

IMEC Statement
ILO programme implementation 2018-2019
GB/340/PFA/5

1. IMEC thanks the Office for the timely publication of the document and appreciates the hard work of those who contributed to the success of this programme during the implementation phase.
2. As ever, IMEC has taken a strong interest in the program implementation report. We welcome the detailed information on the outcomes, cross-cutting drivers and enabling outcomes, and appreciate in particular the higher level conclusions on the contribution of the ILO's work to the decent work agenda and the SDGs.
3. An extensive review of results by policy outcome leads to the observation that most, if not all, results presented seem to be at output level. Referring to policy outcome 1 as an example, 'more and better jobs for inclusive growth and improved youth employment prospects', the results presented are plans, strategies, policies, programmes and measures. Important as they may be, the real results should be measured at outcome level by how many 'more and better jobs' and 'improved youth employment prospects' resulted from the outputs (plans and programmes) and that were implemented.
4. In this respect, we welcome the acknowledgement made during pre-GB consultations that the implementation report does not demonstrate real world outcomes and impacts to the extent the Office would have liked. And we appreciate that work to improve the organisation's results based management continues. We look forward to seeing the fruits of this labour when we come to evaluate the implementation reports of the next biennia.
5. Regarding the cross-cutting policy drivers, we note with concern that almost half of the results on decent work had only a limited contribution to gender equality and non-discrimination. We note with even more concern that 93% of the results had no or only a limited contribution to the cross cutting policy driver on environmental sustainability. Although presented as significant progress compared to the previous reporting period (2016-17), we assume that this is an area of serious concern for the Office and one that will receive careful attention.
6. IMEC appreciates the information given in the chapter regarding lessons learned. We welcome the recognition that the ILO's development cooperation portfolio should be better aligned with the planned outcomes of the programme and budget, and the need for better integration of voluntary funding with the regular budget. We also agree that resource mobilisation efforts with respect to the generation of additional voluntary contributions (both earmarked as well as un-earmarked) to enable ILO to achieve even more (and better) results on the Decent Work agenda needs to be stepped up.

7. On a related note, IMEC appreciates the detailed information regarding budget, expenditures, and source of income. We would be interested in knowing if the data include any One UN funding or resources obtained through competitive bidding.
8. IMEC urges the Office to review and re-evaluate the reasons for the underperformance reported and to take measures to offset or to correct them. We note, for example, quite substantial gaps in policy outcome 5 - decent work in the rural economy and regionally in Africa. What, if any, are the lessons to be learned from this underperformance and what measures are being taken to improve results?
9. Recognising the importance of the ILO's role with respect to the response to the COVID crisis, it is ever more true that, as noted in the report, 'in order to advance decent work programmes, effective linkages and synergies need to be created that go beyond the usual government, labour and employment constituents only.' In addition to continuing and enhancing its cooperation with other UN, international and regional entities such as OECD, G20, G7, BRICs, we would like to see much greater institutional cooperation between the IFIs (particularly the World Bank) and the ILO.