



Final Independent Evaluation of

**BASIC: Gender Equality in the World of Work
in Brazil, Angola, South Africa, India and China**

An International Labour Organization Project,
Funded by the Government of Norway

Julian Walker
With contributions from:
Nadia Taher
Claudy Vouhé

INT/09/61/NOR
3 March 2011

Contents

- 1. Executive Summary**
 - 1.1 Background and context
 - 1.2 Main findings and conclusions
 - 1.3 Recommendations and lessons learned

- 2. Project Background**

- 3 Evaluation**
 - 3.1 Evaluation background
 - 3.2 Evaluation methodology

- 4 Evaluation findings**
 - 4.1 The context of the BASIC project
 - 4.2 Project design and strategy
 - 4.2.1 The planning of the BASIC project
 - 4.2.2 The 'evaluability' of the project document
 - 4.3 Effectiveness of project implementation
 - 4.3.1 Aligning the project's work with the needs of women and men workers
 - 4.3.2 Working with organisations that represent women and men workers and employers
 - 4.3.3. Contributing to ILO's wider work on gender equality
 - 4.4 Efficiency of management arrangements and resource use
 - 4.4.1 Use and development of human resources
 - 4.4.2 Procedures and administrative structures
 - 4.4.3 Use of financial resources
 - 4.5 Project Impact and sustainability
 - 4.5.1 The implementation and impact of project activities
 - 4.5.2 Use of and contribution to knowledge and tools on gender equality
 - 4.5.3 The BASIC project's impact on gender equality in decent work policy

- 5. Conclusions and Recommendations**
 - 5.1 Conclusions
 - 5.2 Recommendations
 - 5.2.1 Recommendations to BASIC Project Phase 2
 - 5.2.2 Recommendations to ILO Bureau for Gender Equality (GENDER)
 - 5.2.3 Recommendations to the Government of Norway
 - 5.3 Lessons Learnt

Appendices

- Appendix 1 List of Interviewees
- Appendix 2 References
- Appendix 3 Evaluation TORs
- Appendix 4 Discussion Guide for Interviews
- Appendix 5 The Web of Institutionalisation

Abbreviations

ACT/EMP	ILO Bureau for Employers' Activities
ACTRAV	ILO Bureau for Workers' Activities
BASIC	Brazil, Angola, China, India, and South Africa
CTA	Chief Technical Adviser
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
EPA	External Payment Authorization (ILO's Funding Request Format)
GENDER	Bureau for Gender Equality
HABITAT	United Nations Centre for Human Settlements
ILC	International Labour Conference
ILO	International Labour Office
ITC	ILO International Training Centre in Turin
MAPESS	Angolan Ministry of Public Administration, Employment and Social Security
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
NEDLAC	National Economic Development and Labour Council (of South Africa)
NPC	National Programme Coordinator
PARDEV	ILO Partnerships and Development Cooperation Department
QLFS	Quarterly Labour Force Survey
RBSA	Regular Budget Supplementary Account
SPF	Strategic Policy Framework
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNWOMEN	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women

1. Executive summary

1.1 Background and context

The BASIC Project, on 'Gender Equality in the World of Work in Brazil, Angola, South Africa, India and China' (BASIC) was funded by the Government of Norway as part of the Norway/ ILO Partnership Framework Agreement (2008-09). The project was implemented between 1 January and 31 December 2010.

The project was managed from ILO headquarters, coordinated by a Chief Technical Adviser in the ILO Bureau for Gender Equality Bureau (GENDER) in Geneva. The overall project strategy was developed in Geneva in coordination with field offices, in consultation with ILO's International Training Centre (ITC) in Turin, and key ILO departments, including ACT/EMP, ACTRAV and LAB/ADMIN (which had a Labour Administration Project, 'twinned' with BASIC, also funded by the Government of Norway).

The project was divided into a global component, and five country components. As outlined in the project document, the project activities were structured around two outcomes which were common to the global component and to the five country specific components:

Outcome 1: ILO Constituents in the target countries are better prepared to promote gender equality at the workplace;

Outcome 2: ILO's knowledge base on gender equality in the world of work strengthened, particularly in relation to the global economic and financial crisis.

Funding for a second phase of the project was agreed with the donor in December 2010, which will extend it until the end of 2011.

This final independent and external evaluation of the BASIC project was conducted in line with the ILO's policy for evaluation of technical cooperation projects, between 8 November 2010 and 14 February 2011. Its broad purpose, as outlined in the TORs (which are attached in Appendix 3), was to evaluate:

- The project's effectiveness in contributing to the planned outcomes; and
- The project's likelihood to have an impact beyond the current phase of implementation.

The evaluation was conducted by the Gender Policy and Planning Unit of the Development Planning Unit (DPU) of University College London.¹ The team was coordinated by Mr. Julian Walker, a member of staff at the DPU, with Ms. Claudy Vouhé and Ms. Nadia Taher, both DPU associates who work as consultants in the field of gender policy and planning.

The evaluation was conducted using data collected through:

- Desk review of project documentation, including project management documents (such as project documents, budget reports and minutes of meetings), a review of the logical framework, and reports on different project activities;
- Desk review of other relevant publications and documents, including background documentation on project countries;
- Interviews with ILO staff, including project staff and technical specialists, at ILO headquarters, ITC-ILO Turin and in field offices;

¹ Development Planning Unit, University College London, 34 Tavistock Square
London WC1H 9EZ, www.ucl.ac.uk/dpu/

- Interviews with key project stakeholders, including ILO constituents and staff of collaborating UN Agencies.

Interviews with ILO staff and partners were carried out during four field visits: one to the ILO HQ in Geneva, two country missions (one to Brazil and one to India), and a mission to participate in the BASIC Project Knowledge Sharing Forum in Turin, during which the draft evaluation findings were shared with, and feedback received from, the project team and constituents. In addition, telephone and Skype interviews were conducted with project stakeholders from countries and team members not reached through the field missions.

1.2 Main findings and conclusions

The overall findings of the evaluation are that the BASIC project has made an important contribution to efforts to address gender inequality through ILO activities in the five project countries, and that valuable progress has been made in relation to the two outcomes defined for the project. Furthermore, in the context of the ILO's new Programme and Budget structures, the BASIC project demonstrates the importance of having dedicated funding for activities on the promotion of gender equality.

The evaluators consider that a number of factors have underpinned the successes of the project. These include the following:

- In-country project design was very well based on consultation with ILO constituents and partners, and the activities identified and supported are therefore extremely relevant to the needs of the country programmes. The linkages between the project activities and country priorities on gender and decent work was clear.
- The project drew well on existing human resources, relationships and interventions. This included drawing on the knowledge of ILO gender specialists, relationships with gender experts and organisations, and, where relevant, building on existing activities and programmes on gender equality in the world of work. Building on what was already in place was critical in enabling timely project start up, which was important given the short time frame.
- The global management of the project was evaluated positively by project staff and partners, as was the efficiency and dedication of project teams in country, and this commitment made it possible to make significant progress despite the time frame of the project.

At the same time there are a number of factors which may have inhibited the impact and sustainability of the project. As reflected in the recommendations (below) it will be important to address some of these issues in Phase 2 of the Project.

- The relatively large budget (\$2.6 million) and short time frame (one year) meant that project teams were working under pressure, and has also meant that there has been reduced incentive for seeking out cost-sharing opportunities or additional funding, which may have implications for sustainability.
- In some cases the wide range of project activities within each country meant that work was spread thinly across a range of areas of activity, meaning that there was less strategic coherence. In other cases (eg activities around Domestic Work) a

critical mass was achieved on a focal area which deepened the strategic relevance of the individual activities.

- In two cases (the ILO New York post and some of the training work in India), the selection of project activities appeared to be based on the need for support to existing ILO activities that needed funding rather than relevance to project
- There could have been a stronger focus on a number of specific management arrangements. These included arrangements for: the documentation and systematic dissemination of project outputs and reports; mechanisms to support communication between the five country projects, and between the project and ILO departments other than GENDER; management of and support to consultants hired to undertake specific project activities, and; on-going monitoring of the project in relations to its impacts (e.g. training impact assessment).

In terms of the contribution of the project and sustainability of the project, given that the majority of project activities have only recently been implemented, or are not yet completed, it is not yet possible to assess the long term impact of activities. However the project has been used to put many processes and structures in place which are likely to make a critical contribution to promoting gender equality in the world of work in the partner countries. Some highlights include the contribution to policy development (e.g. the standard setting agenda on Domestic Workers), capacity building with partners across a range of substantive areas, and methodology development (e.g. the work on time use surveys, gender sensitive statistics and on incorporating a gender perspective into training for Labour Inspectors). It seems likely that the project activities which were grouped strategically around a campaign or issue (e.g. the project inputs on domestic workers) are likely to have a more significant impact than activities which stood more on their own.

One relevant substantive area which could be addressed more systematically through the project is work with employers on gender equality in the informal or unorganised sector, including work with employers' representatives in the domestic work sector. This is a difficult area which would benefit from the development of innovative approaches. BASIC Phase 2 could provide an interesting opportunity to explore this area of focus.

1.3 Recommendations and lessons learned

On the basis of the evaluation, the following recommendations have been addressed to Phase 2 of the BASIC Project, to the ILO Bureau for Gender Equality, and to the project donor.

Recommendations to BASIC Project Phase 2

- Rather than using BASIC 2 to initiate new activities, the BASIC Project should work to **consolidate** the work initiated during BASIC 1*
- Put in place measures to ensure the **sustainability** of the outputs and impacts of the BASIC project*
- Increase the project's substantive focus on **employer representation** for the informal sector and domestic workers.*
- Strengthening of key **management arrangements***

Recommendations to ILO Bureau for Gender Equality (GENDER)

- (e) *Develop **case studies of good practice** on Gender Equality and Decent Work highlighting how they could be used by other ILO Projects*
- (f) *Use the experience of BASIC to **demonstrate how a focus on gender equality can be supported through the new ILO Programme and Budget Structure.***

Recommendations to the Government of Norway

- (g) *Engage with the ILO to discuss how to increase the clarity of **reporting on how gender equality is supported through use of RBSA funds.***
- (h) *Explore approaches to allow funding recipients such as the ILO more **flexibility in the time frames** for the use of funds.*

In addition to these recommendations, a number of lessons can also be learnt from the BASIC experience, which have implications for future ILO activities. These include the following:

- The BASIC Project's response to the tight project schedule was, in part, to build its work largely on *existing* activities in the countries in which it was practical to do so (i.e. those with established ILO work on gender equality). This made an important contribution in: ensuring that ILO activities on gender equality funded through previous interventions were sustained; building on past work to make sure that activities carried out through BASIC were relevant, and meant that they could be rapidly implemented by drawing on preparatory work which had already been undertaken, and; supporting the on-going sustainability of BASIC interventions by making them part of a bigger set of processes with on-going support and involvement from ILO constituents.
- The experience of BASIC stresses the value of undertaking *specific actions on gender equality* as a part of ILO work at the country level, in addition to a mainstreaming strategy, as envisaged in the current ILO Programme and Budget (2010-2011). The BASIC project represents a good example of this type of specific action on gender, in that it created the space (and budget) for a dedicated team working on specified activities on gender equality. It allowed for additional funding and support to constituents and experts working on gender issues in each country, and created the space for dedicated capacity building activities focused on gender equality. This means that the BASIC countries were able to go much further in promoting gender equality in decent work than they would have been purely through attempting to mainstream a focus on gender into their other country activities.
- The networking and cooperation activities which were initiated between Brazil and Angola through BASIC, and which it is planned will be further developed through Phase 2 of BASIC, and through new projects developed on the basis of the BASIC experience, show that South-South collaboration can be fruitful even between countries with very different contexts and levels of experience in working on gender and decent work. This sheds light on the value of this kind of collaborative approach in building networking and solidarity, even where specific activities and structures might not be transferable due to contextual differences.

2. Project background

The project, 'Gender Equality in the World of Work in Brazil, Angola, South Africa, India and China' (BASIC) was funded by the Government of Norway as part of the Norway/ILO Partnership Framework Agreement (2008-09). The project was implemented between 1st January and 31st December 2010. Funding for a second phase of the project was agreed with the donor in December 2010, which will extend it until the end of 2011.

The project was managed from ILO headquarters, coordinated by a Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) in the ILO Bureau for Gender Equality Bureau (GENDER) in Geneva. The overall project strategy was developed in Geneva in coordination with field offices, in consultation with ILO's International Training Centre (ITC) in Turin, and key ILO divisions, including ACT/EMP, ACTRAV and the twin LAB/ADMIN project (which is also funded by the Government of Norway).

The project was divided into a global component, and five country components. The global component included coordination and knowledge sharing activities and policy advocacy. This component was undertaken by project staff in GENDER, in the field offices of the BASIC countries, with support from the ITC-ILO in Turin, and also involved the use of a member of staff in the ILO offices in New York who worked on policy advocacy, lobbying key United Nations entities in New York.

The country components in Angola, Brazil, India and South Africa were managed by National Project Coordinators (NPCs)², placed in the ILO offices in each country with technical support from the field based Gender Specialists and Programme Officers, with the exception of Angola where ILO is a non-resident agency and the NPC was based in the Ministry of Public Administration, Employment and Social Security (MAPESS). In China the project was run by a member of the regular staff with assistance from a long-term consultant. Specific country project strategies were defined in each country, within the structure set up by the overall project strategy, in consultation with ILO constituents and partners, ILO country offices and field gender specialists.

As outlined in the global project document, the project activities were structured around two outcomes which were common to the global component and to the five country specific components:

Outcome 1: ILO Constituents in the target countries are better prepared to promote gender equality at the workplace;

Outcome 2: ILO's knowledge base on gender equality in the world of work strengthened, particularly in relation to the global economic and financial crisis.

The project activities identified and agreed for the five project countries were specific to the country strategies and the demands of the constituents in each country. However, they can be broadly grouped into a number of categories, including:

- Capacity building and sensitisation workshops and seminars (for example, training of facilitators in the use of the ILO Participatory Gender Audit tool in Angola and workshop on work and life balance within private companies in Brazil,)
- Training on employment skills (e.g. vocational training in India and women's entrepreneurship development in China)
- Institutional development and networking (e.g. the development of Task Forces on Gender Equality in the World of Work and on Domestic Workers in India, technical assistance to municipalities in the Brazil on mainstreaming race and gender in

² In China, however, a regular budget staff member ran the project with a consultant hired for the project.

decent work, south-south networking activities between the Angola and Brazil projects).

- Support to the development and implementation of policy (for example policy development around the rights of domestic workers in Brazil, China and India, a review of Angolan Labour law, support to the application of labour conventions (especially ILO conventions dealing with non-discrimination at work and equal pay between men and women) in China and South Africa, support to legal reforms on equal retirement ages in China and the development of an Equal Opportunities code of practice in China)
- Research (for example studies on Domestic Workers in India, Brazil and China, on sexual harassment in India, and on women workers in the informal sector in South Africa)
- Methodological development (for example development of time use survey methods in Brazil and India, a tool for the measurement of women's empowerment in India, a review of the Quarterly Labour Force Survey method used in South Africa).

In practice, however, many activities could fit across more than one of the above categories and many of the activities in different categories reinforced each other. For example the majority of capacity building and sensitization workshops built on research conducted as part of the BASIC project, and much of the support to the implementation of policy was through research or capacity building.

3 Evaluation

3.1 Evaluation background

This final independent and external evaluation of the BASIC project was conducted in line with the ILO's policy for evaluation of technical cooperation projects, between 8 November 2010 and 14 February 2011. Its broad purpose, as outlined in the TORs (which are attached in Appendix 3), was to evaluate:

- The project's effectiveness in contributing to the planned outcomes; and
- The project's likelihood to have an impact beyond the current phase of implementation.

Given the nature of the BASIC project and, in particular, its short time frame and relatively large budget, the scope for the evaluation to focus on the impact of the project and its components was limited. While the project ran from 1st January until 31st December 2010, the bulk of project field activities did not start until country projects were fully set up in March 2010, and implementation of many project activities did not start until the middle of the year or later. This meant that during the evaluation missions in November and December 2010, many of the activities were still on-going, reports had not been completed or finalised, and it was far too early to attempt to assess project impacts. Furthermore, since the evaluation missions were completed, Phase 2 of the BASIC project was agreed. This will extend project activities until the end of 2011 in all of the five countries. In view of these two issues, the evaluation has therefore focused more on the project *process* (in terms of the approach that has been taken toward making progress towards the specified outcomes, and the methods that have been employed), as well as to how the project has been able to contribute to promoting gender equality in the wider work of ILO, rather than focusing primarily on the impacts of the work already carried out to date.

The evaluation was conducted by the Gender Policy and Planning Unit of the Development Planning Unit (DPU) of University College London. The team was coordinated by Mr. Julian

Walker, a member of staff at the DPU, with Ms. Claudy Vouhé and Ms. Nadia Taher, both DPU associates who work as consultants in the field of gender policy and planning.

3.2 Evaluation methodology

The evaluation was conducted using data collected through a variety of means. These included:

- Desk review of project documentation, including project management documents (such as project documents, budget reports and meetings minutes), a review of the logical framework, and reports on different project activities;
- Desk review of other relevant publications and documents, including background documentation on project countries;
- Interviews with ILO staff, including project staff and technical specialists, at ILO headquarters, ITC-ILO Turin and in field offices;
- Interviews with key project stakeholders, including ILO constituents and staff of collaborating UN Agencies.

For a list of interviewees involved in the evaluation, see Appendix 1.

Interviews with ILO staff and partners were carried out during four field visits. These included missions to:

- the ILO HQ in Geneva by Ms. Nadia Taher and Julian Walker (8 -11 November 2010)
- the ILO Country Office in Brasilia, by Ms. Claudy Vouhé (8-12 November 2010)
- the ILO Decent Work Team and Country Office in New Delhi by Mr. Julian Walker (29 November - 3 December 2010)
- to the ITC-ILO in Turin to attend the BASIC Project Knowledge Sharing Forum by Mr. Julian Walker (13-15 December 2010)

In addition a number of ILO staff and partners were interviewed via telephone/Skype. This was crucial in the case of the three countries to which the evaluation team did not make field visits (Angola, China and South Africa). The evaluators were also able to follow up in more detail on project activities for these three countries by attending the BASIC Project's 'Knowledge Sharing Forum' in Turin (mentioned above), which was a workshop in which NPCs and tripartite constituents from the five BASIC countries shared the lessons that they had learnt during the process of the BASIC projects and began to collaborate on planning for the next phase of the project. This forum was also used as an opportunity to share the draft evaluation findings with the BASIC project staff and partners, and obtain feedback from them. A list of those who attended this workshop is included in Appendix 1.

During the preparation of interview schedules in preparation for each of the field visits, particularly during the field mission to the HQ in Geneva, the initial schedule proposed by the ILO team focused exclusively on staff who had been directly involved in the BASIC Project (principally staff from GENDER, including both HQ staff in GENDER and the field specialists). However, given the importance of ensuring that the BASIC project activities make a contribution to promoting gender equality in the wider work of the ILO,³ and also to assess performance on the project's global component output GC 2.2,⁴ it was also important to assess the extent to which ILO staff not directly associated with the project have contributed to and benefited from BASIC. The evaluation team therefore requested that the

³ Although this was not explicitly within the scope of the BASIC Project.

⁴ "Project achievements, lessons and good practices have been communicated to a wide audience, including through relevant UN fora at national and global levels"

interview schedules were broadened to include interviews with key ILO staff in departments which are working in fields related to BASIC project activities.

The evaluation, as specified in the TORs (see Appendix 3), required the consideration of the following key factors:

- Design
- Relevance and strategic fit
- Implementation
- Effectiveness
- Efficiency of resource use
- Effectiveness of management arrangements
- Sustainability

In addition, as the BASIC project represents a critical opportunity for the ILO's Bureau for Gender Equality to promote mainstreaming of gender equality in ILO's Decent Work Agenda (as envisaged in the "International Labour Conference resolution (2009) on Gender Equality at the Heart of Decent Work"), the evaluation team thought that it would be important to assess the extent to which the BASIC project had been able to increase the space for gender equality in the work of the ILO more generally, although this was a desirable indirect project impact, and not explicitly within the scope of the BASIC Project.

To this end, the information collected and lessons derived from the evaluation study have been analysed by developing an 'institutional map' for promoting gender equality through the BASIC project, using a tool called the 'Web of Institutionalisation' (Levy, 1998, see Appendix 5). This tool was used both to generate and structure the questions used in the discussion topic guide, used to structure interview discussions (see Appendix 4), and to analyse the information collected during the field visits. In addition the tool was used to present initial findings to the BASIC team during the Knowledge Sharing Forum in Turin. This methodology allows for a consideration of the factors specified in the evaluation TOR requirements, at the same time as situating them within an institutional assessment of the BASIC project, the ILO, and its key partners to give a broader assessment of how the BASIC project can contribute to the wider objective of promoting a focus on gender equality in the work of the ILO. This is achieved by summarising the main strengths of (and challenges to) the BASIC project in promoting gender equality in relation to thirteen critical elements which determine the space for gender mainstreaming.

4 Evaluation findings

4.1 The context of the BASIC Project

The BASIC project has both worked within the policy context of the ILO, and been in the position to contribute to the ILO's policy development on gender equality in the world of work.

An important policy resource for the ILO, and its constituents and partners, are the Labour Conventions. The ILO engages in international labour standard setting, ratification and supervision, and technical cooperation to assist ILO member States in applying these standards in national legislation, policies and practical measures. Four conventions with particular potential for the promotion of gender equality include the 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 (No. 183).

Of these, Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100), and Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111), have both been ratified in all of the BASIC project countries. Workers with Family Responsibilities Convention, 1981 (No. 156) and Maternity Protection Convention, 2000 (No. 183), however, have not been ratified in any of the BASIC countries, although the process of ratification of Workers with Family Responsibilities Convention, 1981, (No. 156) is in progress in Brazil.⁵

In addition, the ILO is currently engaging with its constituents and member States in a standard setting process for a proposed international labour standard on decent work for domestic workers, which, if adopted and subsequently ratified, would have a significant impact on gender equality, given the fact that this field of employment is typically dominated by women workers, working in very unequal context and with very low levels of labour protection. For example, according to data provided by the BASIC project team in Brazil, 17% of women workers are domestic workers, and women make up 98% of all domestic workers.

In addition to international standard setting, the ILO's most recent guiding instrument on gender equality is the resolution on "Gender Equality at the Heart of Decent Work" of the International Labour Conference, the annual assembly of all governments, employers' organizations and workers' organizations from the ILO's 183 member States, in 2009. It outlines recommended actions to mainstream gender into the work of the ILO across all fields. However, while important in guiding ILO actions, this policy document does not have the same binding nature as a labour convention in terms of member State actions and reporting.

The application of the ILO's policies on gender equality are supported by the ILO Action Plan for Gender Equality 2010-2015, which has been mandated as a tool for gender mainstreaming and the promotion of gender equality in the organisation through the policy on 'Gender Equality and Mainstreaming in the ILO', issued by the Director General in 1999.

These ILO policy commitments on gender are translated into specific planned interventions for the organisation through the medium of the biennial Programme and Budget results

⁵ The Executive Office within the Presidency of the Republic will send the Convention to the House of Representatives for ratification in 2011.

based planning system. The current Programme and Budget (2010 – 2011) has introduced a new format, which will be in place for at least the next three biennia (i.e. until 2015). This Strategic Policy Framework (SPF) is based around nineteen outcomes related to the activities of the ILO, which act as a basis for the allocation of ILO strategic priorities, budget allocation, and performance indicators, both at the organisational level and at the level of ILO country offices. Of particular relevance to the BASIC project are outcomes 5 (on equitable working conditions for women and men), 11 (on labour administration), 17 (on the elimination of discrimination in employment and occupation) and 19 (on an integrated approach to decent work).

Among the nineteen outcomes in this new Planning and Budget format, there is no specific outcome which focuses on the promotion of gender equality in the decent work agenda, as the intention was to mainstream gender equality into the 19 other outcomes both through gender specific actions, and through ensuring that all of the outcome based work-plans and indicators take on gender equality issues.

However, experience has shown that specific actions, and programmes on gender equality, supported by dedicated budgets are often crucial in supporting wider mainstreaming initiatives (see, for example, Mukhopadhyay, 2004, Daly, 2005). The absence of a specific outcome on gender equality may potentially impact on the funding of ILO work on gender equality. While space has been made in Outcome 17 ('Discrimination in Employment and Occupation is Eliminated') for GENDER's "Global Product", through which specific funds for work on gender equality can be channelled, only part of GENDER's work relates to Outcome 17, and their lower visibility in relation to other outcomes may be a threat to funding of gender related activities. The experience of the BASIC project, which has resulted in a higher profile for gender equality actions in the five DWCPs of the countries involved in the project, is evidence of the crucial impact that earmarked funding for gender can have, in addition to using general funds in a gender sensitive manner. Project staff and constituents from all the five countries were very clear that the resources made available through the BASIC project (described by one team as a 'gift from heaven') had meant that they were able to go much further on activities to promote gender equality than they would have otherwise been able to using the office's regular budgets.

These issues related to funding for gender through the new Programme and Budget mean that it is therefore critical to ensure that, in addition to funding work on gender through GENDER's Global Product, budgets allocated through the other eighteen outcomes are also used for work on gender equality. One approach to ensure that this happens in practice, which was suggested by some ILO staff during the evaluation discussions, would be to undertake a gender budgeting exercise to ensure that the budgets per outcome in the Programme and Budget are gender sensitive as envisaged. However, if this approach was to be successful, it would be important to clearly define the role of GENDER in steering this process, and to develop a clear system to track gender related expenses in the 19 outcomes. The methodologies developed through the ILO Participatory Gender Audit could be a useful input to this end.

4.2 Project design and strategy

4.2.1 The planning of the BASIC project

In the policy and planning context discussed above, the BASIC project has represented a crucial initiative for the promotion of gender equality in the work of the ILO, and could potentially act as a test-ground for increasing the profile of a gender perspective into DWCPs by acting as a model for building cooperation on the promotion of gender equality with constituents.

The BASIC project is the outcome of an on-going relationship between the ILO and the Norwegian government. A new phase in this relationship was initiated in 2008, when the Norwegian government launched a decent work strategy, and as a result increased its contribution to the ILO. This was reflected in the 2008-2009 Partnership Agreement between the ILO and the Government of Norway, which allocated 100 million Kroner (\$18 million approx.) to the ILO, half of which went to support specific themes, and half of which went into Regular Budget Supplementary Account (RBSA). Initially gender equality issues were to be addressed through the RBSA, with reference to which the Norwegian partners made the request that gender issues were highlighted in the use of these resources. Thus while the funds were allocated to RBSA, the Norwegian partners made an attempt to 'soft earmark' them for gender equality, although questions were raised about how successful this approach was in practice, as the donor is not in a position to track evidence of the use of these funds on gender equality. This provides an indication of the difficulties that donors may encounter in attempting to support gender equality through the new ILO programme and budget structure and RBSA mechanism. However it should be noted that funds that the ILO Office in New-Delhi received as part of the Norwegian RBSA funds (2.2 million US\$) which had been soft-earmarked for gender in the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific *had* in fact been used on a Decent Work for Domestic Workers project. The use of these funds and their positive impact on the promotion of gender equality is discussed in the relevant evaluation report (Stearns, 2010).

At the end of 2009 (December), on the basis of discussions during the 2009 ILC which had focused on Labour Inspection and on Gender Equality, the Government of Norway allocated an additional budget of 30,000,000 Norwegian Kroner to be used on projects in the five BASIC countries. Half was allocated to a project supporting labour inspection (LAB/ADMIN) and the other half to the project on Gender Equality in the World of Work (BASIC). It was initially intended that this money should be used by September 2010, but on the basis of subsequent discussions, the project timeframe was extended until December 2010 (an official request for a no-cost extension until end-Dec 2010 was submitted to the Government of Norway and approved).

In some ways the planning of the BASIC project was a top-down, donor led process. The identification of the five project countries was made by the donor, and not put up for discussion with the ILO (although the donor indicated some flexibility in relation to the choice of Angola as a project country). This meant that there was no space to suggest different countries which might have been included in the project on the basis of their strategic relevance to the work of the ILO. Furthermore, from the ILO perspective there is no clear logic to the selection of the BASIC countries, which have diverse contexts and needs, and range from countries with well established work on gender and decent work, to countries for which this is a relatively new issue, and, in the case of Angola, one country in which there is no ILO Office and no DWCP, meaning that activities on gender and decent work had to be built from the ground up.

The diversity of countries selected also meant that it was difficult to develop a clear 'project identity' across the five countries, with difficulties to develop a shared strategy and collaboration between the country level projects. However, despite the diversity of the countries, there has been some success in building collaboration in the end (for example the south-south collaboration between Brazil and Angola, and the potential for collaboration between Brazil, China and India which are all working on issues related to the standard setting process for the potential domestic workers instrument).

Another donor-led requirement related to the planning of the project was the BASIC project should collaborate in the five countries with its 'twin' labour inspection project, run by LAB/ADMIN. Given the relevance of gender issues for labour inspection, this was a valuable

approach. However one problem in relation to this coordination is that while gender issues are highly relevant to labour inspection, not all of the gender equality issues covered in the BASIC project relate to labour inspection, giving this intended collaboration a slightly unbalanced nature.

Another aspect of project planning which was regarded as top-down by a number of ILO staff and partners in-country, was that the overall project document which outlines the strategy for the project was led at the level of ILO headquarters in Geneva (albeit in consultation with field offices, the ILO ITC, ACTRAV, ACT/EMP and LAB/ADMIN) and that the project is centrally managed by a CTA in GENDER. However, while a number of ILO in-country staff and partners commented on this top down planning approach during the evaluation, it appears that their objections were more on principle than because of the actual impact that this had on the flexibility and space that staff and partners were given to develop project activities in country. In practice, the outcomes specified in the project document developed in GENDER were sufficiently broad that it was possible to develop country level activities and outputs which could fit both the project document and country priorities. In fact the only concrete problem that seem to have derived from the centralised management of the project were the time consuming financial approval processes, as discussed in section 4.4.3.⁶

One positive aspect of the centralised management, mentioned by project staff from one country team is that having to work directly with Geneva for project management promoted exchanges that would not otherwise have happened, giving country teams a new opportunity to discuss their work at the level of headquarters.

One problematic factor which was specified as a non-negotiable (beyond the extension to December 2010) aspect of the project was the time frame for its development and execution, which was extremely short, particularly given the significant project budget. This was challenging for most of the teams involved in the project. The short time frame meant that project activities had to be planned and implemented very rapidly, without space for more strategic planning through, for example, undertaking dedicated situational analysis in each country to inform the choice of project activities. The short and shifting timeframe, and the uncertainty about whether or not there would be a second phase of the project also meant that it was difficult for the country projects to plan ahead in terms of how they would carry forward the activities initiated through the BASIC project. This was of particular concern given the fact that, with the project implementation only starting by the spring of 2010, many of the project activities were only just getting off the ground by the time the project finished at the end of 2010.

Importantly, at the time of the evaluation the ILO was negotiating a new partnership with Norway, including possible budget for a Phase 2 the BASIC project. This was agreed in December 2010, in time for the Turin Knowledge Sharing Forum and has given the project a vital space to consolidate much of the work that it was not able to fully consolidate in Phase 1.

However, despite the limitations imposed by the short time frame of the project, and the lack of dedicated situational analyses for the country projects, planning of activities at the country was coherent and relevant to the DWCPs in Brazil, China, India and South Africa, and to the needs of constituents in Angola. This is evidenced by the coherence between the activities developed in each country log-frame with the relevant DWCPs, and, in the cases of Brazil

⁶ On the other hand it should be noted that this centralised approach made it possible to streamline other management tasks such as the project extension from nine months to one year across the five project countries.

and India, by the positive evaluation of the relevance of the project activities by ILO constituents such interviewed during the evaluation missions.

This relevance was the result of the fact that, in those countries with established ILO work, the teams were able to both build on their existing work on gender and consult the ILO constituents about the relevant strategies and activities and, in the case of Angola which does not have an ILO office, nor a DWCP, the BASIC project engaged in consultation activities with key constituents and partners to ensure that the project activities and strategies selected would be appropriate.

In Brazil for instance, good baseline research and statistics were available, as the country has embarked on a wide range a participatory action-research processes since former President Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva came to power in 2003. For instance, the National Plan for Women has been elaborated through bottom-up consultation, culminating in the participation of 3000 women at the national conference of women in Brasilia. The mechanism has created strong bodies that control public policies and are a regular source of information with whom the ILO work. Furthermore, some of ILO key partners carry out regular research (for example, DIESSE, a research and training institute created by Trade Unions).

In terms of building on existing work, particularly in Brazil, China and India, the BASIC project activities built on a body of work on gender equality in the world of work which was already well established. This was also supported by the strong involvement of the field gender specialists in developing country strategies, whose contextual knowledge and institutional memory was well used.

In Brazil the project came at a time when there were many unmet demands for work on gender waiting “on the shelves”. In this context, BASIC appeared as a real opportunity to develop a strategy to address these demands. Longstanding relationships with partners were utilized to plan the project and the fact that they already have an ongoing dialogue with these partners meant that they were able to quickly (in just over a week) reach an agreement on the project strategy and activities, as in practice many of these were already in the pipe line.

Similarly in China the project built on existing collaborations on gender equality, notably the work which had been undertaken as part of the ILO ‘3+1’ mechanism⁷ since 2001. This meant that the project built on existing relationships and was able to launch many activities which had already been proposed and discussed with partners. Specific project activities were agreed during a meeting with constituents in December 2009 (including the Ministry of Labour, the CEC employers’ organisation, TUs, and the All China Women’s Federation). It should be noted, however, that not all project activities defined were based on existing proposed activities, and some new areas for intervention were identified during consultations for the BASIC project. For example, the focus on domestic workers in China was a response to a request from government and workers organisations, based on a study which suggested that there is a shortage of 15 million skilled domestic workers in the country, and it was suggested by these constituents that this activity would replace an existing proposal on high-level training for leaders.

In India, as well as consulting extensively with constituents, project planning was similarly based on the extension of existing project activities and gender themes in the work of the

⁷ A working group collaboration between the Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security (MHRSS), the Ministry of Labour, the China Employers Confederation (CEC), the All China Federation of Trade Unions (ACFTU) and the All China Women’s Federation (ACWF)

DWCP, including the project on domestic workers which was already being funded through the Norwegian contribution to the RSBA up to December 2009.

In Brazil, China and India, while building on existing and pipeline ILO activities on gender equality meant that the project funds could be used effectively despite the tight time frame, this also meant that, to some extent, the strategic coherence of the portfolio of activities within each country, funded by BASIC may not easily stand out. For example in China and in some areas of the portfolio of activities in India, the wide spread of project activities makes it hard to identify a clear coherence amongst them. In contrast, where there is a clear relationship between a number of different project activities in each country this creates a strategic 'mass' of activities which contribute more than the sum of their parts. For example, a range of different activities around policy development, institutional networking, research and grassroots mobilisation on Domestic Workers in India, while separate activities, reinforce and support each other to make a larger significant push on this broad issue in the country, which had a positive impact among partners, including the Ministry of Labour and Employment. In the Brazilian case, the activities developed through BASIC were closely coordinated to other activities developed within the gender and race program at the Office. BASIC also supported the overall ILO and Norway development cooperation emphasis on equality and non-discrimination promotion in China.

In South Africa, where there is less of a history of intensive ILO work on gender equality, the project activities were discussed with constituents, and agreed with a technical committee of National Economic Development and Labour Council (NEDLAC), which is the national tripartite committee, on the basis of a concept paper developed by the ILO office. Feedback received during the evaluation was that constituents such as TUs appreciated the high level of consultation in the project strategy development.

Much of the strength of the project has stemmed from this consultation with constituents as a basis for planning, which meant that project not only built on existing work in each country but also on new priority areas identified by constituents. Thus for the main part the extensive consultations and use of existing knowledge has meant that the activities identified for the project are relevant to the needs of constituents and thus to the DWCP. There are very few exceptions to this, apart from a couple of activities which appear to have been identified more on the basis of the need for the ILO and some country offices to fund existing activities than because they are strategically coherent with the BASIC project. One focal area of the project which related more to ILO needs than to constituent demands was the development of a post in ILO New York for policy advocacy on gender equality in the world of work. Another, in the case of the India country project, was some of the work on skills development; while the skills development on domestic workers was coherent with the project strategy, relevance of work other in sectors such as brassware, and glass were not so clear (although over the course of the project there had been an increased focus on issues related to gender equality for home based workers in these sectors, it did not appear to be fully elaborated and they continued to sit uneasily in relation to the overall strategy of the project).

An important component in planning the BASIC project was the allocation of the project budget. This was used to cover management costs at the ILO HQ in Geneva,⁸ to cover technical support and capacity building inputs by the ITC in Turin, to cover the New York policy advocacy component, and the remaining funds were divided equally between the five BASIC countries. As project staff were needed to run the project activities in all of the five countries, and the principal costs in New York and Turin were staff costs, a large proportion of the project budget has been used for staff costs. In addition to needing the staff specifically for the BASIC project, the opportunity that the project provided for hiring of

⁸ Where project funds were used to cover 60% of the cost of the CTA and an administrative assistant

gender staff into the ILO offices was appreciated in many of the countries as an end in itself. This is important because, as noted in a previous evaluation of the ILO soft-earmarked gender RBSA funds for the Asia Pacific Regional Office (Stearns, 2010, p4), 'it remains exceedingly difficult to leverage funds to address the sore lack of competent gender specialists...' In Brazil, the BASIC budget secured the gender team for a whole year in a context where maintaining the focus on gender (and race) since 2003-04 had been difficult because of the limited timeframe and budgets of most programmes. For India and China, the timely arrival of BASIC funds at the end of another gender project (RBSA Gender) meant that the momentum built by the RBSA (Norway) project could be maintained and that NPCs were already on board and had been exposed to the ILO operation in both technical and managerial areas.

4.2.2 The 'evaluability' of the project document

In general, the log-frame for the project is systematic and clearly presented, and the indicators, and their targets, are logically coherent with the outputs and activities that they link to. The log-frame therefore acts a useful basis for the evaluation of the project. It is worth noting that for the main part the indicators used are output indicators (e.g. reports submitted, trainings delivered), rather than more ambitious outcome or impact indicators designed to reflect the impacts of and changes resulting from the project. This is appropriate given the short length of the project, which means that it is not likely that wider impacts will be observed during the course of the project or be clearly attributable to the project. In fact, where efforts have been made to specify indicators that look more broadly at project impacts, in the absence of field monitoring (as noted in section 4.4.3. of this report) it is not possible to assess whether these targets have been achieved. For example output SA1.1 has a target that social partners should have '*increased understanding and enhanced work towards improving labour inspection systems to monitor more effectively implementation of Convention Nos 100 and 111*', but in the absence of field monitoring or training impact assessment this is not possible to ascertain.

While the log-frame was generally clear and useful as a basis for evaluation, a number of other points are worth considering:

- As noted above, while the broad definition of the outcomes meant that there was flexibility for the definition of relevant activities in-country, because the definition of the project outcomes was at a very high level of abstraction, the country outputs related to each outcome could include a very wide range of issues, limiting the pressure to identify a clear strategy across the five countries.
- Not all of the outputs under the second outcome (*ILO's knowledge base on gender equality in the world of work is strengthened, particularly in relation to the global economic and financial crisis*) seem to fit. For example outputs C2.1⁹ and C 2.2¹⁰ actually seem to relate more to capacity of constituents in the target countries (ie Outcome 1) than to the knowledge base of the ILO.
- Outcome 2's focus on the global economic crisis did not appear to be systematically developed, or reflected in the outputs, activities or indicators.
- While clear indicators have been developed for each output, and targets specified, there has been no systematic use of these indicators, or reporting on progress towards achieving targets in project reports (for example the BASIC project progress

⁹ "Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) guidelines for companies developed, field tested and finalised with companies and the other 3+1 partners".

¹⁰ "3+1 partners trained on action against sexual harassment. A Chinese training manual on Action against sexual harassment used and measures against sexual harassment adopted in companies or taken up in collective bargaining agreements, or operational hotlines in selected labour inspectorates".

report dated July 2010). If the log-frame is to be used as a project management tool this data needs to be collected and systematically reported.

4.3 Effectiveness of project implementation

The project's effectiveness in meeting its two outcomes and more generally in terms of its contribution to the ILO's work to place gender equality at the heart of decent work can be evaluated at a number of levels. These are explored in the following sections and include: the extent to which the project was able to align its work with the expressed needs of women and men workers and employers both directly and through their representative organisations and; the extent to which the project was able to contribute to the ILO's wider work on the promotion of gender equality.

4.3.1 Aligning the project's work with the needs of women and men workers

It is not part of the ILO mandate to work directly with women and men workers, but rather to support the organisations representing them. In terms of the project's strategy to embed itself in the expressed needs of women and men workers in the five BASIC countries, there was therefore little evidence of direct contact with women and men workers as a basis for the development of the project and the project strategy. However, as discussed above, in some countries, like Brazil and India, the project had access to significant qualitative and quantitative data about the needs of women and men workers to inform the project. Also, in practice, the BASIC project *did* work extensively with both workers' and employers organisations, as well as government bodies responsible for labour rights when defining national project strategies and specific activities.

In addition, the project has worked directly with women and men on the ground through many of its activities, which rooted the project in the experiences of women and men on the ground. For example, in India, the project has included a range of activities linked to understanding the experiences and actively supporting needs of women and men workers. This included, for example:

- organising and unionising domestic workers to lobby for their rights and also to access government social service and health schemes;
- attitudinal campaigns around the importance of domestic work and the status of domestic workers, and;
- research based around the life stories of women domestic workers and other sectors that have a considerable number of female workforce, such as construction, health sector.

In Brazil, activities also touched women and men workers directly, through:

- field research on the use of time and on domestic workers' access to specific rights (training and education for instance);
- monitoring the impact of the "life and work" training sessions through field visits to participating enterprises, and;
- coordination with the Secretariats on Policies for Women and Race Equality, which work through National Plans, developed during a comprehensive process of public consultation.

This work which focused directly on the lived experiences of women and men workers has made an important input to the effectiveness of the project by ensuring that the project

activities were based on an understanding of the expressed needs of women and men on the ground.

4.3.2 Working with organisations that represent women and men workers and employers

While the project was well grounded on consultation with constituents, a key challenge that it faced (which is also a wider challenge for the ILO's work on promoting gender equality in the world of work) is the tendency in the constituent organisations to primarily focus on the formal economy. This is a challenge in the BASIC countries where informal economy employment is a high proportion of total employment. For example, in India it is estimated that formal economy employment is only around 8% of total employment. Nonetheless the representation of the interests of informal economy workers remains a challenge both in terms of policy development and in terms of constituent organisations which represent them. For example, in India Trade Unions are constantly facing new challenges reaching out and representing the interests of workers in the unorganised sector, although there is evidence that these unions are making efforts to develop their work in this area. South Africa's National Economic Development and Labour Council (NEDLAC) includes a separate structure for workers in the informal economy named the 'Community Chamber', but integrating this fully into NEDLAC remains a challenge.

In this context the BASIC Project has made progress in working with constituent organisations that represent the needs of informal economy workers, including both non traditional unions (for example the National Federation of Domestic Workers in Brazil) and NGOs (for example the National Domestic Workers Movement in India). However an area which remains challenging is working with constituent organisations which represent employers in the informal economy and non-traditional fields such as domestic work. The main work with employers in India, for example, was with the Standing Committee on Public Enterprise (SCOPE) on the development and application of equal opportunities policy. Similarly, in Brazil, the ILO has supported the government Gender Pro-Equity Programme that targets state and parastatal enterprises with the aim of having an impact on human resources and organizational culture with new practices of gender equity. In these enterprises in India and Brazil, women are not the majority, but face very specific issues (maternal leave, child care, sexual harassment, working shifts and their implications on family life and health). However while this work was valuable in itself, it did not engage with informal economy workers, who, as discussed above, are the majority and less well served by labour protection. In the case of domestic workers, in China the study on domestic workers conducted through the project dealt with the issue of employers by primarily focusing on state referral agencies (which was problematic as these represent only a small proportion of domestic workers) and in India attempts were made to include an employers' perspective on the issue of domestic work by engaging with Residents Associations (or colonies). However, despite these efforts, work with employers' representative organisations for domestic workers and the informal sector on gender equality remains a challenge which could be explored further in the Phase 2 of the project.

In addition to working through workers' and employers' organisations in order to consult on the development of the BASIC project strategy, good work has also been done through the project to ensure that these organisations are more receptive to the needs of particular groups of women and men workers by building their capacity. This has included efforts to build the extent to which workers in the informal economy have representative organisations (e.g. the development of collective representation for domestic workers in India) and also building the awareness and capacity of organisations to support gender equality (for example gender sensitivity training of Trade Unions in India, and the Participatory Gender Audit with the Angolan Trade Unions).

4.3.3. Contributing to ILO's wider work on gender equality

The ILO, and specifically GENDER, has already made significant steps to ensure that staff from other departments collaborate and focus on gender equality issues in their work, as envisioned in the ILO Policy on Gender Equality of 1999, and the ILO Action Plan for Gender Equality 2010–15. An important asset to promote this goal is the Gender Network, which encompasses approximately 130 female and male staff members across the ILO.

Although this is not one of its explicit objectives,¹¹ the BASIC project is in the position to draw on and contribute to this initiative to embed a focus on gender equality in the work of all staff and to promote collaboration on gender equality in the world of work. However, to date, perhaps as a result of the time constraints that the project was working under, this potential has not been fully exploited. The BASIC project could have done more in systematically promoting knowledge sharing between the ILO offices in the BASIC countries, between the BASIC project and other ILO departments, and within ILO offices in the BASIC countries (with the exception of Angola which does not have an ILO office). For example more work could have been done to draw on the expertise of sectoral experts in other ILO departments or sectors (e.g. TRAVAIL, STATISTICS), to circulate some of the high quality reports and good practices that had been undertaken in the BASIC country projects (for example, as discussed earlier, the sharing of project activities on domestic worker's rights would have been a critical input for mainstream staff dealing with the standard setting process in TRAVAIL). This would have also had an important impact on the sustainability of the projects' results, by embedding the project in the activities of ILO staff from other departments, and will be an important consideration of Phase 2 of the Project.

There was some coordination and knowledge sharing with other ILO staff in practice. However, this was in part a result of informal networks and relationships (e.g. between gender specialists and other staff, or through the gender network) rather than as a result of deliberate dissemination activities by the project, with the exception of cooperation under the umbrella of the 'twin' LAB/ADMIN project. It is important to note that this limited focus on dissemination has been in part a result of the schedule of the project, which created time pressure for project staff due to administrative and logistical demands, and secondly that many of the reports had not been finalised, or had only recently been finalised, at the time of the evaluation missions and so were not yet ready for dissemination.

At the country level, while there was evidence of coordination with other office staff members (particularly during the planning of each country's portfolio of activities) the project was not always well linked to the work of other staff. In one ILO country office, discussions with non-BASIC project staff suggested that they were only partly aware of BASIC project activities relevant to their sectoral areas of expertise, and that some BASIC meetings and workshops with constituents were set up without consulting relevant ILO officers on their availability to attend them. In the other offices, however, efforts were made to involve other technical specialists by organising workshops in consultation with and with participation of specialists such as Standards, Workers' Activity, Employers Specialist, Social Dialogue and Skills Specialist.

As noted above, one area of intervention where there was a clear effort at coordination, as required by the Norway/ILO Partnership Framework Agreement, was with the LAB/ADMIN project. The main work here was to ensure the integration of a gender perspective into the LAB/ADMIN project's modular training manual on labour inspection. This is a large manual (around 700 pages), which includes discussions on key conventions relating to gender,

¹¹ Although the BASIC Project Global Component output 2.2 does relate to this objective.

namely the Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100), Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111), Workers with Family Responsibilities Convention, 1981, (No. 156)) and for which efforts have been made to mainstream gender issues throughout. It also includes a module dealing specifically with gender and labour inspection issues of around 60 pages. Inputs were made into this by the BASIC team. In addition, the gender module was co-funded by BASIC. While this manual was piloted in Ukraine, there is a plan to translate the whole training manual into the languages of the BASIC countries. In Brazil, the introduction of gender in Labour Inspection was regarded as a break-through for the ILO, and the LAB/ADMIN project was supported by experiences learnt through BASIC (for instance, issues of “life and work” balance were introduced in the manual). Some additional collaboration was also originally planned with LAB/ADMIN (a mid-project Knowledge Sharing Workshop) but not delivered in practice, which is a pity given the contribution this could have made to deepened coordination between the two projects.

4.4 Efficiency of management arrangements and resource use

In evaluating the extent to which the organisational structures of the ILO and the BASIC project have been supportive of gender mainstreaming, and of the project objectives, a number of questions arise. These relate to the mobilisation of human resources for gender in the ILO, as well as for the BASIC project in particular (staff development), to the coordination between BASIC project staff, gender specialists and the mainstream ILO technical staff (developing mainstream responsibility for gender equality), and finally to the procedures and administrative structures through which ILO and the BASIC project work. These are explored in detail below.

4. 4.1 Use and development of human resources

The ILO has a strong team of gender specialists, which includes a team of seven full-time professional staff based in GENDER at headquarters, eight full-time gender specialists in regional and sub-regional offices in the field, and a network of gender focal points in all HQ units the field offices. In addition the ILO ITC in Turin has a unit working on gender equality issues in the capacity building work of the ITC, comprising four gender specialists.

The project was able to draw extensively on this expertise, with a key role for field gender specialists in project planning and implementation in three of the five project countries. The use of existing ILO expertise on gender in these countries was key in integrating the project activities into the work of the country offices and in ensuring the relevance and quality of activities. This added great value to mainstreaming gender equality concerns in the countries’ DWCPs as well as developing a comprehensive programme on promoting gender equality with constituents’ involvement.

However, in some countries where gender specialists were significantly used by the project, this deep involvement in the project meant that they had less time for work on other ILO projects or activities in the region. For example, the evaluation indicates that while the heavy use of one field specialist by the BASIC project made an important contribution to the quality of the project’s work, it also meant that this specialist was pulled away from other commitments to work in the rest of the sub-region.

The fact that there was less direct involvement of the gender specialists in two of the project countries can be explained in part by geographic distance and in part by language barriers. However as these were also project countries with a more limited experience in mainstreaming gender equality into decent work, they would have benefited from more

support from the regional gender specialist. In practice however this gap was filled by a greater involvement of the global BASIC project involvement in these countries.

In addition to having a specialist gender team, work has been carried out in ILO to develop the capacity of other staff to work on gender equality issues, with support to the gender network via a series of gender trainings sessions, and the availability gender training at regional level for ILO staff and partners. However because the project has made limited use of staff from outside GENDER to date, the use of this wider expertise on gender equality, and on relevant sectoral issues, such as statistics was not heavily drawn on through the BASIC project.

At the level of BASIC, a number of staff were hired for the project. At HQ Level, in addition to an administrator, a Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) post has been funded 60% by the BASIC project. As discussed above, staff were also recruited to coordinate the project in each country, including NPCs and administrative staff. In three project countries, these staff members were already working with the ILO on gender equality issues, but in two countries, which did not have established connections to staff, recruitment was a more lengthy process meaning that, for example NPCs were not in place until March 2010, putting additional time pressure on their roles.

Only one of the NPCs recruited for the project undertook training on gender equality issues related to decent work, as most of the NPCs had already been working on gender and decent work issues with the ILO, meaning that such training would not have been useful for them. However, another NPC who had not previously been working in the field of gender equality, and did not receive training, might have benefited from this opportunity.

NPCs were hired to coordinate country level activities, and made substantive inputs at a number of levels, such as supporting the development of new structure created through the projects, such as Gender Task Forces, or taking an active role in the preparatory process for the discussion of domestic work at the ILC. However, the implementation of many project activities, in particular research activities, was carried out by consultants hired through the project and coordinated by NPCs. For the main part these consultants were recruited in coordination with steering committees involving ILO constituents or with ILO constituents directly. In general the quality of the work undertaken (as evidenced from feedback from ILO staff and constituents, and from the quality of the reports produced) indicates that the consultants selected had a strong knowledge and capacity on both gender equality and relevant sectoral issues related to the work of the ILO. In a couple of cases, in one country, however, specific studies and reports produced by consultants were weak. It was explained in discussions with project staff during the evaluation mission that in these cases the NPCs had not been in a position to exercise control over the selection of the consultants as this had been led by constituents. However, in this case the NPCs should have had a stronger role in managing consultants' performance and engaging more heavily in support to their outputs.

Administrative arrangements for the project have functioned effectively, although there were some delays and problems with financial requests from some of the BASIC countries which affected the smooth running of the project. This may be explained in part by the fact that some of the administrative staff in project countries (who were shared with the LAB/ADMIN Project) had not previously worked with the ILO, and were not trained on the specific requirements of ILO procedures (e.g. External Payment Authorisation request formats). However, it should be noted that despite the lack of familiarity with ILO procedures by some administrative staff, and a key staffing change mid-project, no activities were actually delayed or cancelled as a result of failure to disburse funds in time. Furthermore, training was provided on these processes during the Knowledge Sharing Forum in Turin in December 2010, but this was somewhat late in the day, and the training was provided to

NPCs as administrative staff were not present at this meeting. It might therefore have been helpful to train administrative staff earlier in the project, at least through a written instructions and guidelines on how to request a EPA.¹²

4.4.2 Use of financial resources

Despite the significant allocation of budget to staff costs, the (relatively) large size of the budget, coupled with the short time allocated for its use, meant that project staff were under pressure to spend the funds.

As discussed before, while the level of funding was positive, in enabling the ILO to engage in activities for which there was a strong and existing demand from constituents, the pressure to spend the project budget in a limited time period may have also resulted in a reduced incentive (and little time) the concerned Offices to investigate possibilities for resource sharing and local resource mobilisation, although there was scope for this. For example, some better resourced project partners, such as the Standing Conference on Public Enterprises (SCOPE) in India, might have been in a position to contribute to project costs, but this had not been explored. This is an issue as BASIC funds could have been better used as leverage for more funds for gender equality work (which, given the concerns about the new ILO Programme and Budget discussed earlier, is a pressing issue), and may also be an issue in relation to the sustainability of project impacts, as organisations which have co-funded project activities might be more committed to carrying them forward.

However, it should be noted that in Brazil, there has been a clear strategic articulation with the work being done on MDGs for instance (in particular on MDG3 on gender equality) and much of the work on domestic workers was done in the interagency UN framework, with frequent co-funding of activities between ILO and the MDG fund, especially with UNIFEM.¹³ In addition, as a result of CTA visits to Norwegian embassies in Angola and Brazil during field missions, the embassy in Luanda has invited ILO to participate in a seminar on human rights and decent work in February 2011, and also requested talks on possible future collaboration in Angola.

In view of the fact that the budget for Phase 2 of the project will be far smaller than that for Phase 1 (reduced from around two and a half million dollars to less than a million dollars) there will need to be a stronger focus on additional resource mobilisation in this phase. Encouragingly a number of projects have already been proposed for funding as a spin off from the BASIC project, such as a proposal on gendered employment statistics and constituents' data collection capacity. In one case a tentative commitment has already been made for funding - by the Brazilian government for a proposed project on south-south collaboration on gender equality in the workplace in Africa and Latin America using tools and methodologies developed by the BASIC project in Brazil.

4.4.3 Procedures and administrative structures

In terms of procedures and administrative structures, the BASIC project faced a number of challenges. In Angola, for example, as discussed before, the fact that ILO is a non-resident

¹² Such a written instruction has now been produced, since the evaluation missions were conducted.

¹³ UNWOMEN as of January 2011

organization made the administration of the project complex, requiring for example that funds for project activities were sent through the UNDP offices.

Some simple procedural norms could have helped to support the impact and visibility of the project. For example, there was no standardised requirement for information to be included on coversheets of projects reports, with the result that, at the time of the evaluation, many reports did not include the name of the project, reference to the donor, date, or country, which in the long term, unless rectified, will lead to the disappearance of a coherent body of work being recognised as an output of the BASIC Project.¹⁴

Furthermore, as discussed above, while the majority of the reports and outputs reviewed by the evaluation team are of good quality, a couple were not and, it would have been critical to have a procedure to ensure the timely review of such reports. As it was, in two cases such poor quality reports were used as a basis for workshops and seminars without having been reviewed and amended first, with an impact on the quality of these workshops (see below in 4.4.1).

As discussed previously, the dissemination of project outputs vertically and horizontally in the ILO and with partners would have played a valuable role in ensuring that the project had a wider impact on bringing a gender perspective to the work of mainstream staff and also for collaboration between the BASIC country projects (as prior to the ILO-ITC Turin workshop in December 2010 there had been limited formal work to ensure sharing between country projects¹⁵, although in practice there was some informal sharing, for example between the Asia gender specialists on Domestic Worker activities). Clearer procedures on dissemination and coordination would have helped to this end. For example, despite efforts in creating innovative products and dissemination routes, some BASIC staff felt that more could have been done to share information. Some approaches have been proposed (such as a dedicated project website) but (on the basis of past experiences of the ILO) such websites tend to be under used, so there will be a need to explore other formats for dissemination and sharing, as, based on the discussions at the Turin Knowledge Sharing Forum, work on capitalisation and sharing will be a much stronger area of focus on phase 2 of the Project.

A linked issue is that the lack of translation of key documents between English and country languages was felt by some BASIC staff to undermine general support at the HQ level, as well as more effective contributions from project countries to the work done by the ILO as a whole (although the fact that the Project used some experts who were bilingual in project country language as part of the global component helped with this communication issue).

Finally in terms of procedures, there was no formal project monitoring mechanisms in relation to the indicators and targets specified in the project log-frame, although there was some monitoring through the examination of the budget proposals and the mid-term progress report. This means that it is difficult to systematically measure progress on the project using the log-frame.

4.5 Project Impact and sustainability

¹⁴ Following the Knowledge Sharing Forum in Turin this has now been rectified and there is a standard format for cover-sheets of BASIC documents

¹⁵ The ITC-ILO Turin developed a knowledge sharing platform for the projects which met with limited interest from gender specialists in the field. Knowledge sharing occurred between Angola and South Africa projects during inter-regional ILO gender meeting in Addis Ababa in April 2011.

This section considers the delivery of the actual project activities on the ground, and their relevance to and impact on key gender equality issues in the world of work in the five project countries. Furthermore, the extent to which delivery of activities both draws on, and contributes to, the ILO and its partners' knowledge, research and tools on gender equality in the world of work are critical to the sustainability of project activities and impacts. In addition the project has played an important role in the development of wider ILO policies related to gender in the world of work, which should make a critical impact on project impact and sustainability. These issues will be explored in the following two subsections.

4.5.1 The impact of project activities

In general the project performed well in terms of what it was able to deliver on the ground, particularly in the context of the project timeframe. The majority of the activities and outputs outlined in the project documents have been delivered, although not always as specified in the rather ambitious targets set out in the log-frame.¹⁶ Some specific activities were not delivered as originally envisaged, including, for example, the joint activity envisaged with the LAB/ADMIN twin project (a mid-term knowledge sharing workshop).

Each of the five countries had particular opportunities and challenges which affected what the project was able to deliver in terms of concrete activities and helped to determine their space for change and the kind of impacts that they were able to foster.

In the case of Angola, the fact that there is no DWCP or formal ILO presence in the country meant that effectively the project was building structures for the promotion of gender equality and decent work from the ground up. In addition the operational environment for project activities in Angola is challenging, as discussed previously, due to the high costs and logistical issues for working in the country, and also the procedural implications for, for example, financial disbursements in the absence of an ILO office in country. This meant that more time and effort was spent on logistical issues than in other countries and also that, because difficulties in working outside the capital, most of the project activities focused on work in Luanda, limiting project impacts in other parts of the country. However, despite these challenges it appears that the project has been used effectively to create a basis for gender mainstreaming in decent work programming in the country, and has used the ILO's Participatory Gender Audit tool as an effective mechanism to build capacity on the promotion of gender equality.

In Brazil, the Training Centre in Turin developed an innovative training methodology for a workshop on work-family balance. This pilot training helped catalyze what was already happening on this topic. The methodology it developed can be duplicated to Trade Unions, particularly, but not exclusively, in the region. The Brazil project also co-organized with the Brazilian Government an international workshop (with Mozambique, Angola and Portugal) on time use, using it as a framework to address issues of family responsibilities, and productive and reproductive roles. The aim of the event was to help the production of information for policy development. The demand for such work emanated from the women's national conference in 2007 which requested that the government takes the lead on the production of data on use of time.

¹⁶ The Logframe for output GC1.1 sets a target that 50% of the budget should be committed by the end of June 2010 and there should be full delivery on allocated resources by end December 2010.

In China the project continued to build on work already done through the ILO 3+1 mechanism on gender mainstreaming in China,¹⁷ which works with the Tripartite Constituents and the All China Women Federation. This project ended in 2006 but created a series of processes which have been continued with RBSA funding and now through the BASIC project. These projects appear to have had a good impact, individually, and they are well embedded in the work of the ILO country office, and, according to project staff, will continue with or without the support of the BASIC Project. On the other hand, the wide spread of activities conducted under the project, while evidence of the enthusiasm and commitment to gender equality, meant that the impacts of individual activities did not clearly reinforce each other into a broad, complementary, strategy.

In India the project, as discussed before, built successfully on existing relationships and networks and as a critical role of the project has been building relationships and networks between constituents and other partners on the domestic work issue. One critical contribution in this area has been the development of the two task forces (on gender equality and on domestic workers respectively), which have progressively fostered collaboration between stakeholders who would not have worked together without the sustained efforts of the BASIC project.

South Africa, while it has an established office, was similar to Angola to the extent that it was not building on a significant body of ILO work on gender equality and decent work. However, South Africa does appear to have been the country that was most successful in collaborating with the twin LAB/ADMIN project, through attempts to mainstream gender into the LAB/ADMIN training workshops, which also included inputs on Equal Remuneration Convention, 1951 (No. 100), and Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111). However at the same time the LAB/ADMIN project was not involved in the BASIC workshop on the labour conventions which was supported by staff from the ILO ITC, which would have been a good opportunity for collaboration.¹⁸

As was outlined earlier in section 2, while specific project activities were identified in relation to the DWCP and constituent priorities in each of the five BASIC countries, they were grouped under two overarching outcomes across all of the project countries.

A range of different project activities were delivered across the five countries in relation to outcome 1 (*ILO Constituents in the target countries are better prepared to promote gender equality at the workplace*). Some of these have already been discussed in relation to the projects' work with employers' and workers' organisations. In general these were coherent, strategically relevant, and based on constituent demands; and therefore likely to make a positive impact on gender equality in the world of work in the BASIC countries.

One set of activities across the five countries which has not already been discussed is the work around capacity building which was a common and important theme in relation to this outcome. Most of this capacity building work appears to have been well thought out, developed and well executed. However, a number of issues are worth discussing.

During the capacity building workshops and seminars the project encountered some of the perennial problems that are faced by capacity building interventions on gender equality. In some cases, there was the problem of staff not being familiar with the substantive issues

¹⁷ A working group collaboration between the Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security (MHRSS), the Ministry of Labour, the China Employers Confederation (CEC), the All China Federation of Trade Unions (ACFTU) and the All China Women's Federation (ACWF)

¹⁸ LAB/ADMIN was informed of the activity but declined participation.

that needed to be understood as a basis for the workshop being sent as participants. For example, in the Angola workshops on the Participatory Gender Audit, Gender Focal Points from relevant ministries and officials from the ministry of Women and Family were apparently not familiar with the conceptual basis of gender equality as opposed to women in development approaches, which meant that time covered addressing these basic conceptual issues took away time from the core training. In other cases the workshops did not always reach the intended audience, for example where the staff who actually attended workshops intended for policy level staff were in fact operational staff and vice versa. Finally, as is often the case with workshops on gender, there was a tendency in some cases to send women as representatives to gender workshops, which meant that the opportunity for attitudinal changes amongst men was lost, and that training failed to reach men who might also be in key decision making roles and in the position to effect change to promote equality in their organisations. For example, the workshop on family work balance in Brazil, while evaluated extremely positively by participants, was attended mainly by women (44 women and 4 men), which might constitute something of a missed opportunity. Efforts were made to attract men, but ILO constituent-driven procedures dictate that the constituents should nominate participants.

The partnership between ILO-ITC and the NPCs made a good contribution to the outcomes of capacity building activities, and for the main part the ITC staff and NPCs worked closely together on the detail of the development of the workshops that the ITC team was involved in. However, some problem issues might have been avoided if the expertise of the ILO-ITC team who work on capacity building on gender equality had been used earlier in the process of the selection and assessment of participants. Where the selection of participants is undertaken by constituents, rather than the ILO, the ITC, working with the relevant NPCs could have nonetheless have had a greater role in supplying technical support and advice to constituents in selecting relevant participants.

Another issue for capacity building workshops was that, as noted previously, in the few cases where background reports produced by consultants were not of good quality, they were nonetheless used as an input for workshops, and were not always screened before the workshop or made available for review by staff planning workshops. This meant in one case that, due to the inadequacy of a background paper which was intended as a resource for a workshop, the workshop structure had to be changed on the spot as activities based around the paper and inputs by its author were cancelled. It should be stressed, however, that the majority of background paper and reports were of good quality and that this was an exceptional case.

Outcome two (*ILO's knowledge base on gender equality in the world of work strengthened, particularly in relation to the global economic and financial crisis*) also comprised a range of different project activities across the five BASIC countries, which all served to build the ILO's knowledge base on the world of work, although in practice, the particular focus on the global economic and financial crisis, as specified in the project document, was not always clear – but perhaps this was a problem with the project strategy rather than with the relevance of what was actually executed in for the DWCP of each project country. Much of the work on outcome two related to knowledge and theory building and methodological development (for example statistical methodologies, and the important area of time use surveys) which will be explored further below in section 4.5.2

However, as discussed previously, time pressure meant that delivery on outcome two at the level of headquarters was not fully implemented, in particular output GC 2.2 which focuses on the communication of project achievements and lessons to a wider audience. This will be an important outcome to develop and carry through to Phase 2 of BASIC.

4.5.2 Use of and contribution to knowledge and tools on gender equality

Generally the BASIC project did a good job of drawing on the methodologies and tools which have been developed as an on-going product of the work of the ILO and its partners on gender equality. A good example of this was the use of the ILO's Participatory Gender Audit methodology as a basis for much of the work on capacity building and organisational development in Angola.

One area that could have been more systematically shared with consultants and partners is the methodological difference between a WID (Women in Development) and GAD (Gender and Development) approach to analysis. While in general the studies and reports produced did a good job of developing a gendered analysis, a few studies and reports were focused on women. While this is not inherently a problem, where gender analysis demonstrates that a specific focus on women is appropriate (e.g. in the case of the study on life stories of women domestic workers in India, where a focus on women was clearly relevant), it *is* problematic where there is a failure to focus comparatively on men and to situate a focus on women in an understanding of gender relations, and in a couple of cases reports and studies could have had a more strongly gendered analysis. Methodological support to consultants from the BASIC team in these instances would have been beneficial.

In addition to drawing on existing ILO methodologies, the project also made a useful contribution to methodology development and its application in research. Good examples are the work on time use surveys in India and Brazil, the development of a tool to measure women's empowerment in India as well as a training module targeting men on building safe workplaces and promoting gender equality (taking a men and masculinities approach), the use of innovate, multi-media approaches for dissemination of research in Brazil and the work on the Quarterly Labour Force Survey (QLFS) in South Africa which can contribute to a wider critique of labour force statistical methods. A valuable aspect of this methodology development is that it is well rooted in local demand. For example, in India the government has been developing and piloting time use survey approaches since the late 1990s, and the BASIC interventions is therefore contributing to an on-going process of methodology development. Furthermore, while there has been resistance to some of the recommendations made in the review of the South African QLFS, the issues have been raised for debate, and commitments have already been made to implementing other recommendations from this report. In some of these cases work has already been done to ensure the sustainability of these methodological advances. For example, in India work has been done with the gender specialist, STATISTICS, and the ITC to develop a manual on time use surveys on the basis of the time use methodology development. It is also a collaborative work between the Time Use Research Cell that has been set up in India through the Gender and Macro International Working Group (GEM-IWG), an international network of economists.

In terms of broader theory building around gender equality, the work in Brazil has made a valuable contribution to the debates around the intersection of gender and other aspects of social identity (in this case race and class) and explored these in the field of decent work.

4.5.3. The BASIC project's impact on gender equality in decent work policy

In addition to being shaped by the policy context of the ILO and its partners, the BASIC project has also had the scope to influence policy development on labour, both at an international and at a national level.

At national level, the project has had a number of important impacts both in relation to the development of national policies, and in building an environment conducive to the

implementation of relevant policy commitments on gender equality and decent work. BASIC has made a number of important contributions to national policy development including the following:

- In India the project has been used to develop a draft policy on domestic workers, and importantly the project has ensured that this policy development work is a collaboration between the Ministry of Labour and Employment, NGOs and Trade Unions, who were previously working at different levels and were not on a common platform on the issue. The project in India has also been used effectively to work on the formulation and/ or implementation of labour laws related to gender equality, such as the Equal Remuneration Act, Maternity Protection and a proposed bill on Sexual Harassment at the Workplace to build on the existing Vishaka Guidelines.
- In Brazil, activities were geared to the ratification of Workers with Family Responsibilities Convention, 1981, (No. 156). Through BASIC, ILO supported the Federation of Domestic Workers, targeting public policy through ensuring access of domestic workers to housing, child care, labor rights, unions rights, protection against racism and overall recognition of the economic and social value of their work.
- In China, the project has been used in relation to a number of policy issues, including the development of Equal Opportunity in Employment guidelines for employers validated in late 2010, and a number of research and capacity building activities designed to support policy formulation including work on women workers' protection, Maternity Benefits and Sexual Harassment

In terms of building an environment to support the *implementation* of policy commitments, the BASIC project has done significant work in developing an evidence base on the application of gender related labour conventions through research, as well as capacity building and institutional development to support the application of policy. For example:

- In India an important contribution has been the development of two task forces based in the Ministry of Labour and Employment, but involving a wide range of relevant partners which coordinate actions on Gender Equality in the World of Work (Tripartite and Inter-Ministerial in composition), and work on Domestic Workers, respectively.
- In Angola work has been undertaken on a review of the gender equality provisions in Angolan labour law, as well as work to build the awareness and capacity of ILO constituents to deliver on gender equality policy commitments.
- In South Africa the main thrust on policy was in relation to building the capacity of Labour Inspectors to implement the key labour conventions on gender equality.
- In China a key contribution to building capacity on the application of gender labour laws has been work with the MOHRSS and the trade unions on promoting decent work for domestic workers and with the LAB/ADMIN twin project to integrate a gender perspective into the Labour Inspection Training Package.
- In Brazil, the project has provided technical assistance to various inter-ministerial groups (about 12) with the aim of mainstreaming gender and race in all policies. It has also helped link gender, race and domestic work. In Brazil, where black women make up 93% of the six million domestic workers, the project linked support to policy on “balancing life and work” with “domestic work” in their efforts to promote a strong policy environment.

At the international level, a key contribution of the project to policy development has been work in Brazil, China and India on domestic workers which has the potential to make a vital contribution to the proposed standard setting process on the rights of domestic workers. It is possible that the proposed instrument on domestic workers will be tabled during the 2011 ILC and the BASIC project has been supportive of this process. Two of the project countries

(China and India) have shifted their position over the course of the project from wanting a Recommendation on Domestic Workers to supporting a Convention¹⁹. While this shift in support cannot be attributed purely to the project, discussions with the relevant stakeholder (e.g. staff from the Ministry of Labour and Employment in India) suggested that the project's activities on domestic workers have made a strong contribution to this process.

However, although the project has made significant contributions to the discussions on a possible standard setting process for Domestic Workers, these contributions could be taken still further. While the ILO does not have a mandate to interact directly at the policy or legislative level in countries, the ILO role in this process is to make information available to member states on how labour protection for domestic workers can be addressed. Labour protection for domestic workers is far from straightforward, as this is a labour force which is largely in the private arena of households (with challenges for labour inspection), tends to be unorganised for collective bargaining, and works primarily in the informal economy and, in relation to the tripartite approach to labour protection, the lack of clear employers' organisations in the field of domestic work is problematic. This may mean that one level of resistance from some member states on developing a convention on domestic workers relates to a lack of knowledge on how, in practical terms, to address this issue. Therefore country case studies and good practices on protecting domestic workers are critical at this point, as a preparatory input to the ILC in 2011. One example of good practice from the project which could be disseminated is for example the work in Brazil, where the issue of domestic work is a priority for the Government and Trade Unions. In this case, a tripartite group (with representatives of domestic workers) was set up at the Secretariat of Policies for Women within federal Government on domestic work with the aim of developing studies and reflections on the eventual social and economic impacts of broadening the rights for domestic workers. The ILO (through BASIC) is a member of the group and provided technical assistance to the whole process of the discussions that took place at the Group.

However, while BASIC did contribute to a TRAVAIL paper on Decent Work for Domestic Workers which drew on the BASIC experience on domestic workers, more experiences on domestic workers could have been shared with ILO staff working on the standard setting process, in particular the work being done in Brazil and in India. This may be partially a result of the tight timing for the BASIC project which meant that there has not been sufficient time to fully develop dissemination of country activities and outputs to support the policy development process of ILO. It is therefore to be hoped that Phase 2 of the BASIC project will have a stronger focus on dissemination of this kind of policy related output. A positive point in this light is that staff from TRAVAIL working on domestic workers issues attended the BASIC Knowledge Sharing Forum in Turin in December 2010, meaning that close collaboration has been agreed for Phase 2 of BASIC.

As mentioned above, the project also funded a post in ILO-New York, to ensure that ILO priorities on gender equality are advanced in relation to interagency work and at the level of the General Assembly, and ECOSOC. This has included for example work on issues related to trafficking of girls and women and domestic work. However this work does not draw specifically on the experience developed in the BASIC project countries, and so is not used directly as a vehicle for the dissemination of policy related project outputs as envisaged in the project documents.²⁰

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

¹⁹ It should be noted that India is considering supporting the Convention provided that some amendments are made in specific areas which would make the Instrument more in line with national realities.

²⁰ According to the logframe output CG 2.2 good practices from the project were to be reported in UN for a country and global levels.

5.1 Conclusions

The TORs for the evaluation highlighted a number of specific areas to be assessed through the evaluation. These, and a summary of evaluation findings, are summarized in the table below.

Evaluation criteria	Summary of findings
Design	<p>The overall project was designed in Geneva (albeit in consultation with field specialists), within parameters set by the donor (e.g. selection of countries, time frame). This was criticised by some in-country staff and partners for being top-down, but, apart from the specified time frame, this top-down design approach did not act as a constraint to the selection of country level projects in practice.</p> <p>In-country project design was very well based on consultation with ILO constituents and partners, drew on the knowledge of gender specialists and ILO offices and where relevant built well on existing activities on gender equality in the world of work. Project design also drew well on existing ILO work on gender equality and decent work in the countries with a strong track record of working on these issues.</p> <p>The Log-frame is mainly coherent and clear. However the focus and content of Outcome 2 could have been better focused on ILO's knowledge base, and more clearly related to the global economic crisis.</p> <p>In some cases the wide range of project activities within each country meant that work was spread thinly across a range of areas of activity, meaning that there was less strategic coherence. In other cases (e.g. activities around Domestic Work) a critical mass was achieved on a focal area which deepened the strategic relevance of the individual activities.</p> <p>In two cases (the ILO New York post and some of the training work in India), the selection of project activities appeared to be based on the need for support to existing ILO activities that needed funding rather than relevance to project strategy.</p>
Relevance	<p>The result of the strong emphasis on consultation in project design with ILO staff and constituents, and the use of relevant data and statistics is that, in the vast majority of cases, the activities identified and supported are extremely relevant to the needs of the country programme. The linkages between the project activities and country priorities on gender and decent work were clear.</p> <p>The potential contribution of the project to key areas of relevance to the ILO, in relation to policy and methodology was also strong (e.g. the standard setting agenda on Domestic Workers, and methodology development on time use surveys and gender sensitive statistics).</p> <p>One relevant, but difficult-to-reach area relates to work with employers in the informal or unorganised sector, including work with employers' representatives for domestic workers.</p>
Effectiveness of Project Implementation	<p>In general, particularly given the very tight time frame of the project, implementation of the majority of project activities has been thorough and well managed.</p> <p>As a result of the limited project implementation period many project activities had not been completed by the end of Phase 1 of the project, and some project activities were not implemented as originally envisaged.</p> <p>Given that the majority of project activities have only recently been implemented, or are not yet completed, it is not yet possible to assess how effective project activities have been in achieving their stated aims. However, at this point it is clear that many processes and structures have been put in place which are likely to make a critical contribution to promoting gender equality in the world of work in the project countries.</p> <p>As discussed earlier, in relation to design, it is likely that the project activities which</p>

	were grouped strategically around a campaign or issue (e.g. the project inputs on domestic workers) will have a more significant impact than activities which stood more on their own.
Efficiency of resource use	<p>For the main part financial resources appear to have been used efficiently, although the large budget and short time frame means that there has been reduced incentive for seeking out cost-sharing opportunities or additional funding, which may have implications for sustainability.</p> <p>Good use was made of the ILO's human resources on gender (e.g. the gender specialists). However more systematic use could have been made of the expertise of ILO staff in other departments.</p>
Effectiveness of management	<p>The global management of the project by the CTA was evaluated positively by project staff and partners. However the heavy emphasis on the management aspect of the CTA's role has diminished the focus on substantive work on gender equality.</p> <p>Administrative processes and in particular EPA funding requests have been a problem area for management. However while this has been time consuming it has not significantly delayed or compromised the implementation of any project activities.</p> <p>There could have been a stronger focus on a number of specific management arrangements. These included arrangements for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the documentation and systematic dissemination of project outputs and reports • mechanisms to support communication between the five country projects, and between the project and ILO departments other than GENDER • management of and support to consultants hired to undertake specific project activities • on-going monitoring of the project in relations to its impacts (e.g. training impact assessment).
Sustainability	<p>The project has created a good base for supporting long term progress on gender and decent work in the BASIC countries, but at this point the focus has been more on starting up activities than on their sustainability.</p> <p>The relevance of the project activities to country partners, and the fact that it is building on on-going ILO activities in-country, is likely to make a positive contribution to their sustainability. However to support sustainability Phase 2 of BASIC will need to strengthen a number of areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • improved collaboration within the wider ILO system to embed the gender equality and decent work agenda in other areas of activity • a more systematic focus on the dissemination of the project outputs • more efforts to identify co-funding for Phase 2 project activities • setting up hand-over strategies for institutions and structures which have been set up under the remit of the project.

5.2 Recommendations

Based on the evaluation findings, a number of recommendations can be made. These recommendations are grouped according to their relevance at three levels: relevance for the next phase of the BASIC project, which will run until the end of 2011; relevance for the work of the Gender Bureau of ILO more generally, and; relevance for the donor, the Government of Norway.

5.2.1 Recommendations to BASIC Project Phase 2

- (a) *Rather than using BASIC 2 to initiate new activities, the BASIC Project should work to **consolidate** the work initiated during BASIC 1*

This recommendation could be supported through the following actions:

- Focus more explicitly on using the BASIC experience to strengthen work at policy level (upstream);
- Set up a more systematic methodology for documentation and lessons learnt;
- Strengthen collaboration with other ILO Departments around specific initiatives (for example the standard setting process to support the proposed ratification of a convention on Domestic Workers, or the further development and testing of methodologies elaborated through the BASIC project);
- Strengthen collaboration between the BASIC countries where they are working on complementary initiatives and activities (for example through use of new media for networking, peer review of activities and reports, collaboration on publications and other outputs, as relevant).

- (b) *Put in place measures to ensure the **sustainability** of the outputs and impacts of the BASIC project*

This could be supported through:

- Supporting strategies to seek co-funding of project activities, including raising funding at country level or cost sharing with project partners, and build on steps that have already been taken in this direction (e.g. the linkages created with donors in Angola through the project)
- Embedding the project in the country's DWCPs by linking activities more explicitly to the work of other office staff, and involving other office staff more routinely.
- Progressive handover of new structures created under the BASIC project (e.g. Gender Task Forces) to constituents and partners.

- (c) *Increase the project's substantive focus on **employer representation** for the informal sector and domestic workers.*

While it is recommended that the project should focus on consolidation of BASIC 1 activities, rather than the creation of new activities, it would be beneficial, where feasible, to do this in a way which explores new approaches to address the challenge of employer representation of the informal sector and domestic workers. Specific strategies would need to be based on their relevance to the relevant DWCPs and be based on consultation with constituents.

- (d) *Strengthening of key **management arrangements***

These include the following:

- Developing more systematic monitoring by NPCs (data collection and reporting) for progress on the targets specified in the Log-frame.
- Increasing management of and support to consultants hired to undertake specific project activities.
- Selection of candidates for workshops and meetings is undertaken by constituents, in line with ILO practices. However the BASIC project team could provide more systematic guidance on criteria for the selection of candidates, and also work to ensure that participant lists are circulated to workshop organisers well in advance of workshop preparations.

5.2.2 Recommendations to ILO Bureau for Gender Equality (GENDER)

- (e) *Develop **case studies of good practice** on Gender Equality and Decent Work highlighting how they could be used by other ILO Projects*

As there are already a number of good practice publications on gender equality in the ILO,²¹ rather than developing a new good practice publication, it might be preferable to disseminate BASIC good practices through, for example, the ILO Intranet, or newsletters, or make them available for inclusion in other ILO publications (e.g. on data collection, labour inspection, or on social dialogue). Good practices to be developed could include, for example:

- Practical approaches for working with the, frequently challenging, issue of intersecting inequalities based on gender and race without diluting a focus on gender inequality, using the BASIC project experience in Brazil as a model;
- Approaches for organising workers in the domestic work sector;
- Awareness raising campaigns around the rights of domestic workers (based on the work in India);
- Methodological development and application of time use surveys;
- Developing dialogue and cooperation on gender equality between tripartite constituents (for example the work on the two task forces in India).

- (f) *Use the experience of BASIC to **demonstrate how a focus on gender equality can be supported through the new ILO Programme and Budget Structure.***

This could include actions such as:

- Using BASIC products to identify relevant gender indicators and outputs to be specified in the future Programme and Budgets, particularly in relation to the outcomes that are most relevant to the issues covered through the basic project (5, 11, 17 and 19);
- Using the experience of BASIC as an example that highlights the importance of dedicated funds for, and specific actions on gender equality.

5.2.3 Recommendations to the Government of Norway

- (g) *Engage with the ILO to discuss how to increase the clarity of **reporting on how gender equality is supported through use of RBSA funds.***

The BASIC project, as a specific action on Gender Equality, ensured that the donor had a clear view on how funds were being used to promote gender equality. However this type of project is not typical of funding through the RBSA mechanism. Given the donor's concern about how funds can be channelled towards work on gender equality under the new programme and budget mechanisms, it would be helpful for donors to ask the ILO to explore clearer reporting formats on how mainstream funds are used in ways that are supportive of gender equality, for example through a gender budget exercise on the Programme and Budget. Such report formats, however, would have to be in line with ILO Governing body RBSA reporting requirements.

²¹ 2004: Gender equality and decent work: Good practices from the workplace; 2007: Good practices in mainstreaming gender in TC projects

- (h) *Explore approaches to allow funding recipients such as the ILO more **flexibility in the time frames** for the use of funds.*

5.3 Lessons Learnt

In addition to the recommendations, discussed above, another aspect of BASIC which it will be useful to take forward in the work of the ILO is some of the positive lessons learnt on the basis of the project.

While one lesson from the BASIC Project, reflected in the recommendations above, is that structuring a project around a very tight time schedule creates practical difficulties for project development and implementation, the creative ways in which the BASIC project has dealt with this challenge generates a positive lesson. This lesson is that, partly in response to this timing issue, the BASIC Project built its work largely on *existing* activities in the countries in which it was practical to do so (i.e. those with established ILO work on gender equality). This is in contrast of the tendency for many donor funded development initiatives to attempt to start 'from scratch' in order to carve out a unique intervention which can be attributed solely to a specific funding vehicle. In contrast the BASIC project fed into well established activities, relationships and structured in project countries. This made an important contribution in terms of ensuring that ILO activities on gender equality funded through previous were sustained. It also had the advantage of building on past work to make sure that activities carried out through BASIC were relevant, and meant that they could be rapidly implemented by drawing on preparatory work which had already been undertaken. Finally, linking BASIC into established activities is likely to support the on-going sustainability of BASIC interventions by making them part of a bigger set of processes with on-going support and involvement from ILO constituents. It is worth noting that, although this lesson stems (in part) from responses to the tight schedule, they could nonetheless also apply to projects which do not face the kind of schedule that the BASIC Project did.

Another important lesson from the project is the value of undertaking *specific actions on gender equality* as a part of ILO work at the country level. It is critical to mainstream a focus on gender equality into the full range of interventions undertaken by the ILO, as is the intention of the current ILO Programme and Budget (2010-2011), to ensure that a gender perspective is brought to all sectoral areas of intervention. However, specific actions on gender equality can both support this mainstreaming strategy and mean that actions to promote gender equality are able to progress still further. The BASIC project represents a good example of this type of specific action on gender, in that it created the space (and budget) for a dedicated team working on specified activities on gender equality, it allowed for additional funding and support to constituents and experts working on gender issues in each country, and created the space for dedicated capacity building activities focused on gender equality. This means that the BASIC countries were able to go much further in promoting gender equality in decent work than they would have been purely through attempting to mainstream a focus on gender into their other country activities. This underlines the importance of the ILO continuing to seek out and employ specific actions on gender equality like the BASIC Project.

Finally a lesson can also be derived from the BASIC Project on approaches to South-South collaboration. The networking and cooperation activities which were initiated between Brazil and Angola through BASIC, and which it is planned will be further developed through Phase 2 of BASIC, and through new projects developed on the basis of the BASIC experience, show that South-South collaboration can be fruitful even between countries with very different contexts and levels of experience in working on gender and decent work. The outcomes of the collaboration between Angola and Brazil were very positively evaluated by those involved from both countries, and the fact that this is a partnership between a country

which did not yet have a DWCP, and another with a long established DWCP and a strong institutional base on equal opportunities, does not appear to have been an impediment to mutual learning and solidarity between gender and decent work advocates in the two countries. This sheds light on the value of this kind of collaborative approach even where specific activities and structures might not be transferable due to contextual differences.

Appendices

Appendix 1: List of Interviewees

Angola

Simas, Gabriela Maria BASIC National Project Coordinator, Angola

Brazil

ILO Staff

Abramo, Lais, Ms ILO Brazil Director
 Egg, Rafaela, Ms BASIC National Officer
 Faria, Thais, Ms ILO Programming Officer
 Martins, Bernardeth, Ms ILO Administration, Finance and Human Resources Officer
 Vasconcelos, Marcia, Ms BASIC National Coordinator
 Valenzuela, M. Elena, Ms ILO Regional Gender Specialist (Chile)

ILO Constituents

de Moraes, Eunice, Ms Project Manager from the Secretariat of Policies for Women (SPM)
 Guimarães, Cristina, Ms Technical Officer from the Secretariat of Racial Equality
 Oliveira, Creuza, Ms Chairperson of the National Federation of Domestic Workers
 Pinheiro, Luana, Ms Project Manager of the Secretary of Planning for of the SPM
 Querino, Ana Carolina, Ms Project Manager of the UNIFEM
 Ribeiro, Luis, Mr Technical Officer from the Inter-Union Department of Statistics and Socio-Economic Studies (DIEESE)
 Soares, Adalgisa, Ms BASIC Project Assistant

Meeting with 7 representatives of Brazilian companies from 3 of the Gender pro-Equity Program (Eletronorte, Caixa, Serpro)

China/ Subregional Office for East Asia

Huang Qun, Ms BASIC Programme Officer
 Liu Bohung BASIC National Project Coordinator, China
 Haspels, Nelien, Ms Gender Specialist, East Asia Subregion

Norway

Evensen, Therese, Ms Representative, Government of Norway

India

ILO Staff

Birla, Bharti, Ms BASIC National Project Coordinator, India
 Castro, Ariel, Mr Workers Specialist, , ILO South Asia Regional Office
 Comyn, Paul, Mr Training Specialist, ILO South Asia Regional Office
 Gotabaya, D, Mr Employers Activity, , ILO South Asia Regional Office
 Menon, Anandan, Mr Programme Officer, ILO South Asia Regional Office
 Ravichandran, K. S., Mr, Social Protection, ILO South Asia Regional Office,
 Røren, Hilde, Ms Junior Professional Officer, ILO South Asia Regional Office
 Staermose, Tina, Ms Director, ILO South Asia Subregional Office

Constituents

Chaudhary, Pranav, Mr, Delhi Government, Directory General Employment and Training
 Chugh, RK, Mr Delhi Government, Directory General Employment and Training
 Devos, Jeanne, Sr. National Domestic Workers' Movement (NDWM)
 Dixit, U.K., Mr. Standing Committee on Public Enterprise (SCOPE)
 Farell, Martha, Ms Society For Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA)
 Gianchandani, Pooja, Ms A4E (Domestic Work Training Development)
 Hamsa, N. Dr. Women Power Connect
 Hirway, Indira, Ms Director, Centre for Development Alternatives.
 Kesai, Mr. Delhi Government, Directory General Employment and Training
 Khyan, Mr, Standing Committee on Public Enterprise (SCOPE)
 Nizam, Vaheeda, Ms All India Trade Union Congress, (AITUC)
 Pandey, A.C., Mr, Joint Commissioner, Women and Child Labour, Ministry of Labour and Employment
 Poulami, Ms. Women Power Connect
 Ranjana, Ms Centre of Indian Trade Unions (CITU)

Sajinarayana, CK, Mr	Bharatiya Mazdoor Sangh (BMS)
Sharma, Nisha, Ms	Standing Committee on Public Enterprise (SCOPE)
Surendran, B, Mr.	Bharatiya Mazdoor Sangh (BMS)
Swadesh Dev Roy, Mr,	Centre of Indian Trade Unions (CITU)
Swarup, Anil, Mr.	Director General, Labour Welfare Joint Commissioner, Ministry of Labour and Employment
Tsushima, Reiko, Ms	Gender Specialist, ILO South Asia Sub-region

South Africa

ILO Staff

Motsepe, Joseph, Mr	BASIC National Project Coordinator, South Africa
Anang, Rose, Ms	Employers specialist
Chinyangarara, I, Ms	Worker's Specialist
Musabayana, Joni, Mr	Deputy Director ILO South Africa Office

ILO Geneva

Crowe, Rafael , Mr	Gender Bureau
Gmyrek, Pawel, Mr	Desk Officer, Norway, and Gender Focal Point, PARDEV
Guzman, Francisco, Mr	Gender Focal Point, Evaluation
Hodges, Jane, Ms	Director, Bureau for Gender Equality, (GENDER)
King-Dejardin, Amy, Ms	TRAVAIL
Lawton, Ned, Mr	BASIC Project Chief Technical Advisor (from September 2010)
Mata Greenwood, A., Ms	Gender Focal Point, Statistics
Rademaker, Peter, Mr	Bureau of Programming and Management (PROGRAM)
Roberts, Renee, Mr	Labour Administration and Labour Inspection Programme (LAB/ADMIN)
Shala, Marie Helene, Ms	Administrative Officer, GENDER
Tonstol, Geir, Mr	BASIC Project Chief Technical Advisor (until September 2010)

ILO Office New York

Gastaldo, Elena, Ms	BASIC Policy Guidance Officer
---------------------	-------------------------------

ILO ITC Turin

Cavazza, Simonetta, Ms	Coordinator, Gender and Non-Discrimination Unit
Lortie, Johanne, Ms	Gender and Non-Discrimination Training Specialist
Magri, Benadetta, Ms	Gender and Non-Discrimination Training Specialist
Marques, Carolina, Ms	Gender and Non-Discrimination Training Specialist

Participants at BASIC Knowledge Sharing Forum, ILO ITC Turin

Angola ILO Staff

Simas, Maria G., Ms	National Project Coordinator
---------------------	------------------------------

Angola ILO Constituents

Costa Nieto, J.A., Mr	Ministry of Family and Women
Macaia, O S de L, Mr	General Labour Inspectorate
Rito, V F, Ms	Federation of Employers of Angola
Couto de Oliveira, V., Ms	Federal Bank

Brazil ILO Staff

Egg, R., Ms	National Project Officer, Race and Gender
Vasconcelos, M, Ms	National Project Coordinator

Brazil ILO Constituents

De Moraes, E,L., Ms	Secretariat of Policies for Women (SPM)
Lino Costa, P, Ms	Inter-Union Department of Statistics and Socio-Economic Studies (DIEESE)

China ILO Staff

Huang, Q, Ms.	Programme Officer, Programming
---------------	--------------------------------

China ILO Constituents

Hu, L L, Ms	Yunnan Provincial Trade Union Federation
-------------	--

Liu, H, Ms
Liu, B, Ms
Ren, X, Ms.

China Enterprise Confederation
Women Studies Institute of China
Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security

India ILO Staff

Birla, B, Ms
Ravichandran, Mr

National Project Coordinator
National Professional Officer

India ILO Constituents

Shrunji Kiran Desai, Ms
Jethi, H K, Mr.
Sharma, N, Ms

Shramjivi Mahila Kalyan Sangh
Ministry of Labour and Employment
Standing Conference on Public Enterprise

South Africa ILO Staff

Motsepe, J, Mr

National Project Officer

South Africa ILO Constituents

Mabuza, T S, Mr
Mtsweni, L G, Ms
Vince, G L V, Mr

South Africa National Apex Cooperative
COSATU
Prestige

Group

Appendix 2: References

Daly, M. (2005). "Gender Mainstreaming in Theory and Practice", in *Social Politics*, 12 (3), pp. 433-450.

Levy, C (1998) "Institutionalisation of Gender Through Participatory Practice" in I Guijt and M K Shah (eds) *THE MYTH OF COMMUNITY: GENDER ISSUES IN PARTICIPATORY DEVELOPMENT* Intermediate Technology Publication

Mukhodpadhyay, M, (2004), "Mainstreaming gender, or streaming gender away?: Feminists marooned in the Development Business" in *Repositioning Feminisms in Development*, IDS Bulletin, Vol. 53, No. 4, Institute of Development Studies, Sussex

Stearns, Lisa, 2010, "RBSA Evaluation on equality and decent work promotion for Asian women through prevention of human trafficking, protection of domestic workers and gender capacity building", International Labour Office, Geneva

Appendix 3: Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference

Final independent evaluation

INT/09/61/NOR: Gender Equality in the World of Work in Brazil, Angola, South Africa, India and China ("BASIC")

I. Final evaluation

Background

Project INT/09/61/NOR Gender Equality in the World of Work in Brazil, Angola, South Africa, India and China ("BASIC") was funded through the Norway/ILO Partnership Framework Agreement (2008-09) and implemented from 1 January to 31 December 2010 as a centralised technical cooperation project.

The project was managed by the Bureau for Gender Equality (GENDER) in partnership with ILO's Gender Network. National Project Coordinators supported implementation of project activities at national level with support from the respective ILO field offices.

Project activities have combined research with policy-oriented advocacy and capacity building of ILO constituents on gender equality.

The implementation strategy included a global project component and five country-specific components. The global component, managed by GENDER, facilitated technical support, coordination and knowledge sharing throughout the implementation phase. The global component also included an allocation for ITC-ILO Turin to undertake capacity building and training activities at country level as well as an allocation for policy support from ILO-New York.

Two outcomes were proposed for the project under which country-specific outputs were designed and activities implemented:

Outcome 1: ILO Constituents in the target countries are better prepared to promote gender equality at the workplace

Outcome 2: ILO's knowledge base on gender equality in the world of work strengthened, particularly in relation to the global economic and financial crisis

Evaluation

In line with ILO's policy for evaluation of technical cooperation projects, it is proposed that a final independent and external evaluation be conducted of the Gender mainstreaming project to consider:

- The project's effectiveness in contributing to the planned outcomes; and
- The project's likelihood to have an impact beyond the current phase of implementation.

More specifically, the final evaluation will consider the following aspects of the project:

- Design

- a) Conduct an evaluability assessment of the projects' logical framework. Are the indicators SMART? Do indicators include baselines, targets and milestones?
- b) Assess to what extent the project objectives/outcomes were realistic;
- c) Assess to what extent planned activities and outputs could logically and realistically be expected to meet desired objectives/outcomes (causality).

- Relevance and strategic fit

- a) Assess to what extent project objectives/outcomes correspond to ILO's policy on gender equality and gender mainstreaming as operationalised through the ILO Action Plan for Gender Equality 2010-11;

- b) Assess to what extent the project corresponds to priorities set out in the 2009 International Labour Conference resolution on gender equality at the heart of decent work and relevant indicators in ILO's Programme and Budget 2010-11.

- Implementation

- a) Did the project have M&E and Implementation plans?
- b) Describe how planned and unplanned activities have been carried out;
- c) Assess the linkages between outputs and outcomes.

- Effectiveness

- a) In general, present the main project outputs. Assess what have been the most successful and least successful outputs. Justify the assessment.
- b) Assess what contributed to/curtailed project effectiveness?

More specifically, on the basis of the project's strategy, the following questions need to be given particular emphasis with close reference to the indicators developed in the overall logical framework for the project:

- c) How effective have project efforts been in preparing ILO constituents in the target countries to promote gender equality at the workplace?
- d) How effective have project efforts been in strengthening ILO's knowledge base on gender equality in the world of work, particularly in relation to the global economic and financial crisis?

- Efficiency of resource use

- a) Assess the quality and timeliness of delivery on allocated resources.
- b) Consider to what extent resources (financial, human, institutional and technical) have been allocated strategically.
- c) Consider to what extent resources have been used efficiently and whether the obtained results justify the expenditure.

- Effectiveness of management arrangements

- a) Assess the effectiveness of work arrangements under the project.
- b) Assess the adequacy of project management and technical backstopping, both from ILO headquarters and the appropriate field structure.
- c) Assess the effectiveness of project monitoring and tracking of progress.
- d) Was there adequate technical, programmatic, administrative and financial backstopping from project management?

- Sustainability

- a) In view of the above, how likely are project achievements to be sustainable?
- b) To what extent were sustainability considerations taken into account in the execution of project activities?
- c) Has the capacity of implementing partners been sufficiently strengthened to ensure sustainability of achievements beyond the project phase?
- d) Is the involvement of implementing partners and national stakeholders sufficient to support the outcomes achieved during the project?
- e) Is there potential for project activities to be replicated in future work?
- f) Has the project made significant contributions to broader and longer-term development goals?
- g) Has project successfully built or strengthened an enabling environment for gender mainstreaming?

II. Independent evaluator

Independent evaluator

An external and independent evaluator (or a team of evaluators, if appropriate) will be engaged to undertake the final independent evaluation of the above project. The final choice of independent evaluator will be approved by ILO's Evaluation Unit, along with the Terms of Reference for the evaluation. An Evaluation Manager, external to the project, will coordinate the evaluation and act as liaison with the independent evaluator.

The independent evaluation will take place in the period 8 November to 14 February 2011.

The independent evaluator will undertake the initial desk review and interviews in the period 8 November – 15 December 2010. The independent evaluator is expected to travel to Geneva in this period for initial consultations with the Bureau for Gender Equality and to conduct individual interviews.

A first draft of the evaluation report shall be submitted by the external collaborator to the Evaluation Manager no later than 14 January 2011. The Evaluation Manager, in consultation with the Bureau for Gender Equality and relevant stakeholders, will review the draft and submit any comments to the external evaluator by 27 January 2011. The final report, with comments integrated will be submitted to the Evaluation Manager no later than 14 February 2011.

The external evaluator is expected to account for how comments have been integrated in the final report.

Methodology

The evaluation methodology is expected to encompass, but will not be restricted to:

- Desk review of relevant project documentation. Including an *evaluability* assessment of the logical framework;
- Desk review of other relevant publications and documents;
- Interviews with ILO staff, including project staff and technical specialists, at ILO headquarters, ITC-ILO Turin and in field offices;
- Interviews with key project stakeholders, including ILO constituents and staff of collaborating UN Agencies.

To facilitate the above, the external evaluator is expected to undertake one mission to ILO headquarters in Geneva and field visits to two project target countries, namely Brazil and India.

Expected outputs

The external evaluator is expected to provide:

An evaluation report of maximum thirty (30) pages (A4), excluding annexes, which includes an evaluation summary²² and communicates information on:

- Methodological approach developed by the external collaborator for the evaluation;
- *Evaluability* assessment;
- Findings of the evaluation on the key issues indicated above;
- Analysis of the project's potential impact (impact assessment);
- Conclusions based on findings from the desk review and interviews;
- Recommendations for future planning;
- Lessons learned, including good practices and challenges, which may guide similar future initiatives.

It is proposed that the final report is structured as follows:

- Executive summary²³
- Background of project and its context
- Purpose, scope and clients of evaluation
- Methodology employed
- Review of implementation phase/"work done"
- Findings regarding project performance/impact assessment
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons learned
- Annexes, including TORs, list of persons interviewed, list of documents reviewed

Qualifications of external evaluator

The external evaluator is expected to meet the obligations laid out in the UNEG Code of Conducts for evaluation in the UN system²⁴ and have the following qualifications:

- A minimum of eight years experience in evaluating development interventions, with particular experience in the field of gender and development;
- Experience in evaluating organisational strategies for gender mainstreaming;
- Acquaintance with ILO's mandate on Decent Work and relation to gender equality;
- Familiarity with the five countries covered by the project;
- Fluent written and spoken English;
- Excellent drafting skills.

²² In accordance with ILO's evaluation summary template (to be provided by the Evaluation Manager).

²³ In accordance with ILO's evaluation summary template (to be provided by the Evaluation Manager).

²⁴ Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System (19 July 2007).

Management arrangements

The evaluation will be managed by an Evaluation Manager external to the project and in consultation with ILO's Evaluation Unit. The evaluation will comply with the criteria set out in ILO's policy for technical cooperation project evaluations.

The external evaluator will report on a regular basis to the Evaluation Manager who will act as a liaison with the Bureau for Gender Equality and the Evaluation Unit.

The Project Manager, based in the Bureau for Gender Equality, will make available to the Evaluation Manager all information pertaining to the project and facilitate contact with persons to be interviewed.

Appendix 4: Discussion Guide for Interviews

Discussion Guide

Blue: Primarily country Qs.

Red: Qs for partners

A. How was the project developed?

- Where did the idea of the Project come from?
- Who was involved from the start?
- What were the early steps taken in the design of the Project? (eg the general aim, choice of the countries?)
- What methodologies (workshops, consultation, past evaluations, policy review etc?) were used to identify the issues dealt with by BASIC?

B. How was the project strategy decided and by/ with whom?

- How were the outcomes of the Project chosen?
- The situation analysis mentioned in the report – was that done at country level? How, who by/with?
- Is the situation analysis focused on women's working situation/conditions or is it on an analysis of gender relations with women being the focus ?
- How were the outputs and activities decided at country level? Who was involved (ILO, non ILO, constituents, NGOs etc)?
- How are outputs (in country) related to each other? Multiplier effect? Strategic?
- How have outputs and activities been prioritized and related to each other (and to the situation analysis)?
- In your opinion, could the project have been identified in a different (and better) way? How?
- **At what point did you get involved in the project? Were you there at a point where you could contribute to designing/shaping the project ?**

C. What relevant research is available on each country, how good is it, and how have you used it to inform the project?

- situation of Female and Male workers in the different countries? (Urban, rural, formal, informal etc?)
- Is research focusing on women only or on women and men/gender relations?
- What connection with other social relations (race, age etc)?
- Is there policy-oriented research also available?
- Do you find the available data useful to the focus of the Project?
- Do you think that other research could be done and would be more useful?

D. How does the project conceptualise the relationship between gender and decent work?

- What definitions of gender mainstreaming, women specific do you use (WID/GAD etc)?
- What documents/ manuals do you use to source gender related concepts?
- What approach to decent work (women, gender?)
- Articulation between gender and other social relations eg race and caste?

E. What project activities have/ have not been delivered and how successful do you think they have been? (Use the matrices with the activities and referring to each activity in turn and ask the following questions)

Training and capacity building activities

- How was training identified and targeted?
- How were training topics chosen?
- If needs assessment, who did it, how was it structured/ undertaken etc?
- Does capacity building address the process by which to influence the implementation of conventions? le does training include "how to use conventions?"? Or just content of convention?

- Do you think that this was an appropriate activity to choose?
- Did delivery go according to plans? Any problems? Why? Suggestions?
- What are the assets and constraints to the sustainability of the activities carried out?
- Are there any changes already to be noted as a direct result of the project (in ILO and partners work)
- What impact is anticipated on W and M? Some impacts visible yet? How are they measuring impact on W and M? (link to procedures/monitoring)

F. How has the project been coordinated? How effective do you think this has been?

- Coordination between HQ/ ILO ITC and countries? How does it work? How effective? Who leads?
- Linkages between BASIC and other ILO programmes?
- How do BASIC activities relate to other on-going activities in the country? What are the coordination mechanisms in place? Please give us examples.
- Are there any new procedures as a result of BASIC? (internal to ILO and/or governing linkages with other partners)
- Mainstream responsibility For gender? For the project? What connection between “gender” responsible persons/units and other projects? In ILO (HQ and in-country)
- What linkages with national gender mechanism? Other gender programmes (eg. Unifem etc) and/or gender focal points in Min Labour?
- What about coordination with mainstreaming other ID focal points (poverty, race, caste, disabled ...)
- How are results capitalized, shared, disseminated? Who is responsible for capitalization? (Chief technical adviser? Regional and sub regional specialists?)

G. How has the project been monitored and how effective do you think the monitoring has been?

- Indicators for overall project/ per outcome
- linkages to the situation analysis/Baseline?
- Who is involved in progress report?
- How are the findings of Monitoring fed back into the implementation processes? How flexible?
- Who is involved (ILO, partners, workers)?
- Are there different views about what could/should have been done in the implementation of the Project? Explain

H. How has the project team been developed and supported?

- To what extent is the project using existing staff? Or were new staff recruited? Why?
- What is the profile? What is their capacity? Gender and/or labour specialist?
- What is the ratio of F/M involved in BASIC as staff? Is this a reflection of the usual gender division of labour in this area of work (in HQ, in country)? In your opinion, does the gender composition of the team influence the progress and/or the impact of the project?
- Was the staff trained to implement BASIC? How? Explain
- Is there capacity to coordinate the country programme with other ILO programmes? How

I. How committed are partners to ILO policies relating to gender equality?

- What is the level of commitment in your country? Any legislation more “un/popular” than others?
- How is this taken account of in the Project? How are these levels of commitment measured? What indicators? Was this included in the base line?
- General commitment to gender equality (in country) - how is this taken into account in the approach of the Project - Was this included in the base line? What indicators? How are these measured?
- All of ILO is committed to gender equality – however as we know this is not always translated into action - what is the level of commitment to gender by other Programmes in ILO? Partners?

J. How has the project attempted to influence policy? How effective do you think this has been?

- The Project refers to aiming (perhaps in the longer term) to influence policy level – could you give us examples of how it is working towards this aim through its activities?
- How is the project identifying compliance with key ILO conventions?
- Are there particular ILO legislations and/ or policy that the Project is aiming to introduce/strengthen?
- (eg related to domestic work, informal sector etc?)

- Realistically, to what extent is BASIC a possible leverage for policy change (upscaling)? Or is it mainly a project level?
- Why? And if so, what would be required for BASIC to be a policy leverage tool?

For other departments/programmes in ILO and non-ILO staff:

- To what extent does the project fit in with your key policy concerns and priorities?
- To what extent would a different focus (and/or different activities) for this project be more appropriate and why?

K. How would you evaluate the use and allocation of the project budget?

- How was the Budget allocated per country? Seems divided equally between 5 countries?
- How were decisions of breakdown made?
- How was the budget used? Beyond staff training?
- Is BASIC making use of resources from other depts.? If yes examples?
- What is your opinion about how the budget is being used? Examples? Suggestions?

L. What do you think are the main issues faced by women and men workers in your country?

- Differences women/ men?
- How are Woman and Men as workers involved in project activities? Are there activities in which women and men workers are directly involved? (Link to delivery)

M. How has the project worked with labour and gender related civil society groups and how successful is this collaboration??

- Would you say that women and/or men workers are well organized in a way that they can make their voices heard?
- What have been the main issues they have been voicing recently?
- Could you tell us a bit about the profiles of the tripartite partners and their role in the Project? Unions, chamber of commerce and Ministry of Labour? Constraints/assets?
- Are there strong civil society groups who work on labour rights? What issues do they focus on?
- How are/were these groups involved in consultation, priority setting, implementation, monitoring and evaluation?

N. How has the project worked with parliament and other elected structures?

- To what extent do civil society groups link/influence parliament and other representative structures?
- Are there any groups/committees within parliament who are responsible/interested in labour issues? Gender equality issues?
- Does the Project have any activities related directly to parliament or elected bodies? Please explain

O. What is your overall evaluation of BASIC so far and (how) do you think it should be taken forward?

- How different is BASIC from what was done before? What new focus is it bringing in?
- Has BASIC helped to create new dynamics? New mechanisms? New programmes?
- If not yet done that, how could it do it ...
- How do you see the next phase of BASIC?

Appendix 5: The Web of Institutionalization

The 'Web of Institutionalisation' (Levy, 1998).

