



# ILO EVALUATION

- **Evaluation Title:** P&B Outcome 17 (Discrimination in employment and occupation is eliminated)
  - **ILO TC/SYMBOL:** GLO/12/52/NOR; GLO/14/55/NOR; GLO/14/58/NOR
  - **Type of Evaluation :** Independent evaluation
  - **Country(ies) :** Global – India, China, Mongolia, Senegal, El Salvador, Macedonia, Jordan, Occupied Palestinian Territories, Argentina, Hungary, Thailand, Costa Rica, France, India, Indonesia, Montenegro, South Africa
  - **Date of the evaluation:** August 2017
  - **Name of consultant(s):** Magali Bonne-Moreau
  - **ILO Administrative Office:** WORKQUALITY
  - **ILO Technical Backstopping Office:** GED
  - **Date project ends:** December 2015
  - **Donor: country and budget US\$** SIDA, Norway, USD 2'767'309
  - **Evaluation Manager:** Natanael Lopes/Naomi Asukai (for new process)
  - **Key Words:** Gender equality, women's empowerment, discrimination

This evaluation has been conducted according to ILO's evaluation policies and procedures. It has not been professionally edited, but has undergone quality control by the ILO Evaluation Office

## Table of Contents

Acronyms .....	4
Executive Summary .....	5
Introduction .....	5
Evaluation background .....	5
Evaluation methodology .....	5
Evaluation limitations .....	6
Main findings and conclusions.....	6
Lessons learned.....	8
Emerging good practices.....	8
Recommendations .....	8
Introduction and background .....	10
Evaluation background .....	14
Methodology.....	14
Evaluation limitations .....	15
Main findings from Evaluation questions .....	16
Relevance and strategic fit.....	16
Coherence .....	20
Programme progress and effectiveness .....	22
Efficiency .....	24
Impact and Sustainability.....	27
Status of previous recommendations and progress made .....	32
Conclusions .....	41
Lessons learned.....	42
Emerging good practice .....	43
Recommendations .....	44
Annex I: Lessons Learned.....	46
Annex II Emerging Good Practices .....	52
Annex III: Inception Report .....	55
Annex IV Terms of Reference (initial and final) .....	62
Annex V: List of persons interviewed .....	83
Annex VI: List of documents consulted.....	84

## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

### List of Tables and Boxes

Table 1. Budget per Donor and Programme (USD) – based on data provided in the Final Reports to the Donors (2015) .....	13
Table 2. Management response to Recommendations from the previous evaluation of Outcome 17 (2012-13).....	32
Box 1. Synergies between Outcome 17 and other Outcomes.....	21
Box 2. PRIDE Outcomes and Outputs .....	22
Box 3. Selected PRIDE achievements.....	24
Box 4. Selected BASIC achievements according to the Consolidated Country Result Tables for Outcome 17, 2014-2015 .....	26
Box 5. Selected BASIC outputs (not included in the Consolidated Country Result Tables for Outcome 17, 2014-2015).....	27
Box 6. PRIDE-related achievements in Costa Rica in the context of LGBTI rights since 2016 .....	29
Box 7. Example of a sustainable intervention in El Salvador .....	30

## Acronyms

ACI	Area of Critical Importance
ACT/EMP	Bureau for ' Activities
ACTRAV	Bureau for Workers' Activities
BASIC	'Promoting Gender Equality in the World of Work' Project
BUD/CT	Technical Cooperation Budget Unit, Finance
CEACR	Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations
CPO	Country Programme Outcome
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
EVAL	Evaluation Office
GED	Gender, Equality and Diversity Branch
HQ	ILO Headquarters
HRD	Human Resources Department
ILO	International Labour Organization
INWORK	Inclusive Labour Markets, Labour Relations and Working Conditions Branch
IRIS	Integrated Resource and Information System
LABADMIN/OSH	Labour Administration, Labour Inspection and Occupational Safety and Health Branch
LGBTI	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transexual, Intersex
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MULTILATERALS	Multilateral Cooperation Department
OC	Outcome Coordinators
P&B	Programme and Budget
PARDEV	Partnerships and Field Support Department
PA	Partnership Agreement
PRIDE	"Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation: Promoting Rights, Diversity and Equality in the World of Work" Project
PROGRAMME	Strategic Programming and Management Department
RBM	Results-based Management
RBSA	Regular Budget Supplementary Account
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SOGI	Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity
SPF	Strategic Policy Framework
TC	Technical Cooperation

## Executive Summary

### Introduction

This evaluation focuses on gender-related components of the ILO Partnership Agreements (PA) with the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida), as implemented by the Gender, Equality and Diversity Branch (GED). These components were in support of Outcome 17 of the ILO's Programme and Budget for 2014-15: "Discrimination in employment and occupation is eliminated". In particular, it examines the gender mainstreaming components funded by each country, as well as two addendums to the Norwegian PA: the BASIC project, and the PRIDE project<sup>1</sup>. These build on earlier work carried out under both Partnership Agreements.

### Evaluation background

The purpose of the evaluation will be to assess the implementation process and the key achievements of the Outcome 17 Components of the Sida and Norway PAs as per their frameworks. This report reflects the findings from the evaluation on whether these components have achieved their stated objectives, produced the desired outputs, and the extent to which the outcomes have been achieved. It also aims to highlight emerging good practices, possible lessons learned, and recommendations. Finally, it assesses the extent to which the recommendations from the previous Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014) have been addressed, and provides information on the contribution of Sweden and Norway funds towards the achievement of Outcome 17.

The evaluation findings are destined primarily to the donors, Norway and Sweden, the ILO as executor of the projects, project management and staff, and tripartite constituents.

### Evaluation methodology

This final independent evaluation was conducted through a range of data collection methods, including a **review of the incomplete Draft Evaluation Report** (see Chapter Evaluation limitations), a **desk review** of relevant project documents, products, and other documents related to Outcome 17, as provided by EVAL, GED and other key persons; a **review and assessment of the Management Responses to the Recommendations** from the previous Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2012-13); and **semi-structured interviews** with key ILO personnel and other actors involved in the initiatives.

The evaluation framework was guided by the key questions identified in the TOR<sup>2</sup>. All aspects of this evaluation were guided by the ILO evaluation policy which adheres to the OECD/DAC Principles and the UNEG norms and standards, and ethical safeguards were followed.

---

<sup>1</sup> As specified in the TOR, the Pride project will be reviewed for a longer period, from January 2012 to December 2015

<sup>2</sup> See Annex 3

### Evaluation limitations

The evaluation findings are based on information collected from background documents and interviews with current and past ILO officials and other key persons. The accuracy of the evaluation findings is determined by the integrity of information provided to the evaluator from these sources.

This evaluation had a number of limitations:

First, it is important to note that this evaluation was undertaken to complement existing work undertaken in 2016, in which a different consultant began the process, and conducted fieldwork in different countries (Costa Rica, El Salvador, India, and South Africa), but did not complete the assignment due to extenuating medical reasons. Due to the nature of the draft submitted, the veracity of the information provided was difficult to confirm, with certain key sections completely missing, and an absence of field notes to back up findings.

Very little relevant documentation made available during the initial briefing, and most of the evaluator's subsequent time was spent in identifying, requesting, collecting and collating relevant information. Given the circumstances, it was expected that EVAL, GED, and the other technical units associated with the initiatives examined in this evaluation would readily facilitate access to information and resources so that the process would be as smooth as possible. However, this proved to be a challenging endeavour, despite efforts from EVAL to assist the evaluator.

Another major limitation was that project staff in the key countries were no longer employed by the ILO (as the projects have closed) and were thus not be available to respond to questions or requests for interviews. This was exacerbated by the fact that the CTA responsible for the PAs with Norway and Sida left the ILO at the beginning of this new evaluation process in late 2016. The context and delayed timing of this evaluation also means that there was no scope for stakeholder participation during the second phase of this evaluation, especially with regards to beneficiaries in the project countries. While a questionnaire had been initially discussed as an option to gather evidence, it was not administered.

As such, the evaluation was constrained by the limited information available, and thus only presents partial results, thus limiting the scope of the assessment.

### Main findings and conclusions

- This evaluation has found that the interventions supported by Norway and Sweden to promote gender mainstreaming, as well as the BASIC and PRIDE Projects, were strategically relevant to Outcome 17, and coherent with the wider ILO P&B strategy.
- The flexible approach to gender mainstreaming, based on creating synergies and complementing work from other Outcomes (5, 9, 10, 11, 14, 18, 19) and the Area of Critical Importance (ACI 2) was found to lead to positive results, both in terms of achieving specific outputs in collaboration with constituents, and in sensitizing ILO officials to gender issues.
- Most of the initiatives reviewed in this evaluation built on existing work by the ILO, through funding of previous phases by the donors, and responded to demands from constituents, thus maximizing the potential for success, and allowing for the replication, and up-scaling of certain activities and approaches, including through knowledge-sharing between countries. This was

## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

particularly the case for the BASIC project, as well as certain activities under the Global Product, which furthered work initiated in specific countries.

- Funding from Norway and Sweden led to changes in legislation, policies, and a shift in attitudes of workers, employers, governments and civil society regarding gender equality and discrimination in the workplace, leading to important impacts in the countries and regions involved. While progress may be incremental, these shifts in perspective will help create the base for further change and promote sustainability.
- The PRIDE Project was innovative and highly relevant to the mandate of the ILO, as well as the priorities of the donor and the UN community. It brought the ILO at the forefront of the United Nations organizations with regards to the advancement of Gender rights and non-discrimination in the world of work. Funding PRIDE has also given Norway a positive reputation as being the sole ILO donor focused on rights issues as they relate to these communities. Considering that the monetary outlay for PRIDE programming over the course of Norway's PA was not overly cumbersome, funding future related initiatives provides both the ILO and donor with considerably more positive visibility, at limited cost, while ensuring that the rights of minority communities are respected.
- Related to these efforts, the work done at the ILO internally should also continue. In particular, the recommendations from the PRIDE internal survey should be acted upon by HRD and the Staff Union, in order to foster a culture of inclusiveness within the organization.
- In terms of project management, several shortcomings related to the design, implementation, and monitoring and reporting of the interventions associated with Outcome 17 under the Norway and Sweden PAs, were identified during the evaluation process.
- In the majority of cases, the use of comprehensive workplans linked to the different Outcomes supported (as relevant), logframes and detailed results framework was limited, creating challenges to evaluate the work achieved. The programme documents and reporting documents do not show clear links between the different levels of progression, from the activities, to outputs, to outcomes, and the risks and assumptions were very generic, thus limiting their value.
- Although the donors' requirements regarding monitoring and reporting are limited, the ILO could benefit from having more rigorous and more frequent reporting frameworks in place. The use of annual progress and final reports to the donors and Programme Implementation Reports do not allow for critical and comprehensive analysis of results achieved, nor the identification of opportunities, and challenges. This limits the scope for improvement and discussion around possible synergies.
- Finally, the development of an adequate understanding of gender mainstreaming requires clarity on the related concepts of gender and equality. It seems, however, that there is some confusion regarding these concepts in the ILO, and that the different terminologies used in

## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

the context of the advancement of Gender rights and non-discrimination in the world of work would benefit from clarification at the institutional level.

### Lessons learned

- The use of Outcome-based funding of several Outcomes provides flexibility and potential for synergies and collaborations, thus reducing the silo mentality often present in UN organizations.
- Taking risks and focusing on politically sensitive topics related to the world of work, such as LGBT rights, can increase the ILO's visibility and contribute to the protection of human rights. By partnering with Norway on the PRIDE Project, the ILO positioned itself as a champion of human rights in the context of Decent Work, and contributed to the wider UN effort to integrate SOGI into the human rights and non-discrimination framework. This shows the importance of being open to new and innovative initiatives by ILO departments, even if they may be politically sensitive in some regions.
- More positive and effective outcomes related to gender equality are likely to be achieved in countries that are more progressive on social issues, and this should be taken into account when selecting countries where interventions will take place, in order to maximize potential for success.
- Creating forums in which stakeholders can come together can help to promote gender rights in the workplace

### Emerging good practices

- Using research as an entry point to influence social norms and practices. The PRIDE Project showed that conducting and disseminating research on potentially sensitive issues, could lead to open dialogue around these issues and create an impetus for change.
- The example of the public awareness campaign supported by Outcome 17 in El Salvador could serve as a good model of establishing information sharing systems or mechanisms to more effectively engage the public regarding equality in the world of work, leading to policy change.

### Recommendations

Several recommendations stem from the findings and conclusions of this evaluation:

1. The first two phases of the PRIDE project have laid the groundwork for positive change regarding the rights of LGBT men and women in the workplace. GED and PARDEV should secure new funding to keep the momentum going, so that the ILO remains a champion of human rights in the world of work. Funds could also be sought at the Country Level, with technical assistance from HQ and the Regional Offices, as needed.



## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

2. GED should encourage HRD to follow-up on the PRIDE Internal Survey Recommendations, to allow the ILO to provide a more inclusive work environment for its staff. This could be done with the support of the Staff Union.
3. To facilitate autonomy in the allocation of funds, and lessen the administrative burden on GED staff at headquarters, GED should consistently consider the possibility of further decentralizing funds to regional offices in the case of initiatives promoting gender equality and non-discrimination at the country level, when the local capacity to administer these funds is available.
4. Although gender issues have been addressed to a certain extent in the development of the 2016-17 P&B, more work needs to be done by building on the work done through PRIDE, so that an inclusive approach to gender be taken within the ILO, and operationalized through the P&B. In particular, the understanding of concepts related to gender mainstreaming and equality could be more systematically introduced and clarified at an institutional level through HRD and the International Training Centre courses, with inputs from GED. This should subsequently be fully reflected in the ILO's Programme and policy documents. The current ILO Action Plan for Gender Equality 2016-17 includes indicators on capacity building and training but could go further, by also systematically defining such terms for the users, and considering specific references to challenges faced by LGBT women and men in the workplace.
5. GED should provide more substantive guidance and technical advice to colleagues in the field, in order to fully incorporate gender concerns into their work, and assist them in considering opportunities and challenges associated with specific country-contexts more systematically.
6. Project design and implementation, including monitoring and reporting mechanisms, should be strengthened. While some work has been done to incorporate theories of change and logical frameworks in project and programme documents, systematically defining and describing a clear causal chain in these documents, having baseline information, and identifying specific risks would improve the design and implementation of interventions. This should be included as an institutional requirement in monitoring and reporting – even when this is not required by the donor – so that areas of strengths and weaknesses can be identified, reviewed, and updated, leading to a more critical analysis of the situation and better management of the interventions. As a result, a better RBM approach can be implemented at all levels of the ILO's results frameworks.
7. To support institutional memory, knowledge management, and access to information and avoid to duplication of efforts, the reporting systems at headquarters and in the field, should be reviewed at all levels. To this end, a simple document management system and repository would facilitate this work.
8. The Management Response mechanism to Recommendations from Evaluations should be updated periodically by EVAL, until recurring recommendations (i.e. those which are highlighted repeatedly in the Annual Evaluation Reports) have been addressed.

## Introduction and background

This report documents the main findings and conclusions of an independent final evaluation of the Outcome 17 component of the ILO Partnership Agreements (PA) with the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida) as implemented by the Gender, Equality and Diversity Branch (GED) during the biennium 2014-2015<sup>3</sup>. The evaluation builds upon the previous evaluation of gender mainstreaming activities under the Partnerships<sup>4</sup>.

In 2011, the ILO renewed its partnership agreement with Norway for a four- year period. Phase II (2014-2015) corresponds to the biennium covered by the current evaluation. Meanwhile the ILO renewed its partnership agreement with Sida, with its first phase also covering the biennium 2014-2015. The current evaluation is therefore a Final independent evaluation of the ILO/Norway Partnership Agreement and a Mid-term Independent Evaluation of ILO/SIDA's Partnership Agreement.

The first component concerns work at global and country level on **gender mainstreaming under the Partnership Agreement with Sida** (GLO/14/64/SID) for the period 2014-15, and linked to the Global Product GLO 777. It focused on ensuring that the PA per se was implemented in a gender responsive manner. The focus was on working with one Area of Critical Importance (ACI) and five other Outcomes being supported to ensure that their outputs and activities were implemented in a way that paid attention to the needs of both working women and men.

The second component concerns **gender mainstreaming activities under the Partnership Agreement with Norway** (GLO/14/55/NOR) for the period 2014-15, building on Phase I of the PA (2012-13), and linked to Global Product GLO 777. Similarly to the previous component, it focuses on ensuring that the PA per se was implemented in a gender responsive manner. In this context, gender mainstreaming aims to ensure that women and men benefit equally, and that gender biases and/or existing inequalities are not perpetuated.

Under the Sweden-ILO Partnership Agreement, gender mainstreaming activities took place in El Salvador, the Philippines and Zambia during the biennium 2014-2015; for the Norway-ILO Partnership Agreement gender mainstreaming activities took place in the Arab States, Cambodia, Indonesia, Nepal and South Africa over the same period. These gender mainstreaming activities are supported by decentralized Outcome 17 funding and technically supported by GED, and were already underway in these countries in the previous biennium.

Also under the Norwegian Partnership Agreement are the BASIC project and the PRIDE project, which in addition to the two gender mainstreaming components listed above form the third component of the evaluation.

The BASIC project ('Promoting Gender Equality in the World of Work'), sought to promote gender equality and women's economic empowerment in the world of work as an objective in and of itself. This was the gender-targeted component of the PA, and focused on eight countries where ILO

---

<sup>3</sup> Outcome 17 – Discrimination in Employment and occupation is eliminated. Gender Equality does not have a separate Outcome but is 'housed' under Outcome 17.

<sup>4</sup> Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17: Gender mainstreaming with the support of Sweden and Norway Partnership Agreements (2012-13)

## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

constituents specifically requested assistance on gender equality and non-discrimination issues. There is a broad focus on promoting gender equality and women workers' rights in the world of work through (a) gender sensitive workplace practices, and (b) the legal, policy and institutional framework.

More specifically, it focused on interventions to enable constituents to: (i) understand better and apply the principle of equal remuneration for women and men for "work of equal value"; (ii) identify and tackle situations of direct, indirect and multiple discrimination; (iii) negotiate gender equality issues in industrial relations and collective bargaining; and (iv) facilitate women's equitable access to remunerated jobs that lead to economic empowerment and equality in the labour market, especially in the informal economy, rural areas and export processing zones (EPZs), particularly for female migrant and domestic workers.

The BASIC Project built on work in Brazil, Angola, South Africa, India, China, with South-South cooperation in Mongolia, Mozambique, Zimbabwe and Nepal. Over the 2014-15 biennium, work was conducted in China, El Salvador, FYR Macedonia, India, Jordan, Mongolia, the occupied Palestinian Territory (oPt), and Senegal. GED selected the countries where it would work, in direct response to the presence of CPOs under Outcome 17.

The **PRIDE Project** (GLO/12/52/NOR), focused on discrimination based on gender identity and sexual orientation in the workplace ("Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation: Promoting Rights, Diversity and Equality in the World of Work"). The period under review was 2012-15. In particular, it focused on identifying the existing data and knowledge base of governments, employers' and workers' organizations and civil society on discrimination faced by Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) women and men in the world of work. The research explored the underlying causes of such discrimination on the basis of Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity (SOGI) and aimed to identify examples of good practices to overcome them.

It was structured around the four pillars of the ILO's Decent Work Agenda – fundamental principles and rights at work; employment promotion; social protection; and social dialogue - with a fifth pillar devoted to assessing the particular challenges related to the interplay between HIV and AIDS and LGBT issues in the world of work. Fact-sheets focusing on these pillars were developed, based on the findings of the research conducted. Additionally, PRIDE also launched initiatives internally to the ILO.

Research focused on 9 countries: Argentina, Costa Rica, Hungary, France, India, Indonesia, Montenegro, South Africa, and Thailand. For PRIDE, GED selected the countries based on consultations with the regional offices. The choice of target countries was made in view of the current legal framework and social partners' openness to the issue (as evidenced by government, trade union and employer organizations' resolutions and policies).

Gender mainstreaming activities supported also include Global Products managed by the Gender, Equality and Diversity Branch, and the Branch's work to 'engender' Global Products managed by other units at headquarters.

Funding for gender mainstreaming under the PAs was not for individual projects per se (aside from the Addendums), but were outcome based, and aligned with the ILO's strategic Policy Framework 2010-15 (SPF) as well as with the ILO Programme and Budget for 2010-2011, 2012-2013 and 2014-2015.

## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

The four strategic objectives of the SPF's framework for its programme delivery – Employment; Social Protection; Social Dialogue; and Rights at Work – are further divided into 19 separate Outcomes with related indicators, measurement criteria and indicators, as defined in the Programme and Budget.

Outcome 17 is a cross-cutting outcome, which links to each of the 18 other Outcomes. Both Norway and Sweden contribute to ILO technical cooperation programmes, using the outcome-based funding (OBF) modality, as it allows a high degree of flexibility in programming, as long as funding is allocated in line with the ILO's biennial priorities and goals. Additional funds were provided by Norway to support the BASIC and PRIDE projects.

In addition to funding Outcome 17, Sweden contributed to initiatives associated with Youth Employment (ACI 2), Domestic Workers (Outcome 5); Building the capacity of Employers' Organizations (Outcome 9); Building the capacity of Workers' Organization (Outcome 10); Freedom of Association (Outcome 14); and International Labour Standards (Outcome 18).

The selection of the Outcomes supported by Sweden was based on national level consultations and the priorities of ILO field offices, and their linkages with the P&B Outcomes, as well as Swedish development priorities.

The main element of this initiative was to ensure that GED will be able to provide guidance to ILO staff and constituents on the importance and relevance of non-discrimination issues to their subject matter, so that women and men benefit equally, and inequality is not perpetuated. This is achieved by ensuring that gender considerations are mainstreamed into programming and activities of the above outcomes, as well as to ensure that the inclusion of a gender dimension in all ILO programmes and policies.

Norway took a similar approach, and contributed to initiatives for building the capacity of Employers' Organizations (Outcome 9); building the capacity of Workers' Organization (Outcome 10); promoting effective Labour Administration and Labour Law (Outcome 11); promoting Freedom of Association (Outcome 14); and mainstreaming Decent Work into the broader development agenda (Outcome 19).

The selection of the specific Outcomes supported by Norway was essentially based on the themes supported in previous Cooperation Programmes as well as Norwegian development priorities. The main element of this initiative was to ensure that individuals, managers, and policy-makers, both within the ILO as well as constituents at the country-level, mainstreamed gender considerations into their programming and activities in the above outcomes, as well as to ensure that the inclusion of a gender dimension in all ILO programmes and policies.

Of the funding allocated to these outcomes, over 50% was focussed on Outcomes 9 and 10: support for Employers and Workers Organizations to mainstream and implement gender equality considerations into their activities. Allocations were based on resource needs identified in the Outcome-Based Work Plans (OBW) for the 2014-15 biennium, with the majority of funds earmarked to support country-level activities.

Four of the Decent Work Outcomes (Outcomes 9, 10, 14 and 17) thus simultaneously received funding from the Partnership Agreement with the Sida and Norway.

Selection of beneficiary countries under the different Outcomes was based on field consultations with ILO Outcome Coordinators (OCs), with priority being given to work in those countries that were target

## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

countries for the biennium 2014-15. Work undertaken during the previous phase of the Partnership Programme was also factored in.

Funds from the ILO-Sida and the ILO-Norway PAs were equally divided between support for un-earmarked Regular Budget Supplementary Account (RBSA) and support for lightly earmarked Extra-Budgetary Resources for Technical Cooperation (XBTC). The table below illustrates the expenditures for the different associated initiatives associated with Outcome 17 for the period under review.

**Table 1. Budget per Donor and Programme (USD) – based on data provided in the Final Reports to the Donors (2015)**

Donor	Programme	Country	Total allocated budget (USD)
Sida	Gender mainstreaming	Global	\$514'771
Norway	Gender mainstreaming	Global	\$726'601
	BASIC Project	China, El Salvador, FYR Macedonia, India, Jordan, Mongolia, Senegal, oPt	\$715'478
	PRIDE Project	Argentina, Hungary, Thailand, Costa Rica, France, India, Indonesia, Montenegro, South Africa	\$810'459 (2012-2015)

Over the biennium under review Sida thus provided approximately US\$515,000 for gender mainstreaming activities including support to the Global Product; over the same period, Norway provided approximately US\$ 725,000 to gender mainstreaming activities including support to the Global Product.

Additionally, Norway provided an allocation of approximately US \$715,000 to support the BASIC project's activities in the field over the biennium. It also provided an allocation of approximately US\$810,500 over the period 2012-15 to support the PRIDE Global Product.

In accordance with the terms of the Partnership agreements with both Sida and Norway, approximately 75% of the resources from each donor were used to support activities in the regions. The remaining 25% was used to provide inputs to global tools at HQ.

The GED Branch contributed to the achievement of Outcome 17 at the country level through supporting the advancement of individual Country Programme Outcomes (CPOs). Under the gender mainstreaming components, these CPOs were selected by the Outcome Coordinators being supported by the PAs, based on national-level consultations and the priorities of the ILO field offices, as well as their linkages to P&B outcomes. Thus, GED collaborated with other Departments, to ensure that activities associated with the different selected Outcomes were gender-responsive.

## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

The management of day-to-day activities at the country level was decentralized to ILO regional/country offices, while coordination was the responsibility of GED at ILO Headquarters. Regular contact was fostered between the National Project Coordinators, the Gender Specialists in the regions and the Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) based at Headquarters.

While the bulk of the funds was spent on activities in the regions due to the inter-regional nature of the initiative, the funds remained centralized. It is important to note that in 2012-13, gender mainstreaming funds had been decentralized, but the technical units involved under the other outcomes did not decentralize the projects, thus creating a complicated mismatch. As a result, GED went back to a centralized approach in 2014-15.

## Evaluation background

The purpose of the evaluation will be to assess the implementation process and the key achievements of the Outcome 17 (Discrimination in employment and occupation is eliminated) Components of the Sida and Norway PAs as per their frameworks. This report reflects the findings from the evaluation on whether these components have achieved their stated objectives, produced the desired outputs, and the extent to which the outcomes have been achieved. It also aims to highlight emerging good practices, possible lessons learned, and recommendations. Finally, it assesses the extent to which the recommendations from the previous Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014) have been addressed, and provides information on the contribution of Sweden and Norway funds towards the achievement of Outcome 17.

The evaluation findings are destined primarily to the donors, Norway and Sweden, the ILO as executor of the projects, project management and staff, and tripartite constituents.

## Methodology

This final independent evaluation was conducted through a range of data collection methods, including:

- a) A **review of the incomplete Draft Evaluation Report** to ascertain the extent of work needed to complete each section of the report, and to establish a baseline of existing data.
- b) A **desk review** of relevant project documents, products, and other documents related to Outcome 17, as provided by EVAL, GED and other key persons.
- c) A **review and assessment of the Management Responses to the Recommendations** from the previous Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2012-13)
- d) **Briefings at ILO Geneva** and subsequent exchanges on specific questions with relevant staff at HQ via email and Skype
- e) **Telephone/Skype semi-structured interviews** with key ILO personnel and other actors involved in the initiatives.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Interviewees for this evaluation included Ned Lawton, CTA for the Norway and Sweden PAs, GED; Mari Schlanbusch, Associate Expert, GED; Adrienne Cruz, Senior Gender Specialist, GED; Magnus Berge, (former CTA), Workers' Activities Norway PA, ACTRAV; Andrea Marinucci, Focal Point for Norway, Sweden and Ireland, PARDEV; Natanael Lopes, former Evaluation Manager for this evaluation, ILO Brazil; Maria José Chamorro, Gender Specialist, San José Office, El Salvador; Richard Howard, Director, ILO Country Office for Nepal, and

The evaluation framework was guided by the key questions identified in the TOR<sup>6</sup>. All aspects of this evaluation were guided by the ILO evaluation policy which adheres to the OECD/DAC Principles and the UNEG norms and standards, and ethical safeguards were followed.

### Evaluation limitations

The evaluation findings are based on information collected from background documents and interviews with current and past ILO officials and other key persons. The accuracy of the evaluation findings is determined by the integrity of information provided to the evaluator from these sources.

This evaluation had a number of important limitations:

First, it is important to note that this evaluation was undertaken to complement existing work undertaken in 2016, in which a different consultant began the process, and conducted fieldwork in different countries (Costa Rica, El Salvador, India, and South Africa), but did not complete the assignment. The ILO Evaluation Office offered the consultant various extensions for the submission of field work notes and/or a draft report. However due to extenuating medical reasons, the consultant did not complete the assignment. Due to the nature of the draft submitted, the veracity of the information provided was difficult to confirm, with certain key sections completely missing, and an absence of field notes to back up findings.

Very little relevant documentation made available during the initial briefing, and most of the evaluator's subsequent time was spent in identifying, requesting, collecting and collating relevant information.

Given the circumstances, it was expected that EVAL, GED, and the other ILO departments associated with the initiatives examined in this evaluation would readily facilitate access to information and resources so that the process would be as smooth as possible. However, this proved to be a difficult endeavour, due to the delayed timing of the evaluation, and despite efforts by EVAL, the evaluator faced challenges in obtaining some relevant information.

This was exacerbated by the fact that the CTA responsible for the PAs with Norway and Sida left the ILO at the beginning of this new evaluation process in late 2016, and was not able to meet with the evaluator before his departure, although he was available for an interview. Once a staff member leaves, the data collected during their involvement at the ILO often leaves with them, or becomes very difficult to find. In the case of this evaluation, documentation on the PAs was compiled by the coordinator in a shared-drive of GED, along with a handover note, but GED colleagues found it difficult to navigate, due to a lack of use of a systematic filing mechanism and repository within current ILO systems. This meant that documentation had to be sought from other sources.

Another major limitation was that project staff in the key countries were no longer employed by the ILO (as the projects have closed) and were thus not be available to respond to questions or requests

---

former ILO Senior Specialist on HIV and AIDS, Asia and the Pacific); Jae-Hee Chang, Senior Programme and Operations Officer, Bureau for Employers' Activities (ACT/EMP); Lena Hasle, Norway Ministry of Foreign Affairs; and Gudrun Jevne, former Associate Expert, GED, now at the Norwegian Directorate for Children, Youth and Family Affairs

<sup>6</sup> See Annex IV

for interviews. The context and delayed timing of this evaluation also means that there was no scope for stakeholder participation during the second phase of this evaluation, especially with regards to beneficiaries in the project countries. While a questionnaire had been initially discussed as an option to gather evidence, it was not administered.

As such, the evaluation was constrained by the limited information available, and thus only presents partial results, thus limiting the scope of the assessment.

## Main findings from Evaluation questions

### Relevance and strategic fit

The Outcome 17 initiatives were relevant and well-aligned with the ILO's policy and strategy on gender equality: they sought to advance gender equality through the inclusion of a gender dimension in all programmes and policies (i.e. gender mainstreaming), while promoting gender-specific interventions to redress existing inequalities. Furthermore, the objective was also to ensure gender equality in the staffing, institutional structures, and substance of the work of constituents and the ILO itself. This is directly in line with the ILO gender equality policy, established in 1999 and updated in 2015.

The P&B 2014-15 provides specific guidance on how gender is to be mainstreamed into each of the Outcomes, and resources were made available under the different Global Products in order to achieve this. In particular, the objective was that initiatives related to work with Workers' and Employers' organizations (Outcomes 9 and 10); on promoting youth employment (ACI2); on promoting equitable working conditions (Outcome 5); on supporting labour administration (Outcome 11); on advancing freedom of association (Outcome 14); on advancing the implementation of International Labour Standards (Outcome 18); and on helping member states to take an integrated approach to decent work (Outcome 19) – would be conducted in a gender-responsive manner, to ensure that adequate attention be given to “women's as well as men's concerns form an integral dimension of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation” of the PAs, so that “women and men benefit equally and inequality is not perpetuated”.

To maximize the potential for synergies, the specific interventions were defined by the Outcome co-ordinators of the Outcomes listed above, in collaboration with colleagues and partners in the regions. Three of the Decent Work Outcomes (9, 10 and 14) received funding from both PAs.

Turning to International Labour Standards, while many ILO conventions are important to the promotion of gender equality in the world of work, the following conventions are of particular relevance:

- Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100)
- Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111)
- Workers with Family Responsibilities Convention, 1981 (No. 156)
- Maternity Protection Convention, 2000 (183)
- Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189)



## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

The programmes under evaluation aimed to contribute to the achievement of Outcome 17 of the ILO P&B 2010-15. Outcome 17 aims to ensure that “Discrimination in employment and occupation is eliminated”, and its related indicator focuses specifically on the implementation of specific laws, policies, programmes and actions that can improve the application of relevant Conventions, principles and rights on non-discrimination (17.1).

By facilitating an oversight and coordination role, the global component funded through the ILO-Norway PA aimed to ensure that the support given to the CPOs under the other Outcomes would be done in a manner consistent with the Governing Body’s March 2005 decision on Gender Mainstreaming in ILO Technical Cooperation<sup>7</sup> whereby all ILO technical activities must be gender mainstreamed, defined as:

- Both women and men are included in consultations and analyses.
- The background analysis includes gender analysis and data disaggregated by sex.
- There are gender-sensitive strategies and objectives; and gender-specific indicators, outputs and activities consistent with these.
- There is a gender balance in the recruitment of project personnel and experts and in institutional structures set up under the project
- Gender is a central aspect of evaluation and impact assessment and the evaluators have the requisite skills in gender issues.

The overall strategy is to intensify the mainstreaming of gender equality into all ILO programmes, including DWCPs and national poverty reduction policies and strategies. The gender mainstreaming components, along with BASIC and PRIDE efforts at non-discrimination and equality, are directly relevant to the ILO gender equality policy.

The BASIC Project document references the ILO’s Declaration on Social Justice, the Global Jobs Pact, the United Nations Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination against women (CEDAW), and the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention (No. 111).

The PRIDE project was the first one of its kind in the ILO, thus leading the way to reduce discrimination against LGBT workers. Its objective was highly relevant to the Outcome 17 strategy, by taking a wider, more inclusive stance on the definition of gender than is generally the case, and contributed a research basis for the implementation of Conventions 100 and 111 as it applies to LGBT workers. It took as its starting point the 2009 ILC Resolution on Gender Equality at the Heart of Decent Work, which calls upon the ILO to “strengthen its research agenda and knowledge base on emerging issues”.

By conducting and disseminating research on a topic that had largely been ignored, it helped to shed a light on discrimination challenges faced by many workers in different regional settings. The PRIDE research was linked to Outcome 17 but was not formally linked to CPOs in the countries concerned.

Until recently, discrimination against lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) persons had not been specifically focused upon by the ILO or the UN system at large. The PRIDE project aimed to address this need by identifying the multiple types of discrimination facing LGBT persons in the workplace, disseminating the findings of such research, and working with governments, and workers’

---

<sup>7</sup> See [http://www.ilo.org/gender/Informationresources/WCMS\\_100436/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/gender/Informationresources/WCMS_100436/lang--en/index.htm)

and employers' organizations to promote rights, diversity and tolerance in the world of work. Together with the 2009 Resolution, the project was shaped on the basis of international labour standards considered key to gender equality in the world of work, especially the Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111) and the Recommendation concerning HIV and AIDS and the World of Work, 2010 (No. 200). The PRIDE project was thus highly relevant to the ILO's mandate.

Although the focus on sexual orientation and gender identity (SOGI) was unprecedented, its justification and design built on themes previously addressed in the ILO, thus highlighting its relevance to the work under Outcome 17:

- Two ILO instruments, the Private Employment Agencies Recommendation, 1997 (No. 188) and the HIV and AIDS Recommendation, 2010 (No. 200), refer to prohibiting and preventing discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and promoting the involvement and empowerment of all workers regardless of their sexual orientation.
- In the 1990s, the ILO Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (CEACR) drew attention for the first time to legislative provisions concerning discrimination based on sexual orientation, and highlighted, in its Special Survey of 1996 on Equality in Employment and Occupation, sexual orientation as an emerging motive for discrimination in the workplace. The CEACR considered that, with a view to ensuring specific protection against all discrimination based on sexual orientation, provision should be made for SOGI in national legislation.
- SOGI-related discrimination is covered in the 2003, 2007 and 2011 Global Reports under the follow-up to the 1998 ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work.
- In its 2012 General Survey on the fundamental Conventions, the CEACR was encouraged by the increasing number of ILO member States that had included sexual orientation or gender identity in constitutional guarantees and legislative provisions on equality.
- The 2013 report of the CEACR made eight observations under Convention No. 111 regarding discrimination on the basis of SOGI.

Furthermore, the ILO's position regarding discrimination was emphasized during a speech by the Director General on the occasion of the International Day against Homophobia and Transphobia (17 May 2013), where he affirmed the ILO's "commitment to strive for workplaces free of discrimination on all grounds, including on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity". Since then, a statement is released by the Director General every year on this occasion.

In terms of relevance to global development initiatives and goals, Outcome 17 programming may be viewed as directly relevant to several Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), including SDG #5 (Gender Equality), #8 (Decent work and economic growth) and #10 (Reduced inequalities) while indirectly having an effect on several other SDGs relating to poverty alleviation, good health and well-being, and justice and strong institutions. Furthermore, the project created the scope to work with the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (UN Women), with which the ILO has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), signed in 2011.

The work done under PRIDE represents an important contribution to the wider UN effort to integrate SOGI into the human rights and non-discrimination framework. The UN Secretary-General has made

clear the UN's position on the issue of SOGI, namely that "LGBT rights are human rights". The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS and the United Nations Development Programme have all condemned discrimination and harassment against LGBT people. By promoting research on SOGI in the world of work, the ILO is placing itself as an important defender of human rights in the context of decent work.

Overall, activities were found to be well designed and relevant to the needs and interests of tripartite constituents. Promoting gender equality and combatting sex-based discrimination is an area where there is broad consensus among constituents. While motivations for this may differ, all agreed on its importance.

Many of the programme activities responded to direct requests from tripartite members (country governments and employee organizations) to increase capacity building related to gender equality and non-discrimination. This was particularly the case for the BASIC project and the PRIDE project, and, to a lesser extent, certain elements of the Global Components. This included activities to address capacity gaps at the country level, through adapting legislation, and at the union/employer levels, through more equitable policies improving gender equality and non-discrimination in the world of work.

There was a collaborative design process inherent in each specific country initiative, which led to a high degree of ownership of the initiatives by constituents, as a result of their early involvement in the process. According to the previous evaluator: "On every occasion when interviewing tripartite constituents, they were effusive in their gratitude for the ILO and the various in-country Outcome 17 initiatives that were supported, and stated that without the ILO's support through the Norway and Sweden PAs, efforts at altering policies on gender equality and non-discrimination would not be nearly as advanced".

This was also the case for PRIDE, where the selection of pilot countries was a response to suggestions and requests from the gender specialists in the regional offices, based on demands and interest expressed by field offices. As such, there was a strong sense of ownership in the field in this regard. The choice was informed by a number of agreed criteria. Firstly there was a wish to have a good geographical spread. Secondly, in view of the sensitivity of the issue, it was deemed prudent to select countries where the research undertaken would have little risk in terms of inducing a backlash or over-reaction, against the ILO, the researchers, or the LGBT respondents participating in the research. Thus, as a general principle, it was decided not to conduct the research in countries where there were legal restrictions of same sex sexual activity. Thirdly, consideration was given to selecting countries where the ILO had a field office presence.

In terms of constituents' and target groups' priorities, one limitation was that constituents were not always fully involved in the design of the project, but the PRIDE Project researchers sought to interview and involve ILO's tripartite partners in all four countries once the research was underway, and certain modifications were made to accommodate their concerns or suggestions. Furthermore, ILO Constituents were involved in the dissemination of research findings.

One general limitation pertaining to the PAs highlighted by tripartite constituents was a wish for additional workshops and training/mentoring by ILO specialists, which could also be interpreted as an

## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

indicator of a successful initiative. Representatives of Governments, and union/worker organizations responsible for gender equality and non-discrimination in the workplace in El Salvador, Costa Rica and India, three of the countries visited by the previous evaluator, argued for additional resources to expand training for other Ministries and organizations.

This sense of ownership was less pronounced within the ILO itself. Gender mainstreaming efforts were incorporated into the work of various departments, but while managers from the different departments were supportive of gender-mainstreaming actions, it seemed that in many cases, gender-mainstreaming considerations were incorporated in their programming through feedback from GED staff, rather than through design inputs of the departments themselves, showing that further work needs to be done in this context. The selection of countries where PRIDE research was conducted was done in consultation with constituents and ILO offices in the regions, thus reflecting the needs and concerns of recipients.

Finally, the initiatives funded through the Sida and Norway PAs were highly relevant and consistent with the donor priorities and objectives. Norway, in particular, has been promoting LGBT rights at the national and international levels, and was a pioneer in the advancement of LGBT rights in the United Nations system, placing it on the agenda for the first time in the mid-2000s, on behalf of 54 other states. The PRIDE project is thus a direct reflection of the concerns and priorities of the Norwegian government.

### Coherence

The Programme documents for the Outcome 17 Component of the Sida and Norway PAs, as well as for BASIC, aimed to build upon, and consolidate what has been achieved in previous phases of funding. The PRIDE project document also mentions using existing ILO tools and approaches to achieve its objectives.

In many cases, work done during the 2014-15 period built on previous partnership phases, drawing from existing initiatives and tools for the promotion of gender mainstreaming or specific gender-related initiatives, and thus replicating, scaling-up, or furthering successful activities and outputs.

This was especially the case for activities funded through the BASIC Project, which was in its third phase, and responded to requests from ILO constituents; and the PRIDE project, which expanded the number of countries in which research was conducted.

The selection of target countries was also strategic, so that the projects would be established in countries where there was a critical mass of work taking place under the PA (i.e. where two or more CPOs under the Outcomes supported were active), in order to maximize potential for success.

For BASIC, each gender specialist in the regional offices was requested to select one country where assistance had been requested. In two cases (China and Mongolia; and Jordan and oPt), neighbouring countries were selected to enhance knowledge-sharing and exchanges.

Due to the flexibility of Outcome-based funding modalities, it was possible to create synergies between the Global Component and other ILO interventions and sources of funding. The box below presents some of these:

Outcome 5 – co-funding of project activities with INWORK, such as a guide on how to extend social security to domestic workers (global component), such as the global tool on dispute resolution and its trialling in Tanzania, and some of the salary for the project manager in El Salvador, with minor technical inputs, rather than in-depth inputs on gender. This was because the INWORK team already had significant gender expertise, so it was felt that technical inputs from GED should be focused on the Outcomes where an understanding of gender issues was weaker. Work on minimum wages was supported by the country gender expert in Costa Rica and from headquarters in Capo Verde.

Outcome 9 – co-funding of project activities with ACT/EMP, such as the printing and launching of the report “Gaining Momentum: Women in Business and Management” in Europe (2014) and Asia (2015); and a workshop on “promoting maternity protection for employers’ organizations” in Africa (2014) and in the Arab States (2015), and training on integrating gender into policy advocacy in different African countries, as a component of an ACT/EMP training.

Outcome 10 – participation in training of union members in Kenya as part of an ACTRAV training; work with the media in India to promote advocacy on the implementation of C.100 and C.111 as part of an ACTRAV media campaign on international labour standards.

Outcome 11 – co-funding of project activities with LABADMIN/OSH, including gender-responsive videos on OSH and labour inspection in Burkina Faso, Vietnam and Colombia, and a gender-sensitive training of labour inspectors; participation in other trainings on gender and labour inspection organized by LABADMIN/OSH.

Outcome 18 – participation in an inter-regional course on international labour standards, with a focus on gender issues, organized by NORMES

Outcome 19 – co-funding of project activities with MULTILATERALS related to gender-responsive data mapping.

#### Box 1. Synergies between Outcome 17 and other Outcomes

The logical frameworks presented in the Programme documents are not clear, and fail to show a clear causal chain between activities, outputs, and CPOs / P&B outcomes. A better application of RBM principles would be useful in this regard.

Similarly, the section on Risk Analysis, Mitigation and Sustainability for the PAs provides very generic information, rather than providing details linked to each type of activity/output.

Monitoring procedures are not mentioned in the Programme documents. This is problematic, as a lack of monitoring information and a monitoring strategy from the onset creates challenges during the evaluation period, especially in the absence of regular, detailed reporting mechanisms.

Quarterly meetings between the ILO officials responsible for each outcome under the PA were arranged by PARDEV at the behest of GED, and were found to be very helpful. However, as these took the form of rather informal exchanges and updates, there were no official minutes of meeting. Having these may be one way to improve coherence and cohesion, and document potential synergies with other Outcomes, as well as to facilitate monitoring and evaluation.

The BASIC Programme document provides slightly more details regarding components of the logframe. However, causal links are not established clearly, and there isn't evidence of a distinct Theory of Change. Furthermore, the section on Risk Analysis, Mitigation and Sustainability is also

generic, even though in this case, specific countries and activities have been identified, thus allowing for more targeted information to be presented.

While PRIDE did not have a logframe per se, its project strategy provided relevant information regarding its main outcomes and outputs. The project was implemented through two outcomes with corresponding outputs, namely research and the dissemination of policy briefs.

*Research* - Outcome 1: Constituents and civil society have better knowledge and awareness of the discrimination facing LGBT persons in the world of work and why it has to be eliminated.

- Output 1.1: Seven selected country studies mapping discrimination against LGBT persons in the world of work are conducted in close partnership with constituents, LGBT networks, other civil society partners and research institutions;
- Output 1.2: The country studies are consolidated within a framework of regional and global analyses in order to compare, contrast and identify general global/regional trends, challenges and examples of good practices within the four strategic pillars of the Decent Work Agenda and HIV and AIDS;
- Output 1.3: A global study is published in three languages and disseminated widely through ILO channels and Networks and those of constituents and relevant civil society organizations.
- Output 1.4: The global study is launched at an ILO event on May, 17<sup>th</sup>, 2014, International Day against Homophobia and Transphobia.

*Disseminating research through policy briefs* - Outcome 2: Governments, employers and trade unions understand the main challenges facing LGBT persons in the world of work, the effects on productivity and competitiveness, and how to respond through national and enterprise-level measures, as necessary, to overcome those challenges.

- Output 2.1: Based on the research, five fact-sheets (on the four 'decent work themes and HIV and AIDS) on how to eliminate discrimination against LGBT workers are drafted and validated by means of A tripartite workshop;
- Output 2.2: The five fact-sheets are published in three languages.
- Output 2.3: National workshops to disseminate the chief findings of the research are conducted in Argentina, Hungary, South Africa, and Thailand

**Box 2. PRIDE Outcomes and Outputs**

## Programme progress and effectiveness

It was not possible to clearly ascertain the degree of effectiveness of the different gender mainstreaming and gender-specific interventions based on the information available. Additionally, the draft report from the previous consultant did not provide any relevant information on the effectiveness or the achievement of results.

In terms of reporting, the funding structure made it difficult to assess the achievement of the CPOs, as Global tools were reported under GLO 777, while activities in the regions were reported under the Outcome that they are working with to mainstream. While reports sent to the donors included

## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

information on gender mainstreaming in the different Outcome chapters, there is no consolidated document which presents all of this information in detail.

Due to the outcome-based funding modality, the Outputs and Activities for the global components presented in the Programme Document Templates were non-specific, leading to difficulties to assess programme progress. This is probably because a large part of funding for the global components covered the salary of the coordinator and the part-time secretary. Due to this, indicators were not specifically defined either.

Different outputs were envisaged, including capacity building on workplace gender equality for workers' and employers' organizations, leading to improved policies, action plans and/or programmes in gender equality (link to Outcomes 9 and 10); conducting a Participatory Gender Audit in Ministries with responsibility for Youth Employment, and reviewing materials on youth employment from a gender perspective (link to ACI2); development of training manuals and conducting training sessions related to Freedom of Association (Outcome 14); training and advocacy to promote the rights of domestic workers, and advocacy to promote ratification of Convention 183 and/or improved maternity protection (Outcome 5); Training in the application of Conventions 100 and 111 (Outcome 18); training in gender and labour inspection for labour inspectors, leading to improved enforcement and/or promotion of non-discrimination laws and policies (Outcome 11), and upgrading of labour statistics including sex-disaggregated data, and gender responsive indicators.

With regards to PRIDE, during the 2014-15 biennium, research to identify good practices and discrimination faced by LGBT women and men was completed in eight of the nine focus countries, namely Argentina, Costa Rica, France, India, Indonesia, Montenegro, South Africa and Thailand. The research in Hungary was completed in 2013, with results later presented by the author at a conference in Amsterdam; these, along with those of Montenegro have not yet been published

In addition to conducting research in selected countries, the PRIDE project facilitated initiatives internally:

A key initiative was the internal survey of ILO staff's attitudes to LGBT issues, jointly undertaken by the Gender, Equality and Diversity Branch, the Human Resources Department and the ILO Staff Union. A report with targeted recommendations was finalized in 2015. Other initiatives were related to the dissemination of findings, and the positioning of the ILO as a champion of LGBT rights in the workplace, and within the UN System, thus supporting gender rights and non-discrimination, as presented in the box below:

- In January 2015, the ILO's Director General spoke on a panel on Diversity at Work (including LGBT issues) at Davos, using the results of the country research and the internal survey.
- On 17 May, 2015 - International Day against Homophobia and Transphobia (IDAHOT) – the ILO hosted an event to publicize the results of the research to date. An issue brief outlining the preliminary research results was published and disseminated, and the country reports from Argentina and Thailand were published and launched.

- The ILO's Director-General was signatory to a joint statement on Geneva-based UN agencies on LGBT rights in August 2015.
- The ILO is active in an informal inter-agency LGBT network: the Chief Technical Adviser of the PRIDE project represents the ILO on the network, regularly updates the Office of the High Commission for Human Rights (OHCHR) on the scope and results of the PRIDE research, and attends inter-agency meetings. It is essential that the ILO remain represented in this network, despite the departure of the CTA.

Looking beyond the time-frame of this evaluation, there is evidence that the impetus started by PRIDE continued:

- The GED Branch Chief was a panellist at 'Pride and prejudice – The Cost of Discrimination', organized by the Economist magazine in London in March, 2016, as well as at the inaugural Rhodes LGBTQ Forum in Oxford in February 2017.
- A UN system-wide survey based on the ILO tolerance scan is planned to be launched in 2017-2018.

#### Box 3. Selected PRIDE achievements

Progress reports provided for the PRIDE Project underlined certain challenges in implementation, including time constraints on technical specialists in the field, leading to delays, and internal resistance to the Project based on the justification that some of the ILO's constituents would not be willing to work on the issue of LGBT workers' rights, due to its sensitive political nature. It seems that over time, strategies to put in place by GED staff to garner support were successful, as reflected in the achievements above.

### Efficiency

The PAs provided funding for a number of staff posts both at Headquarters and in the field:

The global component was overseen administratively by a Chief Technical Advisor based in GED, and a part-time administrative assistant, both supported by a combination of funds from the two PAs, the BASIC Project, and the PRIDE project. Financial oversight was provided by GED's Financial Controlling Officer.

Funds were also allocated to support a National Project Coordinator in El Salvador in 2015 (ILO-SIDA PA), and a National Project Officer in India for a period of 6 months between 2014 and 15 (BASIC Project). In the context of PRIDE, the CTA was responsible for project implementation, in close cooperation with technical experts from DECLARATION and ILO/AIDS. Local and international consultants were contracted to undertake research and drafting of policy briefs, while Gender specialists ensured technical backstopping in the target countries.

Liaising with the constituents and the national gender machinery at field level was done through the GED specialists in the field, based at ILO Decent Work Country teams in Pretoria, Dakar, Santiago de



## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

Chile<sup>8</sup>, San José, Budapest, Beirut, New Delhi and Bangkok, supported by a team of Gender Specialists at HQ. In addition, each ILO Office and each ILO Unit at HQ has a designated gender focal point.

Interviews with ILO staff revealed that they would like GED to provide more substantive guidance and technical advice, in order to fully incorporate gender concerns into their work. While appreciating past and current efforts related to the provision of technical expertise, officials in the field felt that this could be taken further, and that opportunities and challenges associated with specific country-contexts should be considered more systematically.

These findings coincide with a survey of over 60 ILO staff at headquarters and in field offices, undertaken during an independent evaluation of the ILO Action Plan for Gender Equality 2010-15. Although almost three-fourths of respondents to a specific question rated ILO as having performed well in reflecting gender equality in substantive work. There was an associated recommendation that improved technical expertise was needed in this context.

The decentralization of funds for gender mainstreaming activities to the Regional Offices was suggested as one way to increase efficiency, both in terms of administrative bureaucracy, as well as in response to contextual changes that may occur in the field.

Regarding administration of resources, it was brought to the attention of the previous evaluator that the lack of a compatible budget management system between Headquarters and the Regional Offices was a challenge, and led to inefficiencies in resource use, as ILO staff on both sides needed to verify financial information.

Documentation was lacking in terms of management of individual projects within the PAs. Similarly, reporting was not done in an integrated manner: reporting for global tools linked to the gender mainstreaming component were reported under the Global Product GLO 777, while activities in the regions were reported under the Outcome that they were working with to mainstream. As such, it was not possible to find a complete, detailed reporting document covering all initiatives funded by the PAs.

Only PRIDE and BASIC were reported under Outcome 17. In reports sent to the donors covering the entire Partnerships, the mainstreaming components were reported under the respective Outcomes they were aimed at mainstreaming, and not under GLO 777. This was agreed by PARDEV and the coordinator at the time.

However, reliance on the Progress and Final reports to the donors and the PIR is not a sustainable solution, especially due to the lack of detail and critical analysis included in these reports. While detailed reporting is not a requirement from the donors, the ILO could take a pro-active stance on ensuring a more solid RBM approach.

The Progress and Final reports for the donors provide an overview of achievements in a specific year, and highlight milestones and major outputs, as well as progress made, but do not provide information on shortcomings or challenges, thus limiting the potential for cross-collaboration between countries or initiatives which have faced similar challenges, and found solutions. Furthermore, there is no

---

<sup>8</sup> The post in Chile was cut during the period under review

## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

reflection on risks, mitigation measures, or sustainability, which renders the associated information provided in the Programme documents rather redundant.

The Consolidated Country Result Tables for each Outcome, associated with the Programme Implementation Reports, present country results, but do not distinguish accomplishments based on the source of funding. It is thus difficult to easily appreciate the extent and effectiveness of contributions from specific donors through these documents, especially since certain initiatives may have been funded through a variety of complementary means.

More specific information was available for the BASIC project, although again, the links between the project documents and the reporting format could be improved, especially in relation to sources of funding. Also, the outputs in certain countries were not reported upon in the Consolidated Country Result Tables for Outcome 17, 2014-2015: there was no mention of India, FYR Macedonia, or oPt, although activities were planned and budgeted for in both 2014 and 2015 in the Logframe, because results achieved in these countries were not counted as being reportable. This information was found in the Template for Final Reporting, which draws from information in the PIR, and complements it. Once again, this shows the limitation of the current reporting mechanisms.

The box below presents some outputs and outcomes of the BASIC Project, as reported in these Tables:

- In **Senegal**, an Action Programme for non-discrimination and equality between men and women in the world of work, and a gender-focused plan of action to combat discrimination in the informal economy were adopted; an awareness-raising strategy on non-discrimination was adopted by women union leaders; and a national committee for maternity protection at work and on domestic work was established by the Ministère du Travail, du Dialogue social, des Organisations professionnelles et des Relations avec les Institutions
- A media advocacy strategy on the Gender Pay Gap in private schools was launched in **Jordan**, and a capacity-building programme on the promotion of non-discrimination laws and policies was implemented.
- Capacity-building plans for trade unionists on the enforcement and promotion of non-discrimination labour laws and policies were implemented in **China**; these had a particular focus on the gender pay gap and gender equality; and a national plan on strengthening capacity of business start-up, including provisions to support women entrepreneurship development was implemented.
- **Mongolia** approved a revised Labour Law, with specific provisions with regards to women workers.
- Many results were achieved in **El Salvador**, including an Institutional Policy on Gender Equality implemented by Ministry of Labour and Social Security; and the launch of a campaign to fight gender stereotypes in the workplace.

Box 4. Selected BASIC achievements according to the Consolidated Country Result Tables for Outcome 17, 2014-2015

## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

It is worthy of note that the BASIC Project aims to be “gender targeted”, yet none of the results achieved explicitly mention the participation of specific gender groups in its presentation of results and ILO contributions in these tables.

The Consolidated Country Result Table for Outcome 17 does not reflect all of the achievements funded through BASIC, which also include the following:

### **FYR Macedonia:**

- Gender and motherhood pay gap study and publication
- Analysis of collective agreements, labour legislation and institutional framework for gender equality and non-discrimination in the country
- Workshop on Mainstreaming Gender into Labour Law
- Workshop on Gender-Neutral Job Evaluation
- Publication of an equal pay guide (in Macedonian)
- Publication of a gender-neutral job evaluation guide (in Macedonian)
- Publication (in Macedonian) on “Gender Equality and Decent Work – Selected ILO Conventions and Recommendations Promoting Gender Equality as of 2012”
- Reprinting (in Macedonian) of brochure on “Remove the Obstacles”
- A gender and motherhood pay gap study, first of its kind in the country, contributed valuable input to policy debates and drew attention to such inequality in the economy
- The gender pay gap problem was identified by the Economic and Social Council in its tripartite action plan to promote collective bargaining, with reference to the ILO methodology on gender-neutral job evaluations

### **Occupied Palestinian Territories (oPt)**

- In collaboration with the Palestinian Ministry of Labour and Ministry of Education and Higher Education, a research study explored the gender pay gap in the oPt. The decision to focus on this sector was made in tripartite consultation with the National Women’s Employment Committee, representatives from the Palestinian General Federation of Trade Unions and the Palestinian Federation of the Union of Chambers of Commerce. The study, including recommendations for participating stakeholders, has been since published.

**Box 5. Selected BASIC outputs (not included in the Consolidated Country Result Tables for Outcome 17, 2014-2015)**

## Impact and Sustainability

The gender mainstreaming activities funded by Norway and Sida have clearly initiated, or contributed to a number of key impacts promoting gender rights, non-discrimination, and inclusion in the world of work.

In line with Indicator 17.1, the results presented in the table above show the extent to which the ILO has the potential to make important contributions to Outcome 17. These include the implementation of capacity-building plans on enforcement and promotion of non-discrimination labour laws and policies; awareness-raising strategies launched by constituents; improvements of statistical systems

## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

to provide sex-disaggregated data on non-discrimination; and trainings on gender-related issues and non-discrimination.

Support from the Global Product through the different Outcomes led to the implementation of a range of activities related to capacity building of key organizations in the field, knowledge development at headquarters and in the regions, as well as public awareness and advocacy campaigns.

For instance, briefs on key issues facing women in management, such as maternity protection, the gender pay gap, or gender stereotyping were developed for Employer's organizations, as well as a set of case studies on how employers' organizations and business organizations are promoting gender equality. Workshops on promoting maternity protection targeting employers' and workers' organizations were also held in different regions, and proved to be a success. Videos related to OSH and labour inspection, as well as on the gender dimensions of freedom of association were developed. Guidelines and trainings on specific gender-related issues related to AC12, and Outcomes 5, 10, 11, and 14 were also developed and piloted, or reviewed to ensure that they were gender-responsive. In partnership with the ILO's International Training Centre in Turin, support from PRIDE allowed the ILO to develop a one-week training course on Diversity, inclusiveness and non-discrimination in the world of work, including a strong focus on LGBT issues. The target audience includes Trade unions, leaders and managers at all levels in the public sector, aid organizations, UN organizations, the private sector and the non-profit sector. In several cases, exchange visits were organized to promote knowledge-transfer and create regional networks of support.

According to the first evaluator, "the initiatives supported by Outcome 17 have begun to act as a catalyst upon the abilities of states and Ministries to address these issue by providing them with a sound and fundamental basis for further steps to be taken, as well as the technical assistance provided by the ILO to begin to implement meaningful change. Indeed, there is much work to be done, but the various initiatives have certainly had a positive impact both within the ILO itself (in terms of mainstreaming gender across all interventions) as well as from a policy perspective at the state level. Much goodwill and effective partnerships have now been cemented between the ILO, national Ministries, employers' organizations, and employee representative bodies, and it is fair to say that, within the countries under review for this evaluation, these tripartite bodies now see the ILO as an effective, credible, and knowledgeable partner in forwarding the equality agenda."

In the case of PRIDE, the process associated with the research for the Working Papers and the launching of the reports had positive effects which went beyond the life-cycle of the project. It was highlighted by ILO staff in Latin America that the flexibility associated with the process of selecting countries in which to conduct PRIDE research, and the fact that funds from Norway allowed for the funding of processes, rather than simply tangible outputs, greatly maximized the potential for impact.

While PRIDE research was initially planned to take place in Honduras, the ILO decided to change its country focus to Costa Rica, since the political environment was very conducive to promoting the objectives of PRIDE, leading to positive impact. In In 2015, the Vice President announced an order making it illegal to discriminate against people for their sexual orientation or gender identity. This decree also ordered public institutions to offer training to their employees and establish other reforms to guarantee equal access to public services for the LGBTI population.

In 2016, the Working Paper “ORGULLO (PRIDE) en el Trabajo. Un estudio sobre la discriminación en el trabajo por motivos de orientación sexual e identidad de género en Costa Rica” was presented by the ILO Office in San Jose to the Governing Council of Costa Rica, made up of Ministers and Presidents of the autonomous institutions of the Government, chaired by the Vice President of Costa Rica and the First Lady. All institutions were asked to move forward in the implementation of the Executive Decree No. 38999 “Política del Poder Ejecutivo para erradicar de sus instituciones la discriminación hacia la población sexualmente diversa (Policy of the Executive to eliminate discrimination against sexually diverse populations in their institutions)”, which is mandatory. Some representatives asked the ILO for support to apply the investigation methodology in their institutions.

After the presentation, 18 private-sector companies signed the (Declaration of San Jose: Ten principles against discrimination on the basis of the sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression of LGBTI population and to promote their Human Rights.

Achievements made in Costa Rica since the launch of the report reflect continuous engagement by the ILO team and the tripartite partners, which led to substantial progress regarding LGBTI rights in different government organizations and national institutes, including:

The first **Costa Rica LGBTI Trade Mission Summit** was carried out in 2016.

**Ministry of Public Education – Ministerio de Educación Pública (MEP).-**

The first High School Diploma was awarded to a trans student (including their chosen name) by the

The **Inter-American Court of Human Rights** provided Advisory Opinion Advocacy for more legal certainty for same sex couples and trans people.

**National Child Welfare Agency – Patronato Nacional de la Infancia (PANI)**

- o The Chairwoman of the PANI assigned ₡50 million (about US\$ 100.000) to conduct research on living conditions of the underage LGBTI population.
- o All PANI offices have qualified officers to attend to the LGBTI population.

**National Vocational Institute – Instituto Nacional de Aprendizaje (INA)**

- o The paper “Sistema de Información, asesoría y denuncia sobre violencia homolesbotransfóbica” was approved.
- o The First group of trans women graduated from Customer service module. Seventeen of the graduates received a Diploma with their chosen name.

**National Information System and Single Beneficiary Register – Sistema Nacional de Información y Registro Único de Beneficiarios (Sinirube).**

- o An Inclusive Information Sheet was created by the Governing Board of the Sinirube. In the question regarding “registry sex” (gender identity), there is a blank space on the sheet, in order to allow trans people to choose how they want to be known as.
- o Addressing them with their chosen name is mandatory for officers.

**Ministry of Public Security – Ministerio de Seguridad Pública.**

- o A Protocol for Comprehensive Attention to Trans People (Protocolo para la Atención Integral de Personas Trans) was established for the services they provide.

15 more companies signed the Declaration of San José.

## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

Nevertheless, political changes in the regions, and issues with government staffing and budgets can lead to challenges in sustainability and impact; this was the case in South Africa in the context of the PRIDE Project, and may also be the case in Indonesia, as the government is becoming less supportive of LGBTI rights.

To address these potential risks, the involvement of different groups of constituents, as well as members of Civil Society and other partner institutions, and raising public awareness through advocacy campaigns and trainings around the issues associated with Outcome 17, leading to changes in attitudes, is crucial to ensure lasting effects. Collaboration between these different groups fostered through support from the PAs was also a positive outcome, which may lead to sustainability.

In El Salvador, the campaign “Decídete a Crecer, combatiendo los estereotipos de género en la formación profesional y el empleo” (“Decide to grow – combatting gender stereotypes in vocational training and employment”) was organized by the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, the Salvadoran Institute for the Advancement of Women (ISDEMU) and the Salvadoran Institute of Vocational Training (INSAFORP), supported by funds from the PAs. The aim of the campaign was to sensitize the population about the importance of training spaces for training and employment where equality is promoted and discrimination is eliminated.

This was the result of a 2015 study supported by the ILO, which revealed that women tended to opt for shorter technical careers, due to family-and reproduction-related factors, which also increased the gender wage gap in the country.

Starting in 2015, the three institutions held monthly meetings to agree on the content and management of the campaign, in a participatory manner which involved focus groups with the local population. The campaign was launched publicly in 2016, and received extensive media coverage. Initially, the campaign was financed entirely by the ILO, but in mid-2016, INSAFORM allocated funds to continue the distribution of materials, reflecting the sustainability of the intervention.

### Box 7. Example of a sustainable intervention in El Salvador

In Asia, follow-on work was done through the “Being LGBTI in Asia” regional programme, which is supported by UNDP, Sida and USAID, as a response to the “Leave No-One Behind: Equality and Inclusion in the Post-2015 Development Agenda” campaign.

By drawing from ILO expertise on the different Outcomes and linking them to the work done on gender by GED through different collaborations, a more sustainable approach to gender mainstreaming in the organization was promoted. However, concrete evidence of professional impact of participating staff was not available within reporting documents to the donors. Repeat staff attitude surveys could be one way to address this.

Research findings from the PRIDE Project were disseminated in the relevant countries through National Workshops, where ILO staff, members of civil society, NGOs, UN organizations, and in some cases, representatives of employers or workers, were invited to participate in panels and discussions.

## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

Several people interviewed also underlined the importance of approaching the issue from a fundamental rights at work perspective, which includes all vulnerable groups, in order to increase interest, and impact. The sometimes narrow definition of gender could be revisited in this context, in order to be more inclusive and representative.

Another suggestion to maximize sustainability and impact was for funds to be raised at country level, with the assistance of ILO Gender Specialists, in order to push these important issues further and create partnerships with civil society organizations and community groups.

With regards to the internal ILO survey launched by PRIDE, the evaluator could not find evidence of any follow-up activities by HRD in this regard. Addressing the recommendations based on the survey results would be one way to create lasting and sustainable impact within the organization, in order to tackle issues related to gender-based discrimination internally.

## Status of previous recommendations and progress made

The following table compiles the recommendations made in the previous evaluation of Outcome 17 (2012-13), and presents the progress made, as provided through the Management Response system to Evaluations. Once responses have been submitted, follow-up is not required. In this case, the information available from GED dates from June 2015. Responses from PARDEV, PROGRAMME and some ILO Country Offices were missing, but PARDEV agreed to address the recommendations and provide information regarding these.

**Table 2. Management response to Recommendations from the previous evaluation of Outcome 17 (2012-13)**

	Recommendation	Status (Action to be taken / Progress made)
	ILO Headquarters	
1	<p>Focus: GED Priority: High</p> <p>GED should ensure that greater conceptual clarity on gender mainstreaming is reflected in all its documents and reports as well as reinforced in the ILO Gender Action Plan and other corporate documents on programming, monitoring, and evaluation. The evaluator recommends that if the term 'gender specific' is retained it should be used to indicate 'affirmative action'-type activities which are part of the overall gender mainstreaming strategy and not as now seems to be the case projects of funds managed by GED</p>	<p>Partially completed</p> <p><b>Action to be taken:</b> Continue in-house advocacy and capacity building on gender mainstreaming, gender equality and non-discrimination in the world of work. The Norway and Sweden PAs provide a structure whereby, through the process of collaboration between GED and the partner units, gender issues are becoming more structurally embedded in the work of these departments. The concept of gender mainstreaming is defined by the ILO gender policy 1999, and as regards development cooperation by a decision of the Governing Body of March, 2005. The results of the currently on-going evaluation of the ILO Gender Action Plan will provide further opportunities for strengthening conceptual clarity and corporate documents, and reinforcing gender mainstreaming, including reinforced technical interventions to achieve improved gender equality and non-discrimination through targeted action.</p> <p><b>Progress made:</b> Progress has been made, with PROGRAMME, in increasing conceptual clarity, gender-responsiveness and the operationalization of the gender mainstreaming policy through the 2016-17 Programme and Budget, including its enhanced indicator framework. The Women at Work centenary initiative is increasing visibility of the gender-specific work and enabling the ILO to focus on selected key areas.</p>
2	<p>Focus: GED Priority: High</p> <p>GED should ensure that ILOs commitment to mainstreaming equality in all ILO technical cooperation projects clearly articulated by the Governing Body in 2005 is more robustly</p>	<p>Partially completed</p>



## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

	and explicitly integrated across all Decent Work Outcomes in the Programme and Budget and more explicitly referenced in measurement criteria.	<p><b>Action to be taken:</b> GED has worked, and continues to work to ensure that all Outcomes of the 2016-17 Programme and Budget more robustly and effectively reflect gender issues, with a particular focus on indicators. This is important as technical cooperation projects are explicitly linked to the P&amp;B indicators.</p> <p><b>Progress made:</b> The 2016-17 P&amp;B was designed to ensure that gender issues are better reflected and the indicators for each of the outcomes were revised, with most of them now making specific reference to gender. The principle of gender-equality and non-discrimination is one of the cross-cutting drivers under the P&amp;B, with specific attention to women from disadvantaged groups.</p>
3	<p>Focus: GED Priority: High</p> <p>On the basis of experience in gender mainstreaming and technical cooperation under the Pas and elsewhere, GED should now elaborate in consultation with the gender network more explicit guidelines as to what gender mainstreaming could and should entail at macro-meso-micro levels for each Outcome. This gender analysis framework should be included in the revised ILO Action Plan on Gender Equality and elsewhere with its complementarity to existing tools such as the PGA clearly articulated.</p>	<p>Partially completed</p> <p><b>Action to be taken:</b> GED plans to develop guidance material in cooperation with partner units and field specialists (e.g. during the Inter-regional Gender Learning Forum in October 2015), regarding gender mainstreaming under each of the 10 Outcomes in the 2016-17 P&amp;B. This will facilitate the development of specific, measurable outputs and activities that will enhance the effectiveness of each Outcome from a gender perspective.</p> <p><b>Progress made:</b> The work is underway and will be complete by the end of 2015</p>
4	<p>Focus: GED Priority: High</p> <p>GED should ensure that future guidelines and tools to be issued to enhance gender mainstreaming in the ILO and amongst partners and stakeholders should clearly reflect that gender mainstreaming is understood a being inextricable from the RBM process. Whilst it is necessary that activities themselves are mainstreamed through sex-disaggregation, equal participation, and substantive attention to gender equality issues (equal remuneration, gender stereotyping, work-life balance, sexual violence, maternity protection, etc.) gender mainstreaming needs a solid baseline and should be reflected in results and consequences beyond the specific activity.</p>	<p>Partially completed</p> <p><b>Action to be taken:</b> Communicating the ILO policy that gender mainstreaming is inextricable from the RBM process, i.e. that promoting gender equality ought to be an integral aspect of all ILO actions and, is the central objective of GED's work under the Sweden and Norway Partnership Agreements, and indeed of GED's broader mandate. This also involves working with key units in HQ and the field to ensure that all ILO tools, guidelines and directives etc. reflect this ILO policy.</p> <p><b>Progress made:</b> N/A</p> <p>Comment: by its very nature, this is a work-in-progress</p>
5	<p>Focus: GED Priority: Medium</p> <p>GED should advocate for the Participatory Gender Audit (PGA) which has been used extensively and successfully with constituents to be implemented for internal capacity-building</p>	<p><b>Progress made:</b> The PGA methodology is being used in Mongolia in 2015, and with the UN Country Team in Ghana in 2015. The ITC-ILO Turin is carrying out capacity building on gender equality and diversity and training of gender audit facilitators.</p>
6	Focus: GED Priority: High	Partially completed

## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

	<p>GED should collaborate (with PARDEV) to ensure that the project appraisal process is carried out as described in the Partnership documents ('an in-depth examination of the quality of design in terms of overall logic, the results chain between the different levels of the logical framework, the measurability of results based on the proposed indicators, gender responsiveness, and the extent to which a project provides value for money') with attention to all the dimensions relevant to gender mainstreaming at the field office level. This would include embedding the activities in the DWCP; stakeholder involvement; detailing of gender mainstreaming capacity at the country office level' ILO office collaboration with the UNDAF framework, and a broad range of national stakeholders and development partners.</p>	<p><b>Action to be taken:</b> GED does assist the APPRAISAL unit in PARDEV to ensure that ILO projects are gender responsive through proposing revisions to specific projects that are shared with it. Moreover each new DWCP is reviewed by GED as part of the Quality Assurance Mechanism process. GED plans to undertake training of the appraisal unit to enhance its capacity to appraise projects from a gender perspective. In respect of upcoming new DWCPs, emphasis will placed on highlighting the responsibility of field offices and HQ units concerned for ensuring gender mainstreaming.</p> <p><b>Progress made:</b> ITC-ILO Turin includes training on gender in its project cycle management training programme, and also conducts a biennial Gender Academy. ILO field offices, often with support from GED, participate in the UNCT gender theme groups and in UNDAF related processes.</p>
7	<p>Focus: GED Priority: High</p> <p>GED needs to ensure that activities under GLO777 at Headquarters and field levels are clearly planned for and reported on.</p>	<p>Completed</p> <p><b>Action to be taken:</b> They are reported under the Programme Implementation Report and under the Norway and Sweden PA progress reports.</p>
8	<p>Focus: GED Priority: Medium</p> <p>GED should work to expand and strengthen through training and technical assistance the gender network at field and HQ levels. ILO staff who have already been working on gender mainstreaming under the PAs but who are not part of the gender network should be the front line for expansion of capacity building.</p>	<p>Partially completed</p> <p><b>Progress made:</b> GED will host an Inter-regional Gender Learning Forum in October 2015, bringing together key members of the gender network, both from HQ and the field. This meeting will look at a range of issues including strategic planning and will involve capacity building</p>
9	<p>Focus: GED Priority: High</p> <p>GED should recognize and build upon the excellent work ongoing at regional and country-levels by undertaking more structured and pro-active experience exchange. This could take the form of thematic studies, internet conferences, and more inclusive gender fora at regional levels.</p>	<p>Partially completed</p> <p><b>Action to be taken:</b> The participation of GED and gender field specialists in the newly established WorkQuality Global Technical Team will be used to disseminate information on and experiences from the work under the Norway and Sweden partnerships. The planned revamping of the ILO's thematic portal on gender equality and the GED webpage will be used to communicate generated knowledge, good practices and results. The Women at Work centenary initiative will allow for region-specific discussions and exchanges, while it is also planned to hold an Inter-regional Gender Learning Forum in one of the regions in the next biennium.</p>

Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

		<p><b>Progress made:</b> There is now a more structured exchange of experiences between the regions under the Norway and Sweden Partnerships, with the CTA in Geneva acting as the hub in sharing information between regions, and with the establishment of a regional team structure in GED. The Inter-regional Gender Learning Forum in October 2015 will bring together HQ and field specialists as well as gender coordinators, placing work in the regions at the center.</p>															
10	<p>Focus: GED Priority: High GED needs to develop with the BASIC countries concerned more specific project documentation at the individual country level and a clear framework for South-South Cooperation.</p>	<p>No information available</p>															
11	<p>Focus: PARDEV Priority: High PARDEV should ensure that the appraisal process for gender mainstreaming proposals is rigorously carried out to help ensure the quality of documentation and activities.</p>	<p><b>Action to be taken:</b> This is ensured through the appraisal process and by using the appraisal checklist. The appraisal process ensures that technical and design standards have been met, results-based management has been applied, that the proposals contribute to achieving ILO's priorities and Decent Work Country Programme outcomes and comply with donor criteria. To carry out this analytical assessment of the design of programme and project proposals, appraisers use the Appraisal Checklist, composed of 12 appraisal criteria, among which gender mainstreaming is assessed both in the background analysis and in the body of the project logical framework.</p> <p>See a description of the appraisal criteria on points 4.1 and 4.2 below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="898 818 2032 1279"> <tr> <th colspan="3" style="background-color: #d9e1f2;">4. Gender mainstreaming<sup>3</sup></th> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 30%;">4.1 Does the background analysis contain a gender analysis?</td> <td style="width: 50%;"> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal makes clear reference to existing gender roles, division of labour, opportunities and constraints for women and men to access and control resources, and women's' and men's' different practical and strategic needs.</li> <li>The data are sex-disaggregated to substantiate the background analysis.</li> </ul> </td> <td style="width: 20%;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3"><b>Comments:</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.2 Is gender equality mainstreamed in the logical framework of the project?</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gender equality is reflected at the level of immediate objectives and outputs.</li> <li>There are provisions for gender-specific action (through expertise and funding).</li> <li>The indicators are gender-sensitive and the targets are disaggregated by sex.</li> </ul> </td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3"><b>Comments:</b></td> </tr> </table> <p>During the appraisal process, gender specialists are informed and subsequently review and comment on DC proposals, with the view to include gender considerations in the design of project documents.</p>	4. Gender mainstreaming <sup>3</sup>			4.1 Does the background analysis contain a gender analysis?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal makes clear reference to existing gender roles, division of labour, opportunities and constraints for women and men to access and control resources, and women's' and men's' different practical and strategic needs.</li> <li>The data are sex-disaggregated to substantiate the background analysis.</li> </ul>		<b>Comments:</b>			4.2 Is gender equality mainstreamed in the logical framework of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gender equality is reflected at the level of immediate objectives and outputs.</li> <li>There are provisions for gender-specific action (through expertise and funding).</li> <li>The indicators are gender-sensitive and the targets are disaggregated by sex.</li> </ul>		<b>Comments:</b>		
4. Gender mainstreaming <sup>3</sup>																	
4.1 Does the background analysis contain a gender analysis?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal makes clear reference to existing gender roles, division of labour, opportunities and constraints for women and men to access and control resources, and women's' and men's' different practical and strategic needs.</li> <li>The data are sex-disaggregated to substantiate the background analysis.</li> </ul>																
<b>Comments:</b>																	
4.2 Is gender equality mainstreamed in the logical framework of the project?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gender equality is reflected at the level of immediate objectives and outputs.</li> <li>There are provisions for gender-specific action (through expertise and funding).</li> <li>The indicators are gender-sensitive and the targets are disaggregated by sex.</li> </ul>																
<b>Comments:</b>																	

		<p>Furthermore, due to the participation at the <a href="#">Gender Academy</a>, conducted by the International Training Centre of the ILO, aimed at increasing awareness of gender equality principles, appraisers of DC projects have been able to gain knowledge and share best practices in the field of gender mainstreaming, as well as consider and incorporate gender issues in project budgeting, monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p><b>Progress made:</b> <u>Gender-sensitive projects and programmes:</u> Percentage of project and programme proposals classified in IRIS as development cooperation gender marker 3 (“includes gender equality in at least one outcome statement as well as in at least some outputs and activities”) or 4 (“main stated objective is to promote gender equality, and outcomes, outputs and activities are designed to promote gender equality”) Target: 35% Baseline (2014–15): 27%</p> <p><b>32% (From Jan 2016 – Jan 2017)</b></p> <p>This percentage is calculated by the ILO gender equality markers. The markers are a one-digit code (on a 1 to 4 scale) used to assess whether or not ILO development cooperation projects and programmes are designed in a gender-sensitive manner in order to address the needs of women and men as ultimate beneficiaries of development actions. The selection of gender markers takes place during the appraisal procedure (explained on point 2 below); in addition, the selection and alignment to a gender marker is a compulsory step to create a project in the OGA system, <a href="#">Integrated Resource Information System (IRIS)</a>. Gender markers are defined as indicated in the table below:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="961 854 1965 1175"> <thead> <tr> <th>Name</th> <th>Description</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>GENDER_EQUALITY_MARKER_01</td> <td>Project contains no objectives, outcomes, outputs or activities that aim to promote gender equality</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GENDER_EQUALITY_MARKER_02</td> <td>Project does not include gender equality as an outcome, but some outputs and/or activities specifically address gender issues</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GENDER_EQUALITY_MARKER_03</td> <td>Project includes gender equality in the outcome(s), and some outputs/activities specifically address gender issues</td> </tr> <tr> <td>GENDER_EQUALITY_MARKER_04</td> <td>Project’s main stated objective is to promote gender equality, and outcomes, outputs and activities are designed to promote gender equality</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Name	Description	GENDER_EQUALITY_MARKER_01	Project contains no objectives, outcomes, outputs or activities that aim to promote gender equality	GENDER_EQUALITY_MARKER_02	Project does not include gender equality as an outcome, but some outputs and/or activities specifically address gender issues	GENDER_EQUALITY_MARKER_03	Project includes gender equality in the outcome(s), and some outputs/activities specifically address gender issues	GENDER_EQUALITY_MARKER_04	Project’s main stated objective is to promote gender equality, and outcomes, outputs and activities are designed to promote gender equality
Name	Description											
GENDER_EQUALITY_MARKER_01	Project contains no objectives, outcomes, outputs or activities that aim to promote gender equality											
GENDER_EQUALITY_MARKER_02	Project does not include gender equality as an outcome, but some outputs and/or activities specifically address gender issues											
GENDER_EQUALITY_MARKER_03	Project includes gender equality in the outcome(s), and some outputs/activities specifically address gender issues											
GENDER_EQUALITY_MARKER_04	Project’s main stated objective is to promote gender equality, and outcomes, outputs and activities are designed to promote gender equality											
12	<p>Focus: PARDEV Priority: Medium</p> <p>PARDEV is recommended to develop a project reporting template which gives more scope of analysis and synergies and is experienced as more user-friendly by country offices. This should be done in consultation with field offices. If the current reporting process is maintained, reporting formats</p>	<p>The structure of the reporting template has been maintained as both outcome-based funding donors supporting Outcome 17 (Sida and the Norwegian MFA) expressed appreciation for the consolidated narrative reports that have been provided.</p>										

## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

	need to be modified to all for a more analytical presentation of gender mainstreaming activities in their context; to allow for synergies and shortfalls to be presented, and for more cross-referencing between reports of gender mainstreaming across Outcomes other than Outcome 17.	However, in order to take into account the evaluation's funding and recommendations, PARDEV has more systematically presented the gender mainstreaming work including specific boxes and special focuses on gender mainstreaming under the sections on Outcomes other than Outcome 17.
13	Focus: PARDEV and PROGRAMME Priority: Medium More consideration needs to be given to the interface and complementarity between different reporting systems to reduce duplication of effort at field level.	PARDEV and PROGRAMME have worked together in order to develop joint procedures for collecting inputs for consolidated narrative reports of outcome-based funding partnership programmes with Sida, the Norwegian MFA and Irish Aid.  In practice, some specific options of ILO's Integrated Resource Information System (IRIS) have systematically been used in order to collect information on Country Programme Outcomes' (CPOs) results for progress narrative reports. On the other hand, key information on CPOs' results for final reports have been collected from the ILO's Programme Implementation Report.  These modalities for collecting reporting information have helped to reduce duplication of effort, in particular at the field level.
14	Focus: PROGRAMME Priority: Medium The RBM process needs to be strengthened in the ILO overall by clearer inclusion of the full process beginning with identification of activities at the country level and clearly linked to P&B Outcomes. This process needs to be reflected, <i>inter alia</i> , in development of fuller log-frame matrices to be periodically reviewed and updated.	No information available
	ILO Regional and Country Offices	
15	Focus: ILO Country Offices Priority: High ILO country office management should ensure that all staff including short-term gender specialists and NPCs are familiar with Outcome-based work planning and with RBM processes and how these relate to the DWCP	No information available
16	Focus: ILO Country Offices Priority: High ILO country office management should ensure that gender mainstreaming is integral to the DWCP and embedded in the UNDAF where available.	No information available
17	Focus: ILO Country Offices Priority: High ILO country office management should ensure overall coordination and management of mainstreaming activities grounded in the DWCP.	No information available

Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

Most of the follow-up information to the above recommendations were said to be in progress or to have been addressed, yet the evaluator found that some of the issues raised in the previous evaluation were still relevant at the time of this evaluation. These are highlighted in the table below.

<p><b>Assessment of Management Response to Recommendation 1:</b></p>	<p><i>Progress has been made in the form of the Programme and Budget, 2016-17.</i> A review of the P&amp;B 2016-17, as well as the ILO Action Plan for Gender Equality 2016-17 reveals that progress in this regard has been very limited. According to these key documents, “Gender mainstreaming” tends to use a very restrictive definition and seems to be equated to furthering the rights of women, or focuses on providing sex-disaggregated data, rather than take a more inclusive approach to gender as championed through the PRIDE initiative. This is reflected in the Aims and strategy of the ILO Action Plan for Gender Equality 2016-17: “The Action Plan seeks to help achieve, through a mainstreaming strategy, women’s equality in the world of work and their empowerment” (p. 3). An inclusive definition of Gender, and the concepts related to “Gender mainstreaming”, “Gender-specific”, etc. need to be further detailed by GED and fully reflected in the ILO’s Programme and policy documents.</p> <p>According to GED, The Evaluation of the Action Plan provided important guidance moving forward, and resulted in a strong commitment by the Governing Body as well as the ILO Director-General to advancing this work. As a result, the current Action Plan has a stronger accountability framework, including at the highest levels of the Office.</p>
<p><b>Assessment of Management Response to Recommendation 2:</b></p>	<p><i>Gender issues are better reflected in the 2016-17 P&amp;B: “... the indicators for each of the outcomes were revised, with most of them now making specific references to gender”.</i> Only four indicators (1.2, 1.3, 4.3 and 6.3) have a specific reference to gender or women, while 10 results criteria include gender or women specifically. Again, more work needs to be done, so that an inclusive approach to gender be taken and operationalized through the P&amp;B.</p> <p>At GED’s request, and following from a recommendation from the Independent Evaluation of the ILO Action Plan for Gender Equality 2010-15, GED is now represented in each outcome teams, and has been very active in the P&amp;B process. This should ensure that gender equality is a concern for outcome teams, that may have a tendency to primarily focus on the core area of the outcome they are responsible for.</p>

Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

	<p>On integrating gender equality into CPOs, there is now a gender marker, which has been designed by PROGRAMME in collaboration with GED. GED also now reviews all TC projects over 1MUSD, and is doing a series of webinars on mainstreaming gender into TC projects.</p>
<p><b>Assessment of Management Response to Recommendation 4</b></p>	<p>Under the new ILO Action Plan for Gender Equality 2016-17, the focus is on giving the “business owners” more responsibility over gender issues, with GED having a role in coordinating and supporting them. Mainstreaming needs to be an Office-wide responsibility, as set out in the Gender Policy, and the new Action Plan seeks to reinforce this aspect.</p>
<p><b>Assessment of Management Response to Recommendation 7:</b></p>	<p><i>Activities under GLO 777 at headquarters and field levels are reported under the Programme Implementation Report and under the Norway and Sweden PA progress reports.</i> The information in these documents is not sufficient to review or monitor the achievement of activities, as this evaluation has clearly shown. A more integrated document showing causal links, indicators, activities, and specific results/outputs based on a RBM approach is necessary.</p>
<p><b>Assessment of Management Response to Recommendation 8:</b></p>	<p>It is unclear what the outcome of the meeting has been.</p>
<p><b>Assessment of Management Response to Recommendation 9:</b></p>	<p>A more sustainable approach should be taken, especially as funding for the CTA has ceased.</p>
<p><b>Assessment of Management Response to Recommendation 10</b></p>	<p>No information is provided, and this issue should have been addressed, even if the projects have now ended, as this recommendation could also apply to future projects.</p>
<p><b>Assessment of Management Response to Recommendation 12:</b></p>	<p><i>PARDEV has more systematically presented the gender mainstreaming work including specific boxes and special focuses on gender mainstreaming under the sections on Outcomes other than Outcome 17.</i> A more consolidated approach, providing specific space for analysis of opportunities, challenges and synergies specifically related to gender issues would facilitate sharing of information, and building on synergies.</p> <p>The findings from this evaluation echo the Independent Evaluation of the ILO Action Plan for Gender Equality, 2010-15 (2016), which suggested that there was an under-reporting of</p>

Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

	achievements on gender equality, due to the structure of the reporting frameworks – in particular, the Programme Implementation Reports.
<b>Assessment of Management Response to Recommendation 13:</b>	The challenges faced during this evaluation reveal that further work should be done to address this recommendation, in order to provide a more complete reporting mechanism.
<b>Assessment of Management Response to Recommendation 14:</b>	While no information regarding progress is provided, this recommendation still holds true.
<b>Assessment of Management Response to Recommendations 15-17</b>	ILO Regional and Country Offices should ensure that information regarding progress is provided.

While follow-up is not required once responses have been entered, it is highly recommended that recommendations noted as being in progress, and those that haven't been addressed be verified and completed after a specified amount of time.



---

## Conclusions

This evaluation has found that the interventions supported by Norway and Sweden to promote gender mainstreaming, as well as the BASIC and PRIDE Projects were strategically relevant to Outcome 17, and coherent with the wider ILO P&B strategy.

The flexible approach to gender mainstreaming, based on creating synergies and complementing work from other Outcomes (5, 9, 10, 11, 14, 18, 19) and the Area of Critical Importance (ACI 2) was found to lead to positive results, both in terms of achieving specific outputs in collaboration with constituents, and in sensitizing ILO officials to gender issues.

Most of the initiatives reviewed in this evaluation built on existing work by the ILO, through funding of previous phases by the donors, and responded to demands from constituents, thus maximizing the potential for success, and allowing for the replication, and up-scaling of certain activities and approaches, including through knowledge-sharing between countries. This was particularly the case for the BASIC project, as well as certain activities under the Global Product, which furthered work initiated in specific countries.

Funding from Norway and Sweden led to changes in legislation, policies, and a shift in attitudes of workers, employers, governments and civil society regarding gender equality and discrimination in the workplace, leading to important impacts in the countries and regions involved. While progress may be incremental, these shifts in perspective will help create the base for further change and promote sustainability.

The PRIDE Project was innovative and highly relevant to the mandate of the ILO, as well as the priorities of the donor and the UN community. It brought the ILO at the forefront of the United Nations organizations with regards to the advancement of Gender rights and non-discrimination in the world of work.

Funding PRIDE has also given Norway a positive reputation as being the sole ILO donor focused on rights issues as they relate to these communities. Considering that the monetary outlay for PRIDE programming over the course of Norway's PA was not overly cumbersome, funding future related initiatives provides both the ILO and donor with considerably more positive visibility, at limited cost, while ensuring that the rights of minority communities are respected.

The PRIDE Project has laid a sound foundational basis for future programming activities to take place. However, it appears that continued funding for issues of LGBT rights in the workplace may be unavailable. This would be a significant loss, for the interventions supported through the PRIDE Project were highly significant in terms of providing a voice for traditionally disadvantaged groups in terms of rights in the workplace. The ILO, through Norwegian support, has provided a voice for the LGBT community in this context, and withdrawing this support would result in abandoning a core human rights initiative that has already been successful.

Furthermore, the release of the reports, and their positive reception by both country governments and worker/employer organizations, underline that they are ready to move forward with concrete actions, through both enactment and/or enforcement of legislation or policies, that will serve to further secure LGBT rights and non-discrimination practices in the world of work. This strong momentum would likely be lost, or at the very least delayed, if additional resources to support the rights of LGBT workers are not available.

## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

Following from this, the challenge will be to ensure that policy-making stakeholders have the appropriate technical support to build upon the positive work already done. It is thus essential that the efforts spearheaded by GED with the support of Norway continue, in order to build on the momentum gained in the regions, and to foster support internally as well.

Related to these efforts, the work done at the ILO internally should also continue. In particular, the recommendations from the PRIDE internal survey should be acted upon by HRD and the Staff Union, in order to foster a culture of inclusiveness within the organization.

In terms of project management, several shortcomings related to the design, implementation, and monitoring and reporting of the interventions associated with Outcome 17 under the Norway and Sweden PAs, were identified during the evaluation process.

In the majority of cases, the use of comprehensive workplans linked to the different Outcomes supported (as relevant), logframes and detailed results framework was limited, creating challenges to evaluate the work achieved. The programme documents and reporting documents do not show clear links between the different levels of progression, from the activities, to outputs, to outcomes, and the risks and assumptions were very generic, thus limiting their value. Furthermore, while it is evident that GED staff at HQ and in the field provided ample support to the different interventions, their specific contributions were not clear from the documentation provided.

This shortcoming is exacerbated by the fact that the projects had ended and thus some staff funded by the project were no longer working for the ILO, with a loss of some of the institutional memory. Once a staff member leaves, the data collected during their involvement at the ILO often leaves with them, or becomes very difficult to find. Thus, the use of a systematic filing mechanism and repository within current ILO systems would be beneficial to overcome such challenges.

Although the donors' requirements regarding monitoring and reporting are limited, the ILO could benefit from having more rigorous, and more frequent reporting frameworks in place. Currently, the use of progress and final reports to the donors and Programme Implementation Reports do not allow for critical and comprehensive analysis of results achieved, nor the identification of opportunities, and challenges. This limits the scope for improvement and discussion around possible synergies.

Finally, the development of an adequate understanding of gender mainstreaming requires clarity on the related concepts of gender and equality. It seems, however, that there is some confusion regarding these concepts in the ILO, and that the different terminologies used in the context of gender-related discrimination in the world of work would benefit from clarification at the institutional level.

## Lessons learned

- The use of Outcome-based funding of several Outcomes provides flexibility and potential for synergies and collaborations, thus reducing the silo mentality often present in UN organizations.

## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

- Taking risks and focusing on politically sensitive topics related to the world of work, such as LGBT rights, can increase the ILO's visibility and contribute to the protection of human rights. By partnering with Norway on the PRIDE Project, the ILO positioned itself as a champion of human rights in the context of Decent Work, and contributed to the wider UN effort to integrate SOGI into the human rights and non-discrimination framework. This shows the importance of being open to new and innovative initiatives by ILO departments, even if they may be politically sensitive in some regions.
- More positive and effective outcomes related to gender equality are likely to be achieved in countries that are more progressive on social issues, and this should be taken into account when selecting countries where interventions will take place, in order to maximize potential for success.
- Creating forums in which stakeholders can come together can help to promote gender rights in the workplace

### Emerging good practice

- Using research as an entry point to influence social norms and practices. The PRIDE Project showed that conducting and disseminating research on potentially sensitive issues, could lead to open dialogue around these issues and create an impetus for change.
- The example of the public awareness campaign supported by Outcome 17 in El Salvador could serve as a good model of establishing information sharing systems or mechanisms to more effectively engage the public regarding equality in the world of work, leading to policy change.

## Recommendations

Several recommendations stem from the findings and conclusions of this evaluation:

Recommendation	Responsible units	Priority	Resource implications	Timing
1. The first two phases of the PRIDE project have laid the groundwork for positive change regarding the rights of LGBT men and women in the workplace. GED and PARDEV should secure new funding to keep the momentum going, so that the ILO remains a champion of human rights in the world of work. Funds could also be sought at the Country Level, with technical assistance from HQ and the Regional Offices, as needed.	GED / PARDEV / DDG/FOP	High	Medium	Within current biennium
2. GED should encourage HRD to follow-up on the PRIDE Internal Survey Recommendations, to allow the ILO to provide a more inclusive work environment for its staff. This could be done with the support of the Staff Union.	GED / HRD	High	Limited	Within current biennium
3. To facilitate autonomy in the allocation of funds, and lessen the administrative burden on GED staff at headquarters, GED should consistently consider the possibility of further decentralizing funds to regional offices in the case of initiatives promoting gender equality and non-discrimination at the country level, when the local capacity to administer these funds is available.	GED	High	Limited	Within current biennium
4. Although gender issues have been addressed to a certain extent in the development of the 2016-17 P&B, more work needs to be done by building on the work done through PRIDE, so that an inclusive approach to gender be taken within the ILO, and operationalized through the P&B. In particular, the understanding of concepts related to gender mainstreaming and equality could be more systematically introduced and clarified at an institutional level through HRD and the International Training Centre courses, with inputs from GED. This should subsequently be fully reflected in the ILO's Programme and policy documents. The current ILO Action Plan for Gender Equality 2016-17 includes indicators on capacity building and training but could go further, by also systematically defining such terms for the users, and considering specific references to challenges faced by LGBT women and men in the workplace.	GED / PROGRAMME / HRD / ITC	High	Low	In the next biennium

Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

<p>5. GED should provide more substantive guidance and technical advice to colleagues in the field, in order to fully incorporate gender concerns into their work, and assist them in considering opportunities and challenges associated with specific country-contexts more systematically.</p>	<p>GED</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Within current biennium</p>
<p>6. Project design and implementation, including monitoring and reporting mechanisms, should be strengthened. While some work has been done to incorporate theories of change, and logical frameworks in project and programme documents, systematically defining and describing a clear causal chain in these documents, having baseline information, and identifying specific risks would improve the design and implementation of interventions. This should be included as an institutional requirement in monitoring and reporting – even when this is not required by the donor – so that areas of strengths and weaknesses can be identified, reviewed, and updated, leading to a more critical analysis of the situation and better management of the interventions. As a result, a better RBM approach can be implemented at all levels of the ILO’s results frameworks.</p>	<p>PROGRAMME / PARDEV / Technical Departments</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Within current and next biennia</p>
<p>7. To support institutional memory, knowledge management, and access to information and avoid to duplication of efforts, the reporting systems at headquarters and in the field, should be reviewed at all levels. To this end, a simple document management system and repository would facilitate this work.</p>	<p>PARDEV / PROGRAMME / technical departments</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Next biennium</p>
<p>8. The Management Response mechanism to Recommendations from Evaluations should be updated periodically by EVAL, until recurring recommendations (i.e. those which are highlighted repeatedly in the Annual Evaluation Reports) have been addressed.</p>	<p>EVAL</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Within current and next biennia</p>

---

## Annex I: Lessons Learned

### ILO Lesson Learned Template

**Project Title: Independent Evaluation of the P&B Outcome 17  
(Discrimination in employment and occupation is eliminated)**

**Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/14/58/NOR; GLO/12/52/NOR**

**Name of Evaluator: Magali Bonne-Moreau**

**Date: June 2017**

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

LL Element	Text
<b>Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)</b>	<p><b>The use of Outcome-based funding of several Outcomes provides flexibility and potential for synergies and collaborations around mainstreaming issues, thus reducing the silo mentality often present in UN organizations.</b></p> <p>The use of different types of lightly-earmarked, or non-earmarked funding to supplement or complement existing initiatives could be replicated in the future. This is an effective way to promote adoption of cross-cutting issues in the work done at the ILO, and to foster inter-departmental collaborations.</p>
<b>Context and any related preconditions</b>	<p>This applies to the mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues in the ILO. Relevant funds should be available, and regular meetings between all parties should be organized</p>
<b>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</b>	<p>GED and other ILO departments / Units responsible for the different Outcomes.</p>
<b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>	<p>In the context of gender mainstreaming in the ILO, departments and units should pro-actively integrate the concepts into their everyday work, rather than waiting for specific funding to be provided, or leaving the gender aspects to be developed solely by GED. Silo mentality may still remain.</p>
<b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>	<p>Effective collaboration between GED and ILO departments and regional offices through Outcome-based funding has strengthened collaborations around the topic of gender mainstreaming, gender rights, and non-discrimination in the workplace.</p>

<p><b>ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)</b></p>	<p>Branches responsible for the Outcomes should be involved in the planning and design from the outset. Monitoring and reporting should be done comprehensively so as to reflect the implications of all parties involved.</p>
--	--

## ILO Lesson Learned Template

**Project Title: Independent Evaluation of the P&B Outcome 17 (Discrimination in employment and occupation is eliminated)**  
**Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/14/58/NOR; GLO/12/52/NOR**

**Name of Evaluator: Magali Bonne-Moreau**  
**Date: June 2017**

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

LL Element	Text
<p><b>Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)</b></p>	<p><b>Taking risks and focusing on politically sensitive topics related to the world of work, such as LGBT rights, can increase the ILO’s visibility and contribute to the protection of human rights</b></p> <p>By partnering with Norway on the PRIDE Project, the ILO positioned itself as a champion of human rights in the context of Decent Work, and contributed to the wider UN effort to integrate SOGI into the human rights and non-discrimination framework. This shows the importance of being open to new and innovative initiatives by ILO departments, even if they may be politically sensitive in some regions.</p>
<p><b>Context and any related preconditions</b></p>	<p>Support from the donor was essential in this endeavor, as well as an emerging political informed approach to the selection of pilot and target countries, to maximize the chance of sustainable change and ownership of the interventions.</p>
<p><b>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</b></p>	<p>ILO branches and tripartite constituents working on rights issues; vulnerable groups.</p>
<p><b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b></p>	<p>Potential resistance to politically sensitive topics from constituents in certain countries, as well as from some ILO staff</p>

Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

<b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>	An informed and flexible approach to the selection of pilot and target countries, in collaboration with the regional offices, helped to maximize chances of success. Both formal and informal collaborations with other UN agencies also helped to further the cause of LGBT rights in the workplace.
<b>ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)</b>	No clear area in the P&B where specific measures could be included



## ILO Lesson Learned Template

**Project Title: Independent Evaluation of the P&B Outcome 17  
(Discrimination in employment and occupation is eliminated)**

**Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/14/58/NOR; GLO/12/52/NOR**

**Name of Evaluator: Magali Bonne-Moreau**

**Date: June 2017**

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

LL Element	Text
<b>Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)</b>	<p><b>More positive and effective outcomes related to gender equality are likely to be achieved in countries that are more progressive on social issues</b></p> <p>This was especially true for the PRIDE project, and reflects the idea that the selection of countries in areas where interest was expressed by constituents facilitated the implementation of new initiatives</p>
<b>Context and any related preconditions</b>	<p>The project is focusing on identifying the existing data and knowledge base of governments, employers' and workers' organizations and civil society on discrimination faced by LGBT women and men in the world of work. The research is exploring the underlying causes of discrimination faced by LGBT workers, and identifying examples of good practices to overcome them. There are societies in which this topic meets resistance.</p> <p>It is thus important to consider the account the current legal framework and social partners' openness to the issue (as evidenced by government, trade union and employer organizations' resolutions and policies) when choosing target countries.</p>
<b>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</b>	ILO staff and constituents; LGBT women and men
<b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>	In some cases, changes in government priorities, and or at the individual decision-making level created unforeseen sustainable situations (e.g. South Africa). In addition, certain member states are reluctant to address LGBT issues, and it may endanger the position of the ILO to do so.

Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

<p><b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b></p>	<p>Flexibility in terms of target country selection and knowledge of the socio-political situation on the ground are essential. Cases where constituents and other international organizations were already involved in creating similar change were most successful.</p> <p>Taking different entry-points relevant to the local context allowed for positive results (e.g. fundamental rights at work; non-discrimination in the context of HIV/AIDS)</p>
<p><b>ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)</b></p>	<p>The ILO should ensure that LGBT concerns are integrated in the design and implementation of the decent work agenda and DWCPs; as such, “gender” equality should be defined in a more inclusive manner.</p>

## ILO Lesson Learned Template

**Project Title: Independent Evaluation of the P&B Outcome 17 (Discrimination in employment and occupation is eliminated)**  
**Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/14/58/NOR; GLO/12/52/NOR**

**Name of Evaluator: Magali Bonne-Moreau**

**Date: June 2017**

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

LL Element	Text
<p><b>Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)</b></p>	<p><b>Creating forums in which stakeholders can come together can help to promote gender rights in the workplace</b></p> <p>One of the key pillars related to work on Outcome 17 in South Africa was the establishment of a Gender Task Force, comprised of members from three labour unions brought together to organize and promote women’s rights in the workplace.</p> <p>Prior to its creation, South African union members from different organizations rarely communicated with one another on these issues. This could be extended to employers’ organizations as well.</p>
<p><b>Context and any related preconditions</b></p>	<p>Willingness of unions and other groups to collaborate around a common goal</p>
<p><b>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</b></p>	<p>Workers’ organizations, employers’ organizations, women</p>

Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

<b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>	This might be limited by individual / political agendas, if a common objective is not at the centre of discussions
<b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>	Effective collaboration between the Country Office and national constituent groups, with support from GED and ILO departments and regional offices when needed.
<b>ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)</b>	

Annex II Emerging Good Practices

**ILO Emerging Good Practice Template**

**Project Title: Independent Evaluation of the P&B Outcome 17  
(Discrimination in employment and occupation is eliminated)**

**Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/14/58/NOR; GLO/12/52/NOR**

**Name of Evaluator: Magali Bonne-Moreau**

**Date: June 2017**

The following emerging good practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.

<b>GP Element</b>	<b>Text</b>
<b>Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)</b>	<p>Using research as an entry point to influence social norms and practices.</p> <p>The PRIDE Project showed that conducting and disseminating research on rights issues, could lead to open dialogue around these issues and create an impetus for change.</p> <p>Placing LGBT rights within a context of promoting diversity and equality, at the workplace, and/or as an issue of fundamental rights facilitates buy-in to the Project on the part of constituents</p>
<b>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</b>	<p>This approach seems applicable and appropriate in contexts where the ILO works to promote the rights of vulnerable workers. One condition that facilitated success was the selection of pilot countries where there was an interest expressed by constituents.</p>
<b>Establish a clear cause-effect relationship</b>	<p>Evidence from PRIDE shows that research on sensitive topics allows for an open dialogue with constituents, as well as representative of vulnerable groups. Inviting the different actors to the table to present research results leads to improved sensitization around the topic of focus in a manner which does not threaten social norms and practices.</p>
<b>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</b>	<p>Public awareness (of constituents) on challenges and opportunities faced by vulnerable groups in the workplace</p>
<b>Potential for replication and by whom</b>	<p>Other ILO global products and CPOs working to promote the rights of vulnerable workers.</p>
<b>Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)</b>	

<b>Other documents or relevant comments</b>	
---	--

### ILO Emerging Good Practice Template

**Project Title: Independent Evaluation of the P&B Outcome 17  
(Discrimination in employment and occupation is eliminated)**

**Project TC/SYMBOL: GLO/14/58/NOR; GLO/12/52/NOR**

**Name of Evaluator: Magali Bonne-Moreau**

**Date: June 2017**

The following emerging good practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.

GP Element	Text
<p><b>Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)</b></p>	<p>The example of the public awareness campaign supported by Outcome 17 in El Salvador could serve as a good model of establishing information sharing systems or mechanisms to more effectively engage the public regarding equality in the world of work, and foster policy change.</p> <p>This campaign, supported through the BASIC initiative, is illustrative of how efforts at public engagement on these issues can be effective means of starting a conversation. Having a visible campaign, where messages about equality are directly observable to people going about their daily lives, can generate interest and discussion on the issues, especially within the general public, and is a vital step towards progress.</p> <p>A 2015 study supported by the ILO in El Salvador revealed that women tended to opt for shorter technical careers, due to family-and reproduction-related factors, which also increased the gender wage gap in the country.</p> <p>In order to address this, three institutions, the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, the Salvadoran Institute for the Advancement of Women (ISDEMU) and the Salvadoran Institute of Vocational Training (INSAFORP), launched a campaign: “Decídete a Crecer, combatiendo los estereotipos de género en la formación profesional y el empleo” (“Decide to grow – combatting gender stereotypes in vocational training and employment”).</p> <p>The aim of the campaign was to sensitize the population about the importance of training spaces for training and employment where equality is promoted and discrimination is eliminated.</p>

Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

	<p>Starting in 2015, the three institutions held monthly meetings to agree on the content and management of the report, in a participatory manner which involved focus groups with the local population. The campaign was launched publicly in 2016, and received extensive media coverage. Signs and posters promoting gender equality in the workplace, in terms of pay equity, importance of work, and non-discrimination, were clearly visible throughout the country, for example, on sides of buildings and on public buses.</p> <p>Starting in 2015, the three institutions held monthly meetings to agree on the content and management of the report, in a participatory manner which involved focus groups with the local population. The campaign was launched publicly in 2016, and received extensive media coverage. Signs and posters promoting gender equality in the workplace, in terms of pay equity, importance of work, and non-discrimination, were clearly visible throughout the country, for example, on sides of buildings and on public buses.</p> <p>Initially, the campaign was financed entirely by the ILO, but in mid-2016, INSAFORM allocated funds to continue the distribution of materials, reflecting the sustainability of the intervention.</p>
<p><b>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</b></p>	<p>It is essential to involve relevant national organizations as well as the public, in order to create a sense of ownership.</p>
<p><b>Establish a clear cause-effect relationship</b></p>	<p>National organizations were able to build on ILO-funded work to develop, and partially fund, their own campaign strategy, reflecting a desire to build on findings from previous research, and to improve the conditions of women in training institutions and in the workplace</p>
<p><b>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</b></p>	<p>Targeted beneficiaries were women who were entering, or re-entering the workplace, as well as the institutions supporting them.</p>
<p><b>Potential for replication and by whom</b></p>	<p>This intervention has a high potential for replication, as long as the different institutions involved are able to collaborate.</p> <p>When a specific space is created at the national level to educate the population and encourage them to discuss issues of gender equality and non-discrimination, momentum for change is difficult to stop, and can facilitate policy change at the legislative level.</p>
<p><b>Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)</b></p>	
<p><b>Other documents or relevant comments</b></p>	

Annex III: Inception Report

# Inception Report: Independent Evaluation of the P&B Outcome 17 (Discrimination in employment and occupation is eliminated)

---

**Submitted to EVAL by Dr. Magali Bonne-Moreau**

## **Introduction**

This evaluation will focus on the Outcome 17 component of the ILO Partnership Agreements (PA) with the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Swedish International Development Agency (Sida), as implemented by the Gender, Equality and Diversity Branch (GED) during the biennium 2014-15. In particular, it will examine the gender mainstreaming components funded by each country, as well as two addendums to the Norwegian PA: the BASIC project, and the PRIDE project<sup>9</sup> (see below). These build on earlier work carried out under both Partnership Agreements.

### **a) The Sweden-ILO Cooperation Agreement**

The first component of the evaluation will review work at global and country level on **gender mainstreaming under the Partnership Agreement with Sida** (GLO/14/64/SID) for the period 2014-15 and covers the following areas of work (Outcomes):

- Youth Employment (ACI 2)
- Domestic Workers (Outcome 5)
- Employers' Organizations (Outcome 9)
- Workers' Organization (Outcome 10)
- Freedom of Association (Outcome 14)
- International Labour Standards (Outcome 18)

---

<sup>9</sup> As specified in the TOR, the Pride project will be reviewed for a longer period, from January 2012 to December 2015

## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

In accordance with the terms of the PA, approximately 75% (\$400,000) of the resources were used to support activities in the regions. The remaining 25% (\$125,000) was used to provide inputs to global tools at HQ.

### **b) The Norway-ILO Partnership Cooperation Agreement**

The second component of the evaluation will review **gender mainstreaming activities under the Partnership Agreement with Norway** (GLO/14/55/NOR) for the period 2014-15 and covers the following areas of work (Outcomes):

- Employers' Organizations (Outcome 9)
- Workers' Organization (Outcome 10)
- Labour Administration and Labour Law (Outcome 11)
- Freedom of Association (Outcome 14)
- Mainstreaming Decent Work (Outcome 19)

In accordance with the terms of the PA, approximately 75% (\$520,000) of the resources were used to support activities in the regions. The remaining 25% (\$180,000) was used to provide inputs to global tools at HQ.

### **c) The Addendums**

The third component of the evaluation includes two projects supported by additional funding from Norway:

- i. the **BASIC Project** (GLO/14/58/NOR), which is in its third phase, and aims to promote gender equality and women's economic empowerment in the world of work as an objective in and of itself. The period under review will be 2014-15.
- ii. the **PRIDE Project** (GLO/12/52/NOR), which focuses on discrimination based on gender identity and sexual orientation in the workplace. The period under review will be 2012-15.

The **purpose of the evaluation** will be to assess the implementation process and the key achievements of the programmes as per their frameworks. It will aim to determine the extent to which the key stakeholders in the covered countries (tripartite constituents and beneficiaries) have benefited, and will continue to benefit from the programmes' outcomes, strategy and implementation arrangements. It will also aim to highlight good practices, possible lessons learnt, areas for improvement and recommendations for sustainability. It will also assess the extent to which the implementation has responded to the recommendations from the previous Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014), and provide detailed information on the contribution of Sweden and Norway funds towards the achievement of Outcome 17.



## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

The **key evaluation clients** will be the donors, Norway and Sweden; the ILO as executor of the projects; project management and staff, and tripartite constituents.

All aspects of this evaluation will be guided by the ILO evaluation policy which adheres to the OECD/DAC Principles and the UNEG norms and standards, and ethical safeguards will be followed.

### **Evaluative Approach and Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework of this evaluation has been mapped out in the TOR provided by the ILO Evaluation Manager. This framework draws on the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, and specifies that the purpose of this evaluation is to assess the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the programmes listed above. In addition to the OECD criteria, there is a particular focus on knowledge development initiatives, advocacy and technical advisory services, and capacity building.

The TOR for the evaluation identified a number of questions related to this framework. These questions have been further refined by the evaluator on the basis of initial project document review, and the consideration that the evaluation cannot rely on information from field visits. In line with the ILO Inception Report Checklist, which suggests to focus on 2-3 questions per criteria, the number of evaluation questions has been reduced where possible. The final evaluation questions proposed are presented below:

#### **Relevance and strategic fit**

- To what extent is the design of the project/programme relevant to the strategy outlined in the CPOs and P&B for Outcome 17, and for the achievement of the Global Products and CPOs it aims to support?
- Are the programmes linked to national or international development frameworks, such as United Nations Development Action Framework (UNDAF), Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCP), ILO's Programme and Budget (P&B)?
- Were ILO interventions consistent with the needs and concerns of recipients, and partners' and donors' policies?

#### **Coherence**

- To what extent were the project activities coherent with the elements of the P&B Outcomes that the programme supported?
- How do current efforts build on previous experience (other projects or regions, previous phases funded by the donors) and/or the synergies realized with other ILO interventions and sources of funding (i.e. RB, RBTC, XBTC, RBSA)?
- Did the programme have a coherent Logframe and M&E plan?

### **Programme progress and effectiveness**

- To what extent have the programmes achieved their objectives so far?
- How well have the project outputs been effective in supporting the achievement of the CPOs and the Strategic Outcome?

### **Efficiency of resource use**

- To what extent have the projects' resources (technical and financial) been used efficiently?
- Have the projects been efficiently managed (ie. Focus on use of baselines, monitoring plan, budget / work planning and reporting mechanisms, knowledge dissemination, risk management, sustainability plan)?

### **Impact and sustainability**

- To what extent have the programmes' actions produced immediate and mid-term impact towards achievements of CPOs and Outcome 17?
- To what extent have employers' organizations and workers' organizations been encouraged and supported to promote non-discrimination related to gender issues?
- To what extent have ILO staff been encouraged and supported to tackle issues related to gender-based discrimination internally?
- Do the programmes have a sustainability strategy that involves tripartite constituents and development partners to establish synergies that could enhance impacts and sustainability?
- Do conditions exist to ensure that the programmes' results will have lasting effects?

### **Knowledge development initiatives**

- To what extent have these initiatives contributed to gender mainstreaming and gender-specific outputs? What means have been used to create, share/disseminate knowledge?

### **Advocacy and Technical Advisory Services**

- To what extent is there evidence that the concepts of gender rights, non-discrimination and inclusion have been instilled in ILO constituents in the participating countries as a result of the programmes, through advocacy initiatives and technical advice regarding legislation and policies?
- To what extent have the programmes contributed to increased ratification and implementation of relevant ILO Labour Standards and UN CRPD?

## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

- To what extent have the programmes encouraged and supported the media in participating countries to tackle gender stereotypes and promote positive understanding of women workers?
- To what extent has civil society been engaged in action to promote understanding of gender equality as an issue of discrimination and rights as a result of the programmes under review?

### Capacity building

- To what extent have the programmes enhanced ILO constituents' capacity to develop and implement effective legislation and policies concerning concepts of gender equality rights, non-discrimination and inclusion?

## Methodology

The evaluation will respect ILO evaluation guidelines and the use of required templates. This final independent evaluation will be conducted through a range of data collection methods. These will include:

- a) A **review of the incomplete Draft Evaluation Report** to ascertain the extent of work needed to complete each section of the report, and to establish a baseline of existing data. Annex 1 indicates an estimate of the level of completion of the different sections.
- b) A **desk review** of relevant project documents, products, and other documents related to Outcome 17, as provided by EVAL and GED. A list of documents the evaluator proposes to consult is included in Annex 2. The table indicates which documents have already been provided by the ILO and those which are requested.
- c) **Briefings at ILO Geneva** and subsequent exchanges on specific questions with relevant staff at HQ via email and Skype
- d) **Telephone/Skype interviews** with available project staff in the field, including national programme managers and gender focal points.
- e) **A short questionnaire survey for ILO staff** (at HQ and in the field) who were involved in the different initiatives under review (see Annex 4)

The evaluation framework is guided by the key questions identified in the TOR (see Annex 3 for evaluation questions, indicators and sources). The data collected will be used to triangulate findings during the analysis stage, and will use both objective and subjective measures.

### Foreseen limitations

It is important to note that this work builds on an existing Draft Evaluation Report. Due to the unfinished nature of the work, the veracity of the information provided is difficult to confirm. While certain sections are completely missing, and thus easy to identify, one challenge for the consultant will be to determine which parts of the Draft Evaluation Report are suitable for publication, and which need to be reviewed – either partially, or fully.

## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

Another major limitation to the methodology is that project staff in the key countries may no longer ILO staff (as the projects have closed) and might thus not be available to respond to questions or requests for interviews. Furthermore, the CTA responsible for the PAs with Norway and Sida left the ILO in December 2016.

Finally, the context and delayed timing of this evaluation also means that there will be limited scope for stakeholder participation, especially with regards to beneficiaries in the project countries.

It is expected that EVAL, GED, and the other ILO departments associated with the initiatives examined in this evaluation will readily facilitate access to information and resources so that the process will be as smooth as possible.

## Workplan

The evaluation will be conducted between December 2016 and mid-March 2017. The evaluator will spend a total of 19 working days. The key milestones and outputs are summarized in the table below.

Key tasks	Timeframe	Deliverable
Telephone briefing with EVAL Review of Draft Report Desk review of key documents	Nov/Dec 2016	
Consultations with ILO staff (in person / Skype)  Circulation of questionnaire to ILO staff and national partners  Analysis of data collected  Consultation on initial findings and information gaps with ILO staff	January 2017	Inception report, including evaluation questionnaire
Drafting of evaluation report Comments (by EVAL)	February 2017	Draft report with specific recommendations
Finalisation of report  (Debriefing with ILO)	March 2017	Final Evaluation Report Evaluation summary

**Annex 1. Current level of completion of Draft Report**

1 = Complete	2= Almost complete	3= Partially complete	4 = Missing
--------------	--------------------	-----------------------	-------------

Section	Status	Comments
Executive summary	4	N/A
<b>PART ONE: BACKGROUND TO THE ASSIGNMENT</b>		
1.1 Introduction	1	
1.2 Outcome-based funding (Outcome 17) through Norway and Sweden ILO partnership agreements	1	
1.3 Evaluation Purpose and Approach		
1.3.1 Commonalities across the Norway/Sweden ILO Pas	1	
1.3.2 Evaluation approach	3	Will need to be revised due to situation
1.4 Outcome 17 Evaluation methodology	3	Will need to be revised due to situation (no field notes)
1.5 Evaluation Limitations	3	Will need to be revised due to situation
1.6 Organization of the document	2	I would adapt it to the actual structure
1.7 Evaluation standards and norms	1	
<b>PART TWO: OUTCOME 17 MAIN FINDINGS</b>		
2.1 Relevance	1	
2.2 Coherence	3	Major elements missing
2.3 Effectiveness and impact	3	Major elements missing. This will be the biggest challenge. May be able to populate with interviews and questionnaire results
2.4 Efficiency	3	Major elements missing
2.5 Sustainability	3	Major elements missing
2.6 Status of previous recommendations	4	N/A
Case studies	4	N/A
<b>PART THREE: CONCLUSIONS</b>	3	Need to review and structure the main ideas, and check for evidence.
<b>PART FOUR: LESSONS LEARNED AND EMERGING GOOD PRACTICES</b>	3	Some content, part of which is incoherent/incomplete. May need to revise based on new findings and check for evidence-base
<b>PART FIVE: RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	3	Need to review based on evidence, and write them out properly.
<b>Annexes</b>	3	Need to verify the existing documents, and add new ones.

## Annex IV Terms of Reference (initial and final)

Terms of Reference for Outcome 17 Evaluation

### **Terms of Reference for Independent Evaluation of the P&B Outcome 17 (Discrimination in employment and occupation is eliminated)**

<b>Programmes titles:</b>	ILO Partnership Agreements with Norway and Sweden on Gender Mainstreaming and related addendums
<b>Projects XB Symbols</b>	<b>GLO/14/58/NOR – Promoting gender equality and women's empowerment in the world of work</b>
<b>- Countries Covered (DWCP Outcomes)</b>	- Global (GLO777), India (IND128), China (CHN903), Mongolia (MNG127), Senegal (SEN827), El Salvador (SLV104), Macedonia (MKD153), Jordan (JOR152), Occupied Palestinian Territories (PSE128)
	<b>GLO/12/52/NOR – Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation: Promoting Rights, Diversity and Equality in the World of Work (PRIDE)</b>
	- Global (GLO777), Argentina, Hungary and Thailand, and the research is nearing completion in Costa Rica, France, India, Indonesia, Montenegro and South Africa
<b>Technical field:</b>	Gender Equality
<b>Administrative unit:</b>	Working Conditions and Equality Department (WORKQUALITY)
<b>Technical Backstopping Unit:</b>	Gender, Equality and Diversity Branch (GED)
<b>ILO Outcome Coordinator:</b>	Ms. Shauna Olney, Branch Chief, GED
<b>Period covered:</b>	January 2014 – December 2015 (apart from GLO/12/52/NOR which is January 2012- December 2015)
<b>Evaluation start date:</b>	March 2016 (first evaluation) Additional work: December 2016
<b>Evaluation end date:</b>	March 2017
<b>Type of evaluation:</b>	Final Independent
<b>Evaluation language:</b>	English
<b>Evaluation manager:</b>	Natanael Lopes/Naomi Asukai (for new process)

## **Background/Objective/Scope**

An evaluation covering the above mentioned projects under Outcome 17 was launched in March 2016. This evaluation resulted in the completion of the inception report phase and data collection/field visit phase. Due to unforeseen circumstances the evaluation consultant was unable to complete the draft report. EVAL is now finalizing the report with additional but limited data collection to complete the report. The purpose, objective and scope of the evaluation remains the same as that specified in the TOR for the original evaluation process (see attached).

## **Methodology for new evaluation**

The original evaluation process resulted in an incomplete draft report. The draft report should be the basis for the new evaluation process. It is expected that there will be additional but limited data collection in the form of online communication (skype, teleconfs) and a visit to Geneva to speak to the main stakeholders. A light survey process may also be considered to establish information from countries that were part of the field visits. It is expected that the new evaluation process will now result in a complete final report but that these limitations should be noted as a major limitation in the report. Another major limitations to the methodology is that project staff in the key countries are no longer ILO staff (as project has closed) and may not be available to respond to questions or requests for interviews

## **Management arrangements**

The evaluation is managed by EVAL. The evaluation will be conducted by an external independent Evaluator. The following profile is expected:

- Master's degree in social sciences, economics, development studies or related fields;
- Solid team work skills;
- Excellent written and oral communication skills in English (ability to review and analyze documents and sources in French and Spanish is an asset);
- A minimum of 8 years of experience in conducting evaluations;
- A minimum of 10 years of experience in gender issues;
- Familiarity with the ILO mandate and its tripartite and international standards foundations is an advantage;

The Evaluator is responsible for conducting the revision of the evaluation report and shall:

- Review project background materials (desk-review);
- Collect further and missing data and information through VCT/teleconfs and limited in person interviews in Geneva and if possible through a light survey process.
- Revise the current draft report with additional information obtained and prepare a final report including the major limitations of the new process.
- Submit the final evaluation report including evaluation summary

## **Timeline**

Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

The work is expected to take 19 days. Due to the unforeseen nature of this evaluation process the report will not be circulated for comments to the stakeholders but will be finalized based on feedback from EVAL. The current draft report will be shared with the CTA for any feedback on factual inaccuracies.

Key tasks	Timeframe	Deliverable	Evaluator working days
Telephone briefing with EVAL Review of Draft Report Desk review of key documents Consultations with ILO staff (in person / Skype)	Nov/Dec 2016	Inception report, including evaluation questionnaire	8
Circulation of questionnaire to ILO staff and national partners  Analysis of data collected  Consultation on initial findings and information gaps with ILO staff	January 2017		3
Drafting and finalization of evaluation report	February 2017	Draft report with specific recommendations	8





## INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION

### EVALUATION OFFICE

# Terms of Reference for Independent Evaluation of the P&B Outcome 17 (Discrimination in employment and occupation is eliminated)

**Programmes titles:** ILO Partnership Agreements with Norway and Sweden on Gender Mainstreaming and related addendums

**Projects XB Symbols** **GLO/14/58/NOR – Promoting gender equality and women's empowerment in the world of work**

**- Countries Covered (DWCP Outcomes)**

- Global (GLO777), India (IND128), China (CHN903), Mongolia (MNG127), Senegal (SEN827), El Salvador (SLV104), Macedonia (MKD153), Jordan (JOR152), Occupied Palestinian Territories (PSE128)

**GLO/12/52/NOR – Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation: Promoting Rights, Diversity and Equality in the World of Work (PRIDE)**

- Global (GLO777), Argentina, Hungary and Thailand, and the research is nearing completion in Costa Rica, France, India, Indonesia, Montenegro and South Africa

**Technical field:** Gender Equality

**Administrative unit:** Working Conditions and Equality Department (WORKQUALITY)

**Technical** Gender, Equality and Diversity Branch (GED)

**Backstopping Unit:**

Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

**ILO Outcome Coordinator:** Ms. Shauna Olney, Branch Chief, GED

**Period covered:** January 2014 – December 2015 (apart from GLO/12/52/NOR which is January 2012-December 2015)

**Evaluation start date:** March 2016

**Evaluation end date:** May 2016

**Type of evaluation:** Final Independent

**Evaluation language:** English

**Evaluation manager:** Mr. Natanael Lopes

## CONTENTS

I.	Introduction and rationale for evaluation .....	69
II.	Background on the gender mainstreaming components funded by Norway and Sweden .....	72
III.	Scope, purpose and clients of evaluation .....	73
IV.	Evaluation criteria and key questions .....	75
V.	Methodology to be followed .....	77
VI.	Main Outputs: Inception Report, Draft and Final Report .....	78
VII.	Management arrangements, work plan, formatting requirements and time frame .....	79
VIII.	Legal and Ethical Matters .....	82
IX.	Annexes .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACI	Area of Critical Importance
CPO	Country Programme Outcome
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
DWT	Decent Work Team
EVAL	ILO Evaluation Office
GED	Gender, Equality and Diversity Branch
ILO	International Labour Organization
LF	Logical Framework
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
PA	Partnership Agreement
PARDEV	ILO's Partnerships and Field Support Department
P&B	Programme and Budget
RB	Regular Budget
RBSA	Regular Budget Supplementary Account
RB	Regular Budget for Technical Cooperation
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SPF	Strategic Policy Frameworks
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group

Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

WORKQUALITY ILO's Conditions of Work and Equality Department

XBTC Extra-Budgetary Technical Cooperation

---

## Introduction and rationale for evaluation

1. The ILO Evaluation Office is supporting an evaluation process of Norwegian and Swedish funded Outcomes (Outcomes 9, 10, 11, 14 and 17). The object of this document is the evaluation of the Outcome 17, specifically its two gender mainstreaming components funded by Norway and Sweden, and two addendums to the Norwegian PA, namely the gender-targeted work (called the BASIC project), and an addendum on a technical cooperation project entitled 'Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation: Promoting Rights, Diversity and Equality in the World of Work (PRIDE)'.
2. In 2011, the ILO renewed its partnership agreement with Norway (Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs) covering a four-year period (Phase I: 2012-13 and Phase II: 2014-15). Meanwhile, the ILO entered with Sweden (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency - SIDA) a second phase of its partnership agreement (Phase I: 2010-11 and Phase II: 2012-13). With the exception of PRIDE, funding under the agreement is no longer for projects – but outcome-based and aligned with the ILO's Strategic Policy Framework 2010-15 (SPF) and the Programme and Budget (P&B) for 2010-11, 2012-13 and 2014-15.
3. According to the [P&B 2014-15](#), the ILO strategy to achieve **Outcome 17: Discrimination in employment and occupation is eliminated** in the biennium is focused in strengthening compliance through labour legislation and labour inspection and improving the collection and analysis of national data on workplace discrimination, in both the formal and informal economies, by: (i) reinforcing the capacity of constituents to develop and comply with legislative frameworks on equality and nondiscrimination; and, (ii) strengthening national capacity to measure discrimination in the world of work. It also includes technical assistance and advice; focused research, awareness raising and policy guidance; capacity building for key stakeholders including judges, labour inspectors, government officials and tripartite constituents; facilitated dialogue among the tripartite partners; and increased collaboration across the ILO as well as with other relevant national and international institutions.
4. In addition, gender mainstreaming contributions to the P&B 2014-15 Outcomes include the following activities:
  - Development of further practical tools and guidelines
  - Knowledge development and management
  - Capacity building
  - Awareness-raising on the capacities and rights of workers
  - Support to the country-based Outcomes and the implementation of Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCP).
5. The ILO adopts the results-based management framework as the backbone for its programme delivery. The Strategic Policy Framework 2010-15 is the document that put in place this results-based approach. It defined decent work for all working women and men as the overall goal, broken down into four strategic objectives of employment, social protection, social dialogue and rights at work, and further divided into 19 Outcomes with related indicators, measurement criteria and targets. These 19 Outcomes are planned to be implemented through the biennial Programme and Budget. These Outcomes are:

- **Outcome 1:** More women and men have access to productive employment, decent work and income opportunities
- **Outcome 2:** Skills development increases the employability of workers, the competitiveness of enterprises and the inclusiveness of growth
- **Outcome 3:** Sustainable enterprises create productive and decent jobs
- **Outcome 4:** More people have access to better managed and more gender equitable social security benefits
- **Outcome 5:** Women and men have improved and more equitable working conditions
- **Outcome 6:** Workers and enterprises benefit from improved safety and health conditions at work
- **Outcome 7:** More migrant workers are protected and more migrant workers have access to productive employment and decent work
- **Outcome 8:** The world of work responds effectively to the HIV/AIDS epidemic
- **Outcome 9:** Employers have strong, independent and representative organizations
- **Outcome 10:** Workers have strong, independent and representative organizations
- **Outcome 11:** Labour administrations apply up-to-date labour legislation and provide effective services
- **Outcome 12:** Tripartism and strengthened labour market governance contribute to effective social dialogue and sound industrial relations
- **Outcome 13:** A sector-specific approach to decent work is applied
- **Outcome 14:** The right to freedom of association and collective bargaining is widely known and exercised
- **Outcome 15:** Forced labour is eliminated
- **Outcome 16:** Child labour is eliminated, with priority given to the worst forms
- **Outcome 17:** Discrimination in employment and occupation is eliminated
- **Outcome 18:** International labour standards are ratified and applied
- **Outcome 19:** Member States place an integrated approach to decent work at the heart of their economic and social policies, supported by key UN and other multilateral agencies

6. At country level, the Gender, Equality and Diversity (GED) Branch contributes to the achievement of P&B Outcome 17 through Country Programme Outcomes (CPOs). Under the gender mainstreaming components, the CPOs to be supported were selected by the Outcome Coordinators of the different Outcomes being supported by Norway and Sweden arising from national level consultations and the priorities of ILO field offices, and their linkages to P&B Outcomes. GED's role was to ensure that all the Outcomes were supported in a gender responsive manner. In other words, under the gender mainstreaming components, GED did not itself select the countries, but rather responded to where other Outcomes were focusing their activities, and assisted in ensuring that these activities were gender responsive under the PAs per se. These CPOs are:

- **Global (GLO777)**
- **China (CHN903)** - Enhanced advocacy for non-discrimination through equal employment opportunities policies and practices amongst enterprises.
- **Mongolia (MNG127)** - Increased capacity to address non-discrimination and fundamental principles and rights for women and men at work
- **El Salvador (SLV104)** - Los constituyentes tripartitos fortalecen sus capacidades para combatir la discriminación en el empleo y promover la autonomía económica de las mujeres a través del desarrollo de la empresarialidad.

- **Senegal (SEN827)** - Les mandants ouvrent à l'élimination de la discrimination dans l'emploi et la profession à travers une meilleure application des NIT pertinentes en matière d'égalité entre les hommes et les femmes.
  - **India (IND128)** - Enhanced capacities of the constituents to develop/implement policy, legal and other measures to eliminate discrimination at work.
  - **FYR Macedonia (MKD153)** - Improved Gender Equality in the World of Work.
  - **Occupied Palestinian Territories (PSE128)** - Strengthened capacities of the social partners to engage and influence employment policies, including women's employment and protection in the workplace.
  - **Jordan (JOR152)** - Improved working conditions of women in the labour market.
7. In line with the new funding approach, away from project funding and toward the linkage to ILO P&B Outcomes and CPOs, Outcome Coordinators have been appointed. At a practical level, the management of the day-to-day activities at country level is decentralized to ILO country offices, while overall coordination is managed at ILO Geneva. Regular contact is fostered between the National Project Coordinators, the Gender Specialists in the regions and the Chief Technical Adviser based at Headquarters. While the bulk of the funds was spent on activities in the regions due to the inter-regional nature of the initiative, the funds remained centralized.
8. The evaluation will be conducted by an independent external Evaluator and managed by Mr. Natanael Lopes as Evaluation Manager. The ILO's Gender, Equality and Diversity Branch (GED) has collaborated in defining the scope and methodology of the evaluation as presented in these Terms of Reference. The evaluation process will be participatory and will involve stakeholder counterparts throughout the process. The ILO (Headquarters, Regional and Country Offices and Decent Work Teams), the tripartite constituents and other parties who were involved in the execution of the programmes are the primary users of the evaluation findings and lessons learnt. The evaluation report will be submitted to the Governments of Norway and Sweden.
9. The evaluation is expected to determine if the programme has achieved its stated objectives, assess the preliminary impact, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and potential sustainability, formulate conclusions and recommendations and generate lessons learnt and good practices. The purpose of this independent evaluation is to verify the achievements made during projects implementation, and in particular to assess if the results specified in the logical frameworks have been achieved by the end of the programmes. However, it also identifies further strategic directions to ensure the sustainability of the programmes. The evaluation findings, recommendations, lessons learnt and good practices will also contribute to the gender components of the ILO Programme and Budget for 2016-17.
10. The evaluation will be carried out between February and April 2016, with a Final Report being available by the end of April 2016. The ILO Partnerships and Field Support Department (PARDEV) will bear the costs of the evaluation.
11. This independent evaluation will be carried out according to the ILO Evaluation Policy adopted by the Governing Body in 2005, which provides for systematic evaluations of projects in order to improve quality, accountability, transparency of the ILO's work, strengthen the decision-making process and support to constituents in promoting decent work and social justice. It will also comply with the Norms and Standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). Ethical safeguards will be followed.

12. The evaluation report will be in English and may be translated into French and Spanish.

## Background on the gender mainstreaming components funded by Norway and Sweden

13. This evaluation will cover two gender mainstreaming programmes of outcome-based partnerships.

14. The **first programme** comprises work on gender mainstreaming under the Sweden-ILO Partnership Cooperation Agreement 2014-17 and covers the following areas of work (Outcomes):

- Youth Employment (ACI 2)
- Domestic Workers (Outcome 5)
- Employers' Organizations (Outcome 9)
- Workers' Organization (Outcome 10)
- Freedom of Association (Outcome 14)
- International Labour Standards (Outcome 18)

15. In accordance with the terms of the PA, approximately 75% (\$400,000) of the resources were used to support activities in the regions. The remaining 25% (\$125,000) was used to provide inputs to global tools at HQ.

16. The **second programme** comprises work on gender mainstreaming under the Partnership Agreement with the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and covers the following areas of work (Outcomes):

- Employers' Organizations (Outcome 9)
- Workers' Organization (Outcome 10)
- Labour Administration and Labour Law (Outcome 11)
- Freedom of Association (Outcome 14)
- Mainstreaming Decent Work (Outcome 19)

17. In accordance with the terms of the PA, approximately 75% (\$520,000) of the resources were used to support activities in the regions. The remaining 25% (\$180,000) was used to provide inputs to global tools at HQ.

18. The **third target programme** looked to promote gender equality as an objective in and of itself. It focused on interventions to enable constituents to: (i) understand better and apply the principle of equal remuneration for women and men for "work of equal value"; (ii) identify and tackle situations of direct, indirect and multiple discrimination; (iii) negotiate gender equality issues in industrial relations and collective bargaining; and (iv) facilitate women's equitable access to remunerated jobs that lead



## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

to economic empowerment and equality in the labour market, especially in the informal economy, rural areas and export processing zones (EPZs), particularly for female migrant and domestic workers.

19. The **fourth target programme** concerns a technical cooperation project 'Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation: Promoting Rights, Diversity and Equality in the World of Work (PRIDE)'. The project has developed an innovative methodology that combines desk research with interviews and focus groups to examine discrimination against LGBT workers and to highlight good practices that promote meaningful inclusion.
20. **Target groups:** include implementing partners at country-level, stakeholders of the ILO/Sweden and ILO/Norway Partnership Programmes (government, employers' and workers' organizations and women's organizations), as well as service providers and media. The ultimate recipients are working women and men.

## 21. Previous evaluations and other important references:

- 2015: Sweden-ILO Cooperation: [Factsheet](#), May;
- 2015: Independent Evaluation of the ILO's Strategy on Fundamentals Principles and Rights at Work – Revised Edition ([Full report](#));
- 2015: Sweden-ILO Partnership Programme, 2014-17: [Progress Report](#) (Updated May 2015);
- 2014: Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17: Gender Mainstreaming with the support of Sweden and Norway Partnership Agreements - Final Evaluation ([Evaluation summary](#)).
- 2014: Norway: Outcome-based Partnership Cooperation Agreement 2012–15: [Results Report 2012-13](#)
- 2009: Gender Mainstreaming in ILO/Norway (Partnership Agreement 2006-2007) - Final Evaluation and Evaluation Summary (Annex I)

## Scope, purpose and clients of evaluation

### Scope:

22. The focus of the evaluation will be the Outcome 17 component of the ILO Partnership Agreements with Sweden and Norway as implemented by the GED. The programme with a budget of \$734,926 (gender-targeted), \$760,601 (gender mainstreaming) and \$889,956 (PRIDE – over 4 years) from Norway and \$514,623 from Sweden builds on earlier work carried out under both Partnership Programmes in contributing to the achievement of the various P&B Outcomes listed above. Following ILO Evaluation Policy guidelines, the evaluation will be based on the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. The two gender mainstreaming programmes ended in December 2015 and this independent evaluation was agreed by the technical unit, PARDEV, EVAL and the donors.
23. This evaluation will consist of a thorough assessment of the implementation process and seeks to assess the key achievements of the programmes as per its frameworks, the extent to which the key

stakeholders in the covered countries, tripartite constituents and beneficiaries have benefited, and will continue to benefit, from the programmes outcomes, strategy and implementation arrangements. It is also aimed to highlight good points, areas for improvement and recommendations for sustainability, possible lessons learnt and good practices. The review will use implementation and monitoring information already available, as well as key stakeholder interviews and survey questionnaires.

**24. Purpose:**

- Review existing budget information on the use of funds to determine the added value of donor resources in contributing to the achievement of the Global Products and CPOs selected at the beginning of the partnerships;
- Assess the contribution of Sweden and Norway funds towards the achievement of ILO Outcomes listed in Section II;
- Assess to what extent the implementation has responded to the independent evaluation's recommendations from 2014 (covering the biennium 2012-13 – see paragraph 9);
- Assess to what extent the interventions are aligned with the P&B, SPF and the DWCPs;
- Assess whether the interventions are aligned with ILO relevant Conventions;
- Assess to what extent synergies with other ILO interventions, including projects funded by other donors have been established, in order to have an overall picture of ILO work under each targeted outcome. Synergies with other UN projects should also be included.
- Assess the progress made to establish baselines, promote knowledge dissemination, design a sustainability strategy and manage risks;
- Provide statistics on Sweden and Norway contributions relative to other donors, for each Outcome. This information will be provided by PARDEV to the evaluation manager, to be passed on to the Evaluator;
- Assess the current impact and sustainability of the programme activities undertaken and where possible, identify evidence of pathways and indicators of long-term impact;
- Provide recommendations to support ILO's expansion of its gender mainstreaming activities based on the assessment of the key success factors, good practices and constraints faced by the programme;
- Provide a clear articulation of lessons learnt and identify good practices to inform future project development and contribute to knowledge development of the ILO and the programme stakeholders.

**25. Clients:**

- The donors, Norway and Sweden (collaboration such as sharing the Terms of Reference, asking for comments on the draft report and debriefing at the end of the evaluation) with the donor during the evaluation will ensure that donor requirements are met;
- The ILO as executor of the projects;
- Project management and staff;
- Tripartite constituents (governments, employers and workers in the covered countries).

**26. Use and dissemination of the evaluation:**

- Evaluation findings and recommendations will inform and guide current and future programmes and projects on gender mainstreaming;
- The evaluation report will be disseminated in the ILO for organizational learning through the EVAL's i-Track evaluation database. A summary of the evaluation will be made available publicly through [EVAL's website](#).

## Evaluation criteria and key questions

27. Each evaluation conducted by the ILO is expected to assess the key evaluation criteria defined by OECD/DAC that are directly in line with the international standards of good practices. These criteria are:
- **Relevance:** to what extent is the design of the ILO project relevant to the strategy outlined in the CPOs and P&B for Outcomes it aims to support, and for the achievement of the Global Product and CPOs it aims to support?
  - **Coherence:** to what extent are the various activities in the project's implementation strategy coherent and complementary (in its design and implementation) with regard to the vertical and horizontal elements of P&B Outcomes which the project supports?
  - **Effectiveness:** have the project outputs been effective in supporting the achievement of the CPOs and Strategic Outcomes listed.
  - **Efficiency:** to what extent are the project's resources (technical and financial) being used efficiently?
  - **Impact:** to what extent have the project's actions produced immediate and midterm impact towards achievements of CPOs and P&B outcomes it aims to support?
  - **Sustainability:** does the project have an implementation strategy that involves tripartite constituents and development partners to establish synergies that could enhance impacts and sustainability?
28. The [ILO Policy Guidelines for Results-Based Evaluation](#) and the technical and ethical standards and abide by the [UNEG Ethical Guidelines](#) are established within these criteria and the evaluation should therefore adhere to these to ensure an internationally credible evaluation.
29. Gender concerns should be addressed in accordance with [ILO Guidance Note 4](#): "Considering gender in the monitoring and evaluation of projects". All data should be sex-disaggregated and different needs of women and men and of marginalized groups targeted by the programme should be considered throughout the evaluation process.
30. **Analytical framework:** In analyzing the evaluation data compiled, and drawing conclusions about the relevance and strategic fit of the projects, as well as the validity of their design, impact orientation and sustainability, the following questions should be addressed, in the framework of the programmes documents; and against the backdrop of the objectives described in ILO Decent Work Agenda and Country Programmes, and Programme and Budget; and the provisions of the following ILO Conventions: C. 100 Equal Remuneration for Men and Women Workers for Work of Equal Value, 1951; C. 111 Discrimination in Respect of Employment and Occupation, 1958; C. 156 Equal Opportunities and Equal Treatment for Men and Women Workers: Workers with Family Responsibilities, 1981; C. 183 Revision of the Maternity Protection, 1952.
- 30.1. **Knowledge development initiatives:**
- To what extent have gender mainstreaming action-oriented research and other knowledge development initiatives contributed to a more analytical understanding of national issues related to gender mainstreaming to equal training and employment opportunities?
  - To what extent have these initiatives contributed to gender mainstreaming and gender-specific outputs? What means have been used to create, share/disseminate knowledge?

30.2. *Advocacy and Technical Advisory Services*

- To what extent is there evidence that the concepts of women rights, non-discrimination and inclusion have been instilled in ILO constituents in the participating countries, through advocacy initiatives and technical advice regarding legislation and policies? Give examples.
- The extent to which the projects have promoted and establish dialogue between ILO constituents and allowed a platform for gender mainstreaming organizations to be heard by ILO constituents? Has this been achieved or is it in the process?
- To what extent have the projects contributed to increased ratification and implementation of relevant ILO Labour standards and UN CRPD? If possible, examples should be given in respects of this.
- To what extent have employers' organizations been encouraged and supported to promote among their members the notion of women-inclusive workplaces? How many have changed practices?
- To what extent have workers' organizations been encouraged and supported to extend their membership and work with women workers? How many have changed practices and what are some examples?
- To what extent has civil society been engaged in action to promote understanding of gender equality as an issue of discrimination and rights? How many have taken actions and provide examples.
- To what extent has the media in participating countries been encouraged and supported to tackle stereotypes and promote positive understanding of women workers? How many media portraits/reflections have done so with examples?

30.3. *Capacity Building*

- To what extent has ILO constituents' capacity to develop and implement effective legislation and policies concerning concepts of gender-equality rights, non-discrimination and inclusion been enhanced through project initiatives? What changes are to be observed?
- To what extent have women's organizations been able to build their capacities to promote the principles of decent work and non-discrimination and to dialogue with labour market institutions?

30.4. **Relevance and strategic fit of the intervention**

- How the Sweden and Norway funding contributes to achieving progress towards the selected Global Product and CPOs as set out in the documents approved by the donor, in line with the indicators listed in the log frames.
- Is the programme linked to national and or international development frameworks such as United Nations Development Action Framework (UNDAF), Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP), ILO's Programme and Budget (P&B), etc.?
- Are the objectives of the intervention consistent with recipients' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies?
- Does gender Mainstreaming programme design effectively integrate the different interests and capacity levels of communities in their roles as programme stakeholders, workers and employers' organization, other partners, implementers and recipients?

30.5. **Coherence of intervention design**

- Were the project strategy, objectives and assumptions appropriate for achieving the planned results in capacity building and employment creation?

- Did the programme have a coherent LF and M&E plan?
- How other decent work issues (gender equality, social dialogue...) are mainstreamed into the implementation?
- How the current efforts build on previous experience (other projects or regions, previous phases funded by the donor), and/or the synergies realized with other ILO interventions and sources of funding (i.e. RB, RBTC, XBTC, RBSA)?

### 30.6. Programme progress and effectiveness

- Are the results of the programmes, technical quality and usefulness of ILO outputs and contributions recognized by core partners and direct beneficiaries?
- To what extent has the programme so far achieved its objectives and reached its target groups? Do programme outcomes contribute to gender equality? What factors influenced the effectiveness of the project capacity building and other activities? Have the quantity and quality of outputs been satisfactory? How have outputs been transformed into outcomes? (i.e. Policies have been implemented?)
- How and to what extent has the Government been involved in project implementation?
- What are the good practices and lessons learnt noteworthy of documentation?

### 30.7. Efficiency of resource use

- Do the programmes make efficient use of its financial and human resources?
- Is the implementation strategy cost-effective?
- Is the distribution of resources between staff and activities optimal?
- Do the programmes have good systems to provide: (a) budget planning and reporting and (b) work planning and reporting effectively correspond? Do they allow for efficient use of time and resources?

### 30.8. Impact orientation and sustainability of the intervention

- Have the programmes made a significant contribution to broader and longer-term development? What are the obstacles the project encountered towards achieving sustainability and how did the project address these?
- Are national partners willing and able to continue the programme? How effectively has the programme built national ownership and capacity of people and institutions?
- Do conditions exist to ensure that the programmes' results will have lasting effects?
- What is the likelihood that the programmes' benefits will be sustained after the withdrawal of external support?

## Methodology to be followed

31. Since the gender mainstreaming programme is operational in several countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, the independent evaluation will combine a desk-review of relevant project documentation, to obtain an overview of the activities supported in terms of their contribution to the ILO CPOs and P&B. Following briefings and interviews at ILO Geneva, the Evaluator will present an inception report clearly indicating the methodological approach to be followed and a set of the key evaluation questions that will guide the assessment of each evaluative criterion. A final report would be based on case studies, desk-review and field visits to 2 Countries in Americas (Costa Rica and El

Salvador), 1 in Africa (South Africa) and 1 in Asia (India); and compilation of information on progress in other countries through other methods (phone/Skype interviews, questionnaires, etc). The countries to be visited were selected for having been covered by different components (India – gender-targeted component and PRIDE; South Africa – gender mainstreaming and PRIDE) and logistics (Costa Rica – PRIDE; El Salvador – gender-mainstreaming).

32. The key questions to be posed to all country offices where gender mainstreaming is active will be agreed by the Evaluator and a questionnaire will be prepared and sent out to key programme staff and national constituents. These questionnaires might be issued electronically through Survey Websites and complemented with telephone/Skype interviews if felt appropriate. This will be established in the evaluation inception report. Any proposed revision to the Terms of Reference should be reflected in the inception report and approved by the Evaluation Manager.
33. The Evaluator will undertake case study visits to selected countries to conduct the field evaluation mission to gather country level information and a review of partner organizations, bearing in mind that these visits are very short.
34. A draft report will be prepared by April 2016, with the final report, including examples of good practices and lessons learned, and recommendations for a next phase, submitted by the end of April 2016.
35. Methodologies will complement each other and data will be triangulated through the different methodologies. The Evaluator is expected to use the following methodologies during the evaluation:
  - 35.1. **Evaluability assessment:** The Evaluator will conduct an evaluability assessment of the programmes logical framework and M&E plan. This evaluability assessment shall review the coherence and logic of the, as well address issues related to data availability and adequacy of this data in reflecting progress towards results. The Evaluator shall be guided by EVAL's [Guidance Note 11: Using the evaluability assessment tool](#).
  - 35.2. **Desk review:** The Evaluator will review the relevant documents before conducting any interview and undertaking visits to the programme sites. Please refer to the Annex I – Desk-Review List below.
  - 35.3. **Interviews to key actors:** ILO staff backstopping the project, technical specialists from the regional and HQ.
  - 35.4. **Field visits for observation and interviews:** The evaluation mission will visit a number of covered countries, which will give a representative picture of the gender mainstreaming activities. During the mission the Evaluator will conduct interviews with key stakeholders, staff and beneficiaries.
  - 35.5. **Stakeholder workshop:** it may be organized depending on the circumstances.
  - 35.6. **ILO and donor debriefing:** In case the donor requests it, a final debriefing session by the Evaluator to the ILO, SIDA and Norway, will be arranged, as a means of cross-checking draft findings, conclusions and recommendations and obtaining feedback from the stakeholders.

## Main Outputs: Inception Report, Draft and Final Report

36. **Inception Report** submitted to the Evaluation Manager with detailed methodological document outlining the evaluative approach, key activities, interview questionnaires, list of key actors and timeframe (refer to [Checklist 3: Writing the inception report](#)).
37. **Draft Evaluation Report** with specific feasible recommendations submitted to the Evaluation Manager at the ILO (refer to [Checklist 5: Preparing the evaluation report](#)).
38. **Final Evaluation Report** submitted to the Evaluation Manager, within one week after the receiving final comments on the Draft Report. The report will follow EVAL format template, including a title page (refer to [Checklist 7: Filing in the evaluation title page](#)) and be no more than 40 pages in length + annexes. Annexes of the report will include results of the questionnaire survey, a summary of findings for each field visit, summary for each meeting, a list of people interviewed and; a list of documents reviewed. The quality of the report will be determined based on conforming to the EVAL quality standards (refer to [Checklist 6: Rating the quality of evaluation reports](#)).
39. **Evaluation Summary** submitted to the Evaluation Manager based on the evaluation report executive summary (refer to [Checklist 8: Writing the evaluation report summary](#)).
40. All draft and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided in electronic version compatible with the software Microsoft Word for Windows. Ownership of the data from the evaluation rests solely with the ILO. The copyright of the evaluation report will rest exclusively with the ILO. Use of the data for publication and other presentation can only be made with the agreement of the ILO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

## Management arrangements, work plan, formatting requirements and time frame

### Management arrangements

41. The evaluation is managed by an independent Evaluation Manager, Mr. Natanael Lopes of the ILO Country Office for Brazil. He will be supported by the Senior Evaluator Officer Ms. Naomi Asukai.
42. The evaluation will be conducted by an external independent Evaluator. The following profile is expected:
  - Master's degree in social sciences, economics, development studies or related fields;
  - Solid team work skills;
  - Excellent written and oral communication skills in English (ability to review and analyze documents and sources in French and Spanish is an asset);
  - A minimum of 8 years of experience in conducting evaluations;
  - A minimum of 10 years of experience in gender issues;
  - Familiarity with the ILO mandate and its tripartite and international standards foundations is an advantage;
43. The Evaluator is responsible for conducting the evaluation and shall:

## Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

- Review the ToR and provide input, as necessary;
- Review project background materials (desk-review);
- Review the evaluation questions and refine the questions in collaboration with the Evaluation Manager as necessary and develop interview protocols;
- Develop and implement an evaluation methodology (i.e., conduct interviews, review documents) to answer the evaluation questions;
- Design and conduct a survey/questionnaire for the interviews and field visits;
- Conduct interviews and possibly a stakeholder workshop;
- Participate in a briefing teleconference prior to the evaluation mission;
- Undertake evaluation missions to selected countries;
- Prepare an initial draft of the evaluation report and submit it to the Evaluation Manager. Prepare a final report, reflecting any comments or additional inputs received;
- Submit the final evaluation report after the evaluation mission according to the timeline provided below.
- Evaluation summary using ILO EVAL template and the completion of the templates on lessons learned and good practices.

44. On the ILO's side, the Evaluator will be supervised by the Evaluation Manager who will:

- Prepare and finalize the ToR for the evaluation and liaise with the ILO GED and EVAL as necessary. The ToR is to be reviewed and approved by EVAL;
- Review the evaluation questions and work with Evaluator to refine the questions, as necessary;
- Oversee the missions schedules and, if appropriate, accompany the evaluator in the mission.
- Review and provide comments on the evaluation report;
- Ensure that the evaluation is conducted in accordance with these ToR, for the preparation of the draft report of the evaluation, discussing it with the other members of the evaluation team (if any), the beneficiaries and the stakeholders.

### **Suggested work plan and payments**

45. The total duration of the evaluation process is approximately **3 months**, from **01 February 2016** to **30 April 2016**. Meetings in the visited countries will be scheduled by the relevant ILO Office. A detailed programme for the in-country mission will be prepared by GED. The suggested work plan below may be changed in agreement with the Evaluation Manager.

PHASE	RESP.	TASKS	TENTATIVE DATES	EVALUATOR WORKING DAYS
I	Evaluator	Skype briefing with the Evaluation Manager	Mar 11	0.5
		Desk-review	Mar 18	7.5
		Submission of the Incept Report	Mar 18	



Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

	Evaluation Manager	Approval of the Inception Report	Mar 24	
		<b>Payment 1 – Inception Report (20%)</b>		
		<b>Payment 2 – Lump Sum</b>	Mar 24	
II	Evaluator	Mission to Geneva (ILO Headquarters)	Mar 28	4
		Mission to Africa (South Africa)	April 1	4
		Mission to Asia (India)	Apr 07	4
		Mission to Americas (Costa Rica and El Salvador)	Apr 12	3
III	Evaluator	Submission of the Draft Report	May 31	10
	Evaluation Manager	Quality check and initial review	June 3	
		<b>Payment 3 – Draft Report (30%)</b>		
		Circulate to key stakeholders	June 3	
		Consolidate comments and send to the Evaluator		
IV	Evaluator	Finalization of evaluation report and evaluation summary	June 10	6
	Evaluation Manager	<b>Payment 4 – Final Report (50%)</b>	June 13	
	Evaluator	Debriefing with ILO and donor	June 13	
TOTAL =			2,5 MONTHS	40

**Resources**

46. Evaluator:

- **Fees** for approximately **40 days**;
- **Lump sum** to cover all the costs of the international missions. The travels will be from consultant' home to destinations by the most direct and economical routes (economy class). The Evaluator will receive the lump sum in advance and will be responsible for all the travel arrangements. The Evaluator must be aware that you need to have your own travel and health insurance. The ILO is not liable, under any circumstances, in case of sickness or accident

47. For the evaluation as a whole:

- Possible stakeholder workshop expenditures;
- Possible interpretation costs;
- Any other miscellaneous costs.

## Legal and Ethical Matters

48. This evaluation will comply with UN norms and standards for evaluation and ensure that ethical safeguards concerning the independence of the evaluation will be followed. Please refer to the [UNEG ethical guidelines](#).

49. To ensure compliance with ILO/UN rules safeguarding the independence of the evaluation, the Evaluator will not be eligible for technical work on the programme for the next 12 months.

## Annex V: List of persons interviewed

Ned Lawton	CTA for the Norway and Sweden PAs, GED
Mari Schlanbusch	Associate Expert, GED
Adrienne Cruz	Senior Gender Specialist, GED
Magnus Berge	(former CTA), Workers' Activities Norway PA, ACTRAV
Andrea Marinucci	Focal Point for Norway, Sweden and Ireland, PARDEV
Natanael Lopes	former Evaluation Manager for this evaluation, ILO Brazil
Maria José Chamorro	Gender Specialist, San José Office, El Salvador
Richard Howard	Director, ILO Country Office for Nepal, and former ILO Senior Specialist on HIV and AIDS, Asia and the Pacific
Jae-Hee Chang	Senior Programme and Operations Officer, Bureau for Employers' Activities (ACT/EMP)
Lena Hasle	Norway Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Gudrun Jevne	former Associate Expert, GED, now at the Norwegian Directorate for Children, Youth and Family Affair

## Annex VI: List of documents consulted

### **Gender mainstreaming under the Partnership Agreement with Sida (GLO/14/64/SID)**

Programme Document Template for Outcome-Based Partnerships. Programme title: Advancing a Gender Responsive Approach to Decent Work (June 2014 - December 2015) – ILO SIDA Partnership

Promoting a Gender-responsive Approach to Decent Work (Sida Gender Mainstreaming): Results-based budget

SIDA-ILO Partnership Programme 2014-17. Phase I, 2014-15. Progress Report 2014

SIDA-ILO Partnership Programme 2014-17. Phase I, 2014-15. Final Report 2014-15

Briefing Note for Meeting with the Swedish Parliamentarians (n.d.); Sida Gender Mainstreaming note (n.d.)

#### Outcome 5 Outputs:

- Programme Document Template for Outcome-Based Partnerships. Programme title: Integrated actions towards improved and more equitable working conditions for vulnerable groups of workers (June 2014 – December 2015)
- Training of mediators and arbitrators on resolution of labour disputes relating to domestic workers' complaints. Ledger Plaza Bahari Beach, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania. 20 – 23 October, 2015

#### Outcome 9 Outputs:

- Programme Document Template for Outcome-Based Partnerships. Programme title: Enhancing policy capacity of Employers' organizations to promote enabling environment for sustainable enterprises and job-rich growth (August 2014 – December 2015). Draft

#### Outcome 10 Outputs:

- ILO and UN Women collaboration on Advancing Gender Equality and Strengthening Gender Inclusiveness in Social dialogue: Women's leadership development in the trade union movement and the private sector in Southern Africa. (n.d.)

#### Outcome 18 Outputs:

- Programme Document Template for Outcome-Based Partnerships. Programme title: Strengthening the ratification and implementation of International Labour Standards at country and global levels (June 2014 – December 2015). Draft.

### **Gender mainstreaming activities under the Partnership Agreement with Norway (GLO/14/55/NOR)**

Ensuring a Gender Responsive Approach to Decent Work (Norway PA Gender Mainstreaming): Results-based budget

Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

Programme Document Template for Outcome-Based Partnerships. Programme title: Ensuring a Gender Responsive Approach to Decent Work (April 2014 – December 2015)

Norway-ILO Programme Cooperation Agreement 2012-15 (PCA) Phase II, 2014-15 – Progress Report 2014

Norway-ILO Programme Cooperation Agreement 2012-15 (PCA) Phase II, 2014-15 – Final Report 2014

Outcome 9 Outputs:

- Gender stereotypes at the workplace (draft)
- Creating a family-friendly workplace
- Pay equity – A key driver of gender equality
- Maternity, paternity at work - Baby steps towards achieving big results
- Fostering female talent in the workplace. Asia-Pacific Regional Conference on Women in Business and management. Singapore, 3 July 2015
- Gaining Momentum: Women in Business and Management in the Middle East and North Africa. Conference: 30 November 2015, Dubai, United Arab Emirates

Outcome 14 Outputs:

- Concept Note: Training of Trainers on Freedom of Association for Women Workers in EPZs. Laguna, Philippines. 27-29 November 2015.
- Mission Report. Diagnostic Mission Malawi, Lilongwe, 27-30 April 2015.
- Malawi Congress of Trade Unions (MCTU) Concept on Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining. 7-11 September 2015
- National plan of action 2015-2016: Towards full freedom of association and collective bargaining rights in the rural sector in Malawi

Outcome 19 Outputs:

- Report on Mission to Chisinau, Moldova, 25-26 February 2015 (EMP/CEPOL)

### **BASIC Project (GLO/14/58/NOR) and Pride Project (GLO/12/52/NOR)**

Programme Document Template for Outcome-Based Partnerships. Programme title: Promoting Gender Equality and Women's empowerment in the World of Work "BASIC Project" (June 2014- May 2015) – ILO-Norway Partnership

Template for final reporting – Phase II (2014-15) of Norway-ILO Partnership Cooperation Agreement (2012-15)

Promoting Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment in the World of Work - Results based budget 2014-15

Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

Gender Identity and Sexual Orientation: Promoting Rights, Diversity and Equality in the World of Work. Results of the ILO's PRIDE Project (2016)

Pride Progress Report. Norway-ILO Partnership Cooperation Agreement (PCA) 2012-15. Technical Cooperation Outcome-based Report. Outcome 17 (Focus on Non-discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity). Reporting period: 01/2012 – 12/2013.

PRIDE at work : a study on discrimination at work on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity in Indonesia / International Labour Office, Gender, Equality and Diversity Branch. - Geneva: ILO, 2016

PRIDE at work: a study on discrimination at work on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity in Thailand / Busakorn Suriyasarn; International Labour Office, Gender, Equality and Diversity Branch. - Geneva: ILO, 2015

ORGULLO (PRIDE) en el trabajo: en estudio sobre la discriminación en el trabajo por motivos de orientación sexual e identidad de género en Argentina / Oficina Internacional del Trabajo, Servicio de Género, Igualdad y Diversidad. Ginebra: OIT, 2015

ORGULLO (PRIDE) en el trabajo: un estudio sobre la discriminación en el trabajo por motivos de orientación sexual e identidad de género en Costa Rica / Ana Carcedo Cabañas, María José Chaves Groh, Larraitz Lexartza Artza, Alberto Sánchez Mora; Oficina Internacional del Trabajo, Servicio de Género, Igualdad y Diversidad. - Ginebra: OIT, 2016 viii, 104 p. (Documento de trabajo; 1)

PRIDE at work : a study on discrimination at work on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity in South Africa / International Labour Office, Gender, Equality and Diversity Branch. - Geneva: ILO, 2016

### **Other documents**

Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15) – Final Report (Draft) by Corin Chater

ILO Action Plan for Gender Equality 2010-15 – Independent Final evaluation by Una Murray

GB Document: Results of the independent evaluation of the ILO Action Plan for Gender Equality 2010–15 and outline of the ILO Action Plan 2016–17

ILO Action Plan for Gender Equality 2010-15

ILO Action Plan for Gender Equality 2016-17

ILO Strategic Policy Framework 2010-2015. ILO, Geneva

Programme & Budget for the Biennium 2012-2013

Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17 (2014-15)

Programme & Budget for the Biennium 2014-2015

Programme & Budget for the Biennium 2016-2017

ILO Programme implementation report 2014-15

Independent Evaluation of Outcome 17: Gender mainstreaming with the support of Sweden and Norway Partnership Agreements (2012-2013) by Jane Haile.

Governing Body's March 2005 Decision on Gender Mainstreaming in ILO Technical Cooperation

Various TORs and CVs associated with the Norway and Sida PAs, Other non-published documents provided by interviewees.