGING ECD FOR RESULTS

ECD itself needs to be evaluated against results. Activities and outputs have traditionally been easier to assess but many of the objectives of ILO programmes are likely to be measured in decades not years. Funding and reporting cycles to donors usually don't allow that length of time.

There is a need to build in more long-term impact studies and tracer studies and to become smarter in interpreting the early warning signs of both ultimate success and failure.

The log frame approach is a good introduction to evaluation and strategic thinking but local development often does not follow a linear progression and greater flexibility is often needed.

Evaluation of ILO training needs to place less emphasis on customer satisfaction surveys at the end of a course and more on mandatory six-month-after impact reports from trainees.

SUGGESTIONS FOR ENGAGING SOCIAL PARTNERS IN NES

1. NATIONAL EVALUATION SYSTEMS

ILO should continue to work with UN partners at country level to integrate DWCPs with UNDAF priorities, and identify clearly both the existing foundations for a national evaluation system (e.g. audit offices) and the "fit" and pacing of imports from more mature evaluation systems.

2. INCLUSION OF CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS

ILO should encourage constituent partners report to their members in ways that are frequent, informative and useful. ILO should encourage constituent partners report to each other in ways that encourage the clear communication of quality information directly relevant to local needs.

The larger UN Community is encouraged to maximize both passive (information) and active (advocacy) exchange between CSOs and their governments.

Donors should ensure involvement of CSOs, where relevant, in projects and programmes that they fund.

3. MANAGING EVALUATION PARTNERSHIPS

The larger UN Community is encouraged to maximize study and improvement of how its member agencies build, manage, and learn from the partnerships they form with CSOs in developing countries.

4. ILO AND ITS SOCIAL PARTNERS

The ILO should continue to develop its Decent Work Country Programmes as high quality components of evolving national evaluation systems in ILO member countries. ILO should become sharper at evaluating which ECD inputs, and methods of delivery, produce good results and greater ownership, and which do not.

Through the DWCP ILO should build capacity for employment policy and implementation management in its counterpart national ministries so that they can provide valued data to key economic, social and planning ministries in their national governments.

ILO social partners should practice advocacy for their members in ways which provide useful data to their governments and create demand for quality evaluations by government of its policies and activities that affect the social partners' constituents.

5. THE CAPACITY TO RECEIVE CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

ILO should ensure that the inputs it provides to its social partners are attuned to the latters' felt priorities while continuing to support and challenge the partners to reach international best practice. It should continue to develop their commitment to Results Based Management capacity through the incentives of increased support and international recognition as well as the discipline of quality reporting on the successful use of this support.

Donor funding should be made conditional on two sets of quality reports (for which funding is provided): a) to the CSO's constituents (in forms relevant to them) on the activities carried out for their benefit and b) to the donors or implementing agencies on their results.

6. CULTURE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The larger UN Community is encouraged to support the development of a culture of information-based decision-making in governments, with respect for local inherited attitudes to accountability, balanced by contemporary results-based management skills.

7. EVALUATION LANGUAGE: INCLUSIVE RATHER THAN EXCLUSIVE

ILO should ensure that evaluation capacity building communicates evaluation concepts and practices with technical depth but consumer-friendly expression.

The larger UN Community is encouraged to ensure that there is an international consensus on all remaining aspects of technical evaluation discourse (where there is not yet consensus), and that it is adequately communicated (and "translated" as necessary) to national governments and CSOs2.

8. EVALUATION SUPPLY AND DEMAND

The larger UN Community should encourage its member agencies to ensure that capacity building is accurately demand-driven (without diminishing awareness of issues, such as gender parity, that may be a local need but not currently a priority demand). There should also be more precise identification of capacity deficits and their verification or revision as result of impact assessment of the capacity building tools selected.

9. THE MEDIA AS PARTNER IN RESULTS-BASED MANAGEMENT

ILO should ensure that the needs and the achievements of DWCPs and other ILO initiatives are effectively communicated to journalists and opinion formers in both recipient and donor countries and that the usefulness of this information is itself evaluated.

10. MANAGING ECD FOR RESULTS

ILO-ITC Turin and, likewise, ILO Country offices, should ensure that all capacity training (including evaluation capacity) is followed by adequate six-month reports and further tracer studies on the impact of training.

Where possible some financial incentives (e.g. final reimbursement of expenses) should be made conditional on reports of a relevant standard being provided.

---

[2] A UNEG task-force on National Evaluation Capacity Development co-chaired by ILO and UNICEF is in the process of completing practical tips on the subject matter.

TERMINOLOGY[3]

SPECIFIC TO THE ILO

Social Partners are the two non-Government organizations representing workers or employers. The focus of this study has been on these two agencies and how they are currently involved in national evaluation systems. Other UN agencies do not use these terms with the same technical meaning, while Employers' Organizations and Trade Unions, are generally not mentioned in the UN system outside of ILO material.

ILO Constituents or ***Constituent Partners*** are the two Social Partners plus the government partner: usually the Ministry of Labour.

SPECIFIC TO THE UN SYSTEM

Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) "include all non-market and non-state organizations, outside of the family, in which people organize themselves to pursue shared interests in the public domain. Examples include community-based organizations and village associations, environmental groups, women's rights groups, farmers' associations, faith-based organizations, labour unions, co-operatives, professional associations, chambers of commerce, independent research institutes and the not-for-profit media." This is the working definition[4] used currently by the OECD[5].

---

[3] The definitions here are based on a number of sources though priority reliance has been on OECD-DAC and ILO. The main glossary is that prepared by OECD DAC in 2002 though there are minor differences with other sources such as the World Bank, UNICEF and the EU. Attempts at simplification are the consultant's own.

[4] The Advisory Group on Civil Society and Aid Effectiveness a body of the OECD-DAC

[5] OECD-DAC http://www.oecd.org/document/42/0,3746,en

Capacity is "The ability of people, organizations and society as a whole to manage their affairs successfully[6]." ***Capacity Development*** (now tending to replace "capacity building") is a "long-term continual process of development that involves all stakeholders; including ministries, local authorities, non-governmental organizations, professionals, community members, academics and more"[7].

Decent Work Country Programme is the main vehicle for delivery of ILO support to countries: 1) promoting decent work as a key to national development: 2) delivering ILO expertise to the tripartite constituents within a defined national plan[8].

Evaluation: "the systematic and objective assessment of a development project, programme or policy, its implementation and results"[9]. ***Evaluation Capacity Development (ECD)*** A simple definition is the "ability of organizations over time to assess the actual against the intended impact of their development policies and programmes"[10].

Monitoring is the process carried out during the lifetime of a programme that checks whether the activities are on track against timetable, budget, and reasonably predictable effectiveness [Monitoring's difference from Evaluation is likened to a medical check-up compared to an autopsy. In fact, evaluations can be initiated at any stage to check that the design and progress in activities are showing the "signs of life" necessary to achieve the intended outcomes.]

NGOs are a major component of Civil Society, though are generally seen as non-profit socially-oriented organizations distinct from both the institutions of the State and the commercial organizations of the Market. ILO's social partners are organizations of both

---

[6] http://oe.cd/ecd

[7] http://www.un.org/esa/cdo/

[8] http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/program/dwcp/index.htm

[9] OECD 2002, Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results based management

[10] The OECD defines ECD as "a **process whereby people, organisations and society as a whole unleash, strengthen, create, adapt and maintain evaluation capacity over time". "Unleash" seems a bit dramatic.**

the Market and Civil Society, and its tripartite structure builds a partnership of State and Market.

South-South Co-operation Originally conceived as a system of economic and political co-operation by less developed countries in South America and Africa, the term is increasingly used to include less developed countries wherever they are. As such, it is a de-stigmatised description of countries sometimes defined as "poor" "underdeveloped" or "less developed".

Triangular Cooperation is cooperation between at least one traditional donor and/or international organization, one provider (from South or North) and one recipient (usually a South) partner combining North technical expertise with South peer experience and expertise.