



Evaluation Summary



International
Labour
Office

Evaluation Unit

Improving safety and health at work through a Decent Work agenda

Quick Facts

Countries: *Honduras, Malawi, Republic of Moldova, Ukraine, Zambia*

Final Evaluation: *March 2013*

Mode of Evaluation: *Independent, External*

ILO Office Administratively backstopping the Project: *Geneva*

ILO Technical Backstopping Office: *Safe Work*

Evaluation Manager: *Ms. Lee-Nah Hsu*

Evaluation Consultant: *Mr. Dwight Ordoñez*

Project End: *November 2012*

Project Code: *INT/09/08/EEC*

Donor & Project Budget: *European Union - 1,667,171 Euros*

Keywords: *Occupational Safety and Health, working conditions*

Background & Context

Summary of the project purpose, logic and structure

This project is a 36-month (2009-2012) *joint EU-ILO initiative*, implemented by the ILO in five developing, low and middle income countries (Honduras, Malawi, Republic of Moldova, Ukraine, Zambia) in three regions of the world, aimed to foster the tripartite development of a promotional framework for OSH in the same, according to ILO Conventions 155 and 187. The project had as key stakeholders national governments and associated agencies, employers' and workers' organizations, as well as NGOs and relevant training and research institutes in target countries.

The project had as *overall goal* "to contribute to a more inclusive and productive society through a reduction in occupational accidents and work-related diseases". It aimed to accomplish three specific objectives:

Specific objective 1: A systematic approach to improving occupational Safety and Health (OSH) is taken on board at the highest political level, including consideration of OSH concerns in national development policies in the pilot countries. In order to attain this objective, the project sought to: a) Establish in each country a national tripartite steering committee, linked to an existing national tripartite mechanism on OSH or which could be used as the basis for a tripartite mechanism to continue after the end of the project. b) Undertake a review of the current national OSH infrastructure, including OSH inspection services (OSH profile) in the target countries. c) Promote the elaboration and adoption of a National OSH Programme/action plan, with regular reviews, in the target countries. d) Develop a methodology to determine the number of occupational accidents and diseases more accurately in a country. e) Promote the application of the methodology to determine the extent of occupational injuries in the target countries. f) Develop an advocacy tool to raise awareness on the costs of not improving working conditions. g) Organize seminars for national policy-makers on prioritizing OSH in each target country.

Specific objective 2: Practical OSH management measures are introduced and implemented at enterprise level in accordance with national action plans. In order to attain this objective, the project sought to: a) Develop training of trainers courses in

risk assessment and OSH management. b) Support training on training on risk assessment and management to key stakeholders, particularly enterprises, by the trained trainers. c) Train OSH and labour inspectors for more efficient and effective workplace inspections. d) Support the organization of awareness-raising campaigns in the target countries.

Specific objective 3: Promotion of global knowledge sharing on OSH tools and good practices towards a systematic and sustainable approach to OSH improvements. In order to attain this objective, the project sought to: a) Elaborate and publish a final project synthesis report. b) Organize a global meeting in Brussels to present and disseminate the results of the project. c) Organize national conferences showcasing the results of the project in each target country.

The project's management structure was composed by a Chief Technical Officer and an Administrative Assistant based in Geneva, and three local coordinators (one per region), based respectively in Honduras, Zambia and Ukraine.

Present Situation of the Project

Project implementation in the five target countries ended one month before the start of the final evaluation. Originally, there was a sixth country considered as part of this project: Nicaragua, which had placed OSH as a priority within its tripartite DWCP and which requested ILO's technical support to improve its OSH system. However, by May 2011 the Ministry of Labour of Nicaragua let ILO know that it proposed to implement the project as a governmental, NON-tripartite initiative. Given that this was contrary to both the spirit of the project and to the mandate of the ILO, it was no more possible to maintain Nicaragua as a target country for the project.

Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

Purpose: The evaluation included: a) A review of project implementation to draw conclusions and make project-specific recommendations. b) The identification of wider lessons learned for consideration in the future design and implementation of projects and as evidence on ILO's work in promotion and improvement of OSH. c) The assessment of the results achieved against intended outcomes.

The evaluation was guided by four core evaluative areas addressing: the **relevance** of the project, the **efficiency** of its implementation, the **effectiveness** of its interventions and the **sustainability** of project results.

Scope: The evaluation addressed all aspects of project implementation and included both desk-review and in-country assessments covering the following four areas: a) Overall project design and implementation. b) Individual project components implemented in participating countries. c) ILO procedures and working methods in light of results-based framework that the project contributes to. d) Evidence of results achieved and sustainability of these results. Two countries (Honduras and Ukraine) were visited by the evaluator and key tripartite stakeholders were tele-interviewed in the other three target countries.

Clients: The main clients for the evaluation were ILO management, including SafeWork as the technical unit and the EC as the donor. Other stakeholders include the ILO constituents, the Ministries of Labour, employers' organisations and trade unions, other ministries which are involved in the project (such as the Ministries of Health or Mines), EU Delegations in the project countries, and other international development cooperation agencies who may be interested in supporting national OSH systems, as well as the ILO regional and country offices, both those participating in this project and non-participating offices, the tripartite constituents and other interested parties.

Methodology of evaluation

The evaluation had a participatory character. The methodology followed an ex-post design and was focused on the analysis of the relevance, design, effectiveness and efficiency of the project. The evaluation addressed the specific questions raised in this regard within the TOR.

Data collection procedures included: a) Extensive desk review of relevant documents related to the Project and other sources. b) Review of information on project initial budget, budget revision and general information on final expenses by end of project. c) In-country assessments in two countries (Honduras, Ukraine), carried out through the interview of Project local coordinators, representatives of ILO constituents, OSH training institutions, research institutes, ministries, EU

representatives, ILO country or regional office representatives and ILO national project coordinators. d) Tele-interviews of key tripartite representatives and other key stakeholders in those countries not selected for visit (Malawi, Moldova, Zambia). e) Tele-interviews of key DEVCO and ILO – Headquarters stakeholders related to the project (PARDEV, Safe Work, project CTA).

The **methods** used for this evaluation included: a) Semi-structured interviews based on a roster of questions applied accordingly to the characteristics of the interviewee. b) Focus group discussions with labour inspectors in Honduras (focus group discussions could not be carried out in Ukraine due to the fact that labour and OSH inspectors that participated in the Project were scattered in several regions. c) Visits to enterprises in Honduras to observe the way in which they had implemented the knowledge on risk assessment and management (RAM) acquired through the project.

Main Findings & Conclusions

Regarding the project's **relevance**, the evaluation found that its objectives were highly consistent with various ILO and EU policy and programmatic instruments regarding cooperation for development, economic development and the Decent Work Agenda, as well as with International Labour Conventions 155 and 187.

Regarding its **effectiveness**, the evaluation found that the Project helped national constituents advance the issue of OSH within the tripartite labour agenda of each country. The project created or strengthened institutional conditions for a systematic approach of the issue of OSH in all target countries (national OSH profile, national OSH programme, training of trainers), favouring a significant level of national ownership and that activities may be replicated and extended to an increasing number of stakeholders in the years to come. In this framework, the Project allowed testing an effective methodology to implement the step-by-step approach on the promotional framework for OSH proposed by ILO Convention 187. The project also contributed to the introduction of practical OSH management measures in all countries and promoted its effective implementation at enterprise level. It is expected that this activity will continue to be

carried out by local trainers within the framework of the national OSH programmes, on the basis of the institutional capacities built by the Project in each country. Regarding its impact outside the countries in which it was implemented, the Project lacked a consistent strategy to disseminate its results and have a greater global and regional impact.

Regarding its **efficiency**, the evaluation found that the Project did not follow strictly its approved budget. Higher staff costs were initially requested by the ILO to EU, but these were not accepted by the donor. Thus Project implementation was based on an inadequate estimation of its overall and specific costs, particularly those of human resources and of the time-span needed to achieve its results. While administrative costs were maintained “officially” within the budget provisions, more resources than expected, coming from third sources were used to cover the real costs of human resources and activities. In the end, Project resources were not used as scheduled, and there was a 9% surplus of unspent funds.

The evaluation found that the **sustainability** of Project's achievements will depend on the level of institutionalization of the bodies in charge of implementing the National OSH Programmes, the political commitment of local authorities and employers and the economic situation of governments' finances. Greater sustainability may be obtained in countries like Ukraine and Honduras, where the issue of OSH is institutionalized by governments, at a tripartite level, through the State Service on Mining Supervision and Industrial Safety of Ukraine and the *Comisión Nacional de la Salud Ocupacional de los Trabajadores de Honduras*. Notwithstanding the above, the project contributed to increase the sense of ownership and capacity of various stakeholders in all countries, particularly at steering committee level, and by the end of the project risk assessment and management courses were being replicated by/ or the subject included in the curricula of diverse institutions in all target countries (training institutes, OSH inspectorate, Trade Unions, Associations of employers).

Recommendations & Lessons Learned

Main recommendations and follow-up

- a) The **ILO** should consider combining the work with its constituents' at tripartite level with interventions that allow a more rapid and extensive trickle down of knowledge on OSH and RAM to small and medium size enterprises, including those in the informal sector. The ILO should promote specific campaigns and courses, tailored to the reality of these sectors, in coordination with associations that represent these informal, often self-employed, entrepreneurs.
- b) The **ILO** should improve cost management by carrying out a more realistic budget design and review, include all project costs into one sole budget and track project-related expenses in an integrated way, independently of funding source.
- c) The **EU** should consider the possibility of tagging a certain amount of budget (10 or 20%) for "non-labeled" activities, to be decided/ agreed with local stakeholders during the first year of project implementation. This would provide greater flexibility and responsiveness to local needs.
- d) The **ILO** should work so that all UN country strategic documents contain more clear and explicit mentions to labour rights, including mentions to the right to work in a healthy and safe environment.
- e) The **EU** should establish a mechanism that facilitates that its Delegations be involved on a regular basis in the follow-up of the implementation of centralized projects.
- f) In order to ensure a proper follow-up of country specific actions, the **ILO** should provide support to the implementation of National OSH Programmes at the five target countries within its technical assistance to the implementation of Decent Work Country Programmes.
- g) **ILO** specialists at sub-regional and national offices should take forward the work of the Project and prioritize through their own work the key issues highlighted as strategic priorities in the National OSH Programmes in target countries.
- h) When implementing similar projects, the **ILO** and the **EU** should consider developing activities on dissemination of project methodology, experiences and good practices starting the second year of the project.

- i) The **ILO** and the **EU** should consider that future Projects on OSH should have a clear phase out strategy and a handover methodology to local stakeholders.

Important lessons learned

- a) Given the organizationally cumbersome and time-consuming features of centralized management projects, future implementation may benefit of a region-based approach, in which OSH projects benefit multiple countries in a same Region and are managed by an ILO Regional Office.
- b) Countries' Steering Committees may benefit if they are not only in charge of designing their National OSH Programmes but also have time to pilot some activities of their National OSH Programmes. The length of future OSH Projects should be designed taking this into account.
- c) If a project is to communicate its advancements and successes as part of an awareness raising strategy, this should not wait to the end of the project's lifetime. An effective communication strategy on project's progressive results, comprising relevant activities should accompany the project since the beginning of implementation.

Good practices highlighted by this evaluation

- a) **All countries:** The practical, "hands-on" side of the RAM courses with enterprises was commented as a very favorable learning tool by several interviewees.
- b) **Honduras:** The creation of a local "icon" to identify the awareness raising campaign on OSH (*Chico Catracho*) was signaled-out by several parties as a major success to convey preventative messages on OSH to the general public.
- c) **Ukraine, Moldova:** The use of same language/ cultural-economic background trainers (for example, the use Russian-speaking trainers, who shared a similar social and economic background and the tele-conference between Kiev and St. Petersburg's experts) were highlighted as an effective means for learning.