



ILO – EVALUATION

- **Evaluation Title:** Promoting Social Dialogue
- **ILO TC/SYMBOLS:** MKD/13/02/MKD
- **Type of Evaluation:** Final Independent Evaluation
- **Countries:** FYR Macedonia
- **Date of the evaluation:** February-March 2017
- **Name of consultant(s):** Dr Andy Harvey, London, UK
- **Administrative Office:** DWT/CO Budapest
- **Technical Backstopping Office:** DWT/CO Budapest
- **Date project ends:** 31 March 2017
- **Donor: country and budget** Ministry of Finance, Central Financing and Contracting Department (CFCD) (funding by European Commission)
EUR 1,149,690
- **Evaluation Manager:** Maria Borsos
- **Evaluation Budget:** US\$
- **Key Words:** Collective bargaining, dispute settlement, social dialogue, tripartism

This evaluation has been conducted according to ILO's evaluation policies and procedures. It has been quality controlled by the ILO Evaluation Unit

Table of Contents

List of abbreviations and acronyms	4
Executive summary	5
1. Project Background	12
2. Evaluation Background	13
3. Evaluation Criteria and Question	13
4. Evaluation Methodology	15
5. Main Findings	17
6. Conclusions	40
7. Lessons Learned	42
8. Emerging Good Practices	42
9. Recommendations	42
Appendix I: Lessons Learned template	45
Appendix II: Emerging Good Practice template	47
Appendix III: Terms of Reference	48
Appendix IV: Project Status	56
Appendix V: Persons Interviewed	59
Appendix VI: Evaluator's Inception Note	61
Appendix VII: Bibliography	66

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the interviewees who gave up their time to assist with the evaluation; the ILO project team and support staff for making all the arrangements and helping to frame and finalise the evaluation; and Dave Spooner for help in understanding the trade union data.

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ALDS	Alternative Labour Dispute Settlement
BKM	Business Confederation of Macedonia
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
DWT/CO	Decent Work Team/Country Office Budapest
EC	European Commission
EO	Employers' Organization
EU	European Union
FYR	The Former Yugoslav Republic
ILO	International Labour Organization
IPA	Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance
KSS	Confederation of Free Trade Unions of Macedonia
LESC	Local Economic and Social Council
MLSP	Ministry of Labour and Social Policy
NESC	National Economic and Social Council
OECD-DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development – Development Assistance Committee
ORM	Organization of Employers of Macedonia
P&B	Programme & Budget
PSDP	Promoting the Social Dialogue Project
ROM	Results Oriented Management
SSM	Federation of Trade Unions of Macedonia
ToR	Terms of Reference
TU	Trade Union
UNASM	Union of Independent and Autonomous Trade Unions of Macedonia
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework

Executive summary

Project Background

In FYR Macedonia, the ILO promotes decent work as a national objective and assists constituents to make progress towards achieving that objective. Advancement of social dialogue is one of the priorities in the DWCP for FYR Macedonia in the period 2015-2018. The EU funded project “Promoting social dialogue” contributes to achievement of the goals under this priority of the DWCP. This project builds on the extensive work done by the ILO to support the establishment of the National Economic and Social Council, develop amicable settlement of labour disputes legislation, and strengthen the capacities of Employers and Workers organizations.

The overall objective of the project is to extend and enhance tripartite and bipartite social dialogue as a means to achieve economic growth and social progress. The problem of social dialogue is addressed from three levels and the project aims to achieve the following specific objectives:

1. Enhanced institutional capacity of stakeholders in charge of tripartite and bipartite social dialogue in terms of sustainability, efficiency and functionality in order to provide a comprehensive participation of all the relevant stakeholders, especially of the social partners, in the creation, development and implementation of economic and social policies;
2. Strengthened social partnership on the industry/branch/company level including a coordinated and effective machinery for collective bargaining;
3. Establish an operational mechanism of amicable settlement of labour disputes and trained specialized conciliators and arbitrators for labour disputes.

Evaluation Background

The purpose of the final independent evaluation is accountability, programme improvement and planning of the next steps, including the envisaged second phase of the project.

The objectives of the evaluation are to:

- a) Determine the extent to which the outcomes of the project have been achieved, the kind of changes produced, and the intended or unintended effects of the project, and an assessment of the reasons/factors that helped to produce these changes and effects;
- b) Obtain feedback from the national partners and other stakeholders: what is working, what is not and why and to assess that feedback against broader evaluation evidence;
- c) Provide suggestions, recommendations to better target the next steps, future strategies and new areas of technical cooperation.

The evaluation covers the project as a whole, 2014 – 2017, in all three pillars. The final evaluation builds on the findings of the mid-term evaluation.

The evaluation serves the following - external and internal - clients' groups:

- ILO tripartite constituents and national project partners;
- The donor;
- ILO management and technical specialists (in the ILO /Budapest and cooperating departments at the Headquarters);
- Project staff.

Evaluation Methodology

Evaluation methodology was based on assessments of the areas of influence on the tripartite social partners, namely trade union federations, employers' organisations, national government and the NESC and LESC consultative bodies. These influences were assessed through:

- Reviews of evidence of the project, [the products of the project- e.g. dedicated staff, agreements (procedural and substantive) at different levels, normative results (legislation, ratification of ILO conventions, policies etc), infrastructure, training packages and events etc];
- One to one interviews with key stakeholders influencing or influenced by the project [trade union officers, employers, government officials, project staff, ESC stakeholders].

Where available, findings will be compared with similar initiatives in other countries as well as national statistics over the life of the project.

The primary evaluation activities were:

- Document review;
- Review of the results of the project and discussions with project team around these;
- One to one interviews with direct stakeholders – project management, country management, and stakeholders as organised by project management.

Main Findings

Relevance

The overall and specific objectives of the project were entirely relevant to the ambition of FYR Macedonia to join the European Union. In particular, the project addressed the needs of the country to make progress in the field of social policy and employment, including social dialogue at tripartite and bipartite levels that is required under Chapter 19 of the criteria for ability to assume the obligations of membership.

The project addressed the objectives of the DWCP to improve mechanisms of social dialogue through strengthening the capacity of the social partners; enhancing the capacity of the tripartite ESCs at national and local levels; by improving the capacity of the social partners to engage in collective bargaining and; by establishing a mechanism for the amicable settlement of labour disputes.

The project addressed the strategic objectives for social dialogue contained in the ILO Programme and Budget for the periods covering the project; the ILO mandate for social dialogue under UNDAF 2010-15 and; ILO mandate for social dialogue under the Partnership for Sustainable Development United Nations Strategy 2016-20.

Effectiveness

On the national level, the project equipped the NESC to allow it to function more effectively. The project has provided infrastructure to enable the NESC to operate as an effective body in providing opinions and recommendations on legislation and policy to government.

The NESC has established a working tripartite secretariat that enables it to provide opinions and recommendations on legislation and policy to government.

The NESC has established five new standing working committees: Committee on labour relations and salary; Committee on employment and labour market policy; Committee on social security; Committee on occupational safety and health, and Committee on issuing and revoking licenses to mediator and arbitrators.

Six new LESC's have been established in the following municipalities - Resen, Veles, Sveti Nikole, Struga, Kichevo and Radovich. Each LESC has been provided with computer and other equipment to allow it to function effectively.

The political crisis hindered the project's work in developing national tripartite structures but that by the end of the project these had been largely overcome and good progress has been made in the development of the ESCs.

An innovative element of the strategy to promote collective bargaining involved the capacity-building of social partners through the use of marketing, communications and business strategies to help them grow their membership and gain greater credibility as representative organisations.

The marketing, communications and business strategies were especially useful for the Employers Organisations who saw membership growth and an increase in their capacity as a result of the intervention.

The marketing, communications and business strategies were less useful for trade union federations who were not able to take full advantage of the opportunities offered.

Training interventions to improve the processes and outcomes of collective bargaining were validated as high quality and correctly focussed.

Structural issues, such as laws on representivity, low trade union membership in the private sector, and lack of extension of collective agreements to non-affiliated employers are barriers to free collective bargaining.

The project made limited progress in the field of collective bargaining by developing a tripartite action plan, providing high quality ILO materials to support collective bargaining and made use of specialists to assist the social partners to improve collective bargaining.

The project has established a machinery for the amicable settlement of disputes through: the training of 90 conciliators, 50 of whom have been licensed; the establishment and training of a tripartite licensing commission; a case management information system; a publicity campaign to promote the conciliation system; ongoing training of conciliators to a high standard; and the promotion of ALDS as part of the process of social dialogue and tripartism.

To date, the ALDS system has been used four times for collective disputes that fall within the remit for conciliation. To date, one conciliator, trained through the project, has been utilised.

Efficiency and management arrangements

The project has been well-managed at the country and regional levels. The ILO has provided significant added value via its extensive resources base, technical expertise, project management backstopping, and training inputs, making good use of its comparative advantage.

The project management structure and staffing levels were appropriate for a project of this size, enabling the project to meet revised deadlines and requests for flexibility from project partners.

The project was extended by six months to enable the activities to be completed. Nevertheless, according to interviews with trade unions, the activity schedule was very compressed in the extension period.

Impact and Sustainability

The project had created a significant infrastructure for all the three components, especially in relation to the NESC and LESC and for amicable settlement of labour disputes. However, to date, the capacity built has only been partially utilised.

Sustainability for the NESC depends on the continued willingness of the MLSP to fund its activities and on the continued commitment of the social partners to the tripartite mechanism.

There is some evidence of the willingness of municipalities to provide a budget for LESC that will enable them to be sustained.

For the amicable settlement of disputes there is a mechanism in place and ready for use but it needs to be utilised to a greater extent to ensure sustainability.

Capacity has been built to improve collective bargaining but structural issues that act as barriers to sustainable improved collective bargaining remain to be resolved.

There is no formal sustainability plan although sustainability is predicted to be ensured through a new externally funded project.

Conclusions

Evaluation criteria used to evaluate the project is the standard OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. Evaluative reasoning has consisted of defining key evaluation questions as set out in the ToR. The objectives against which the evaluation has been performed are set out in the Prodoc and an understanding of evidence required to assess whether objectives have been met has been agreed in discussions with the project team. An informal inception note was developed to identify different data sources that would allow an assessment of each evaluation question. Data collection instruments primarily consisted of document reviews, discussion with project team and interviews with project stakeholders. A rubric of evidence has been developed based on the principles of triangulation whereby more than one, and preferably three, sources of data are examined in order to have confidence in the reliability of data to support conclusions.

Relevance

- The PSDP met the needs of FYR Macedonia to improve the infrastructure in which social dialogue can take place in order to meet the requirements set out by the European Union for accession to the EU.
- The PSDP was in line with ILO global mandates and ILO regional and national strategic priorities to improve social dialogue and increase the capacities of the social partners to engage effectively in dialogue and tripartism.
- The project adapted well to the challenging political environment in which it had to operate and made good use of a no-cost six month extension to complete project activities.
- The compressed timescale in the closing months of the project led to an overloaded activity schedule that put pressures on the social partners to keep up with the high pace of the project, affecting their capacity to maximise the benefits.

Effectiveness

- The value of social dialogue has been increased within the MLSP but there is still work to be done to disseminate that value across other government departments, notably the economic and finance ministries.

- A significant infrastructure has been established for the NESC and there is embryonic evidence that the infrastructure is working, enabling the NESC to exercise its functions as a tripartite advisory body.
- The six LESC established by the project have the potential to influence decision-making at the municipal level provided they continue to gain the support of the local tripartite actors, and if the municipalities guarantee continued funding.
- The project has made limited progress in the field of collective bargaining, notably by developing a tripartite action plan, providing high quality ILO materials to support collective bargaining and making use of specialists to assist the social partners to improve collective bargaining.
- Multiple structural barriers remain to effective and free collective bargaining. These barriers include restrictive laws on the representative status of employers bodies and trade unions; unwieldy trade union registration procedures; low trade union density in the private sector; unresolved historic affiliations of trade unions with government; limited membership democratic influence over trade union decision-making processes; and lack of extension of sectoral collective agreements to employers not affiliated to EOs.
- An operational machinery has been established that meets the objective of the project to establish a system for the amicable settlement of labour disputes by establishing the infrastructure in which conciliation can take place.
- With four referrals to ASLD there are early signs that the system is working, but it is too early to say whether ASLD process will become embedded as a significant alternative to the formal court system.
- Stakeholder involvement in the project has been strong with good attendance at Steering Committee meetings and significant commitment to project activities and events.
- Significant capacity has been built for the NESC and LESC which has enabled them to start to exercise their functions.
- Employers' organisations have witnessed membership growth and enhanced capacity to provide services to members as a result of the project.
- Due to the political crisis, structural issues and internal problems, trade union federations have not been able to take full advantage of the project benefits.
- Demand has been created by the project, notably to continue to learn from other countries; to improve the legal environment to support social dialogue and; to continue to build the expertise of the social partners for enhanced credibility.
- The project has helped the country to incorporate international labour standards into national law, most notably in relation to freedom of association and right to collective bargaining.
- The critical factors that underpinned the project results were: the commitment of the national project team; the comparative advantage provided by ILO backstopping and technical expertise; and the support of the national tripartite actors.

Efficiency and Management Arrangements

- The project has been managed efficiently and transparently, largely achieving the project results, and making good use of ILO comparative advantage in social dialogue and employment relations.

Sustainability and Impact

- The project has strong potential for sustainability due to the infrastructure that has been built but it will require the tripartite actors to make good use of the infrastructure in the future.
- The lack of a clear sustainability plan is a risk to long term sustainability as project continuation plans are based primarily on a new externally funded project.

Gender Equality

- The project adequately promoted gender equality through its management structure, programme of activities and monitoring of data.

Lessons Learned

- Establishing an infrastructure in which social dialogue can take place through, *inter alia*, provision of equipment, bespoke software, capacity-building practices (tripartite action plans, communications strategies, business plans, operational plans, formalised procedures etc), and high quality training interventions is validated as an effective project strategy.
- Separate marketing and communications strategies developed for EOs proved to be highly successful with increased membership and capacity. A single strategy developed for three trade union federations proved less successful as a capacity-building tool. Each organisation needs a separate strategy to reflect their uniqueness and to differentiate themselves from other, similar organisations.

Emerging Good Practice

- The use by ILO of its comparative advantage in the field of social dialogue, collective bargaining and industrial relations, working at the tripartite level is validated as a good practice that added significant value to the project. The ILO made effective and efficient use of technical backstopping and project management support that is validated as providing added security to funders and national stakeholders.

Summary of Recommendations

For future projects

High priority

- A sustainability strategy and implementation plan should be developed at an early stage of the project.
 - Resource implication: low
 - Timeframe: next project
- Sustainability should be a mandatory item on the Steering Committee agenda.
 - Resource implication: low
 - Timeframe: next project

Medium priority

- A theory of change should be developed that allows for fuller understanding of the assumptions and change logic that underpins the project.
 - Resource implication: medium if a theory of change consultant is used. Low if no consultant used.
 - Timeframe: next project
- Any project extensions should be of sufficient duration to allow activities to proceed at a pace that allows partners time to assimilate and embed benefits.
 - Resource implication: unknown as depends on project and terms of extension
 - Timeframe: unknown

For project partners

High priority

- Steps should be taken to ensure the neutrality and impartiality of conciliation and to promote its independence from the tripartite actors as a means to settle labour disputes.
 - Resource implication: financial support to develop an independent professional body; ongoing training; publicity and marketing.
 - Timeframe: next 12 months

- Trade unions should take steps to ensure they can benefit from a continuation project by resolving or otherwise dealing with internal problems that distract from project objectives.
 - Resource implication: low, but possibly some external assistance from ITUC/ETUC.
 - Timeframe: as soon as possible

Medium priority

- The good practice of deploying the ILO's comparative advantage in project activities should be disseminated through the region and globally.
 - Resource implication: publicity, training, materials
 - Timeframe: next 12-24 months
- The national government should take steps to ensure that social dialogue is a central feature of the strategies for all economic ministries.
 - Resource implication: publicity, training, materials
 - Timeframe: next 12-24 months
- The NESC should promote its capacity and functions to ministries outside of the MLSP.
 - Resource implication: publicity, training, materials
 - Timeframe: next 12-24 months
- LESC's should be put on a statutory basis as soon as practicable.
 - Resource implication: low - research, advocacy
 - Timeframe: next 12-24 months
- Employers' organisations should consolidate gains made under the project and continue to enhance their representative status.
 - Resource implication: invest in own capacity
 - Timeframe: next 12-24 months
- Individual unions that are not affiliated to a Global Union Federation should examine the benefits of affiliation for capacity-building support.
 - Resource implication: affiliation fees
 - Timeframe: next 12-24 months

1. Project Background

FYR Macedonia is one of the successor states of the former Yugoslavia from which it declared independence in 1991. It became a member of the United Nations in 1993. FYR Macedonia has the ambition to join the European Union. The Stabilisation and Association Agreement between FYR Macedonia and the EU came into force in April 2004 and Macedonia achieved candidate country status in December 2005.¹

In FYR Macedonia, the ILO promotes decent work as a national objective and assists constituents to make progress towards achieving that objective. Advancement of social dialogue is one of the priorities in the DWCP for FYR Macedonia in the period 2015-2018.

The EU funded project “Promoting social dialogue” contributes to achievement of the goals under this priority of the DWCP. This project builds on the extensive work done by the ILO to support the establishment of the National Economic and Social Council, develop amicable settlement of labour disputes legislation, and strengthen the capacities of Employers and Workers organizations.

The overall objective of the project is to extend and enhance tripartite and bipartite social dialogue as a means to achieve economic growth and social progress. The problem of social dialogue is addressed from three levels and the project aims to achieve the following specific objectives:

- Enhanced institutional capacity of stakeholders in charge of tripartite and bipartite social dialogue in terms of sustainability, efficiency and functionality in order to provide a comprehensive participation of all the relevant stakeholders, especially of the social partners, in the creation, development and implementation of economic and social policies;
- Strengthened social partnership on the industry/branch/company level including a coordinated and effective machinery for collective bargaining;
- Establish an operational mechanism of amicable settlement of labour disputes and trained specialized conciliators and arbitrators for labour disputes.

The project is managed and technically backstopped by the ILO DWT and Country Office for Central and Eastern Europe, based in Budapest, which provides the necessary administrative support and technical and project-backup services. A local project office is set up in Skopje to manage and coordinate the activities with one National Project Coordinator and a Project Assistant. The project team reports directly to the Senior Specialist on Social Dialogue and Labour Law based in DWT/CO Budapest.

A Steering Committee of the project was established for provision of strategic, political and technical guidance to the project, monitoring progress and assistance where possible in overcoming any obstacles to progress in any aspect of the contract. The Steering Committee members include the ILO, the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy (Labour Department and the IPA Coordinator) Employers Associations; Trade Unions, etc. The CFCD and EU Delegation will participate to the Steering Committee as observers. The Steering Committee is chaired by the MLSP.

The Steering Committee ordinarily meets twice a year.

¹ European Commission, *The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia 2016 Report*. European Commission: Brussels, November 2016, 4.

2. Evaluation Background

The purpose of the final independent evaluation is accountability, programme improvement and planning of the next steps, including the envisaged second phase of the project.

The objectives of the evaluation are to:

- Determine the extent to which the outcomes of the project have been achieved, the kind of changes produced, and the intended or unintended effects of the project, and an assessment of the reasons/factors that helped to produce these changes and effects;
- Obtain feedback from the national partners and other stakeholders: what is working, what is not and why and to assess that feedback against broader evaluation evidence;
- Provide suggestions, recommendations to better target the next steps, future strategies and new areas of technical cooperation.

The evaluation covers the project as a whole, 2014 – 2017, in all three pillars. The final evaluation builds on the findings of the mid-term evaluation.

The evaluation will serve the following - external and internal - clients' groups:

- ILO tripartite constituents and national project partners;
- The donor;
- ILO management and technical specialists (in the ILO /Budapest and cooperating departments at the Headquarters);
- Project staff.

3. Evaluation Criteria and Questions

Evaluation questions were developed in a dialogic process between the project team and the independent evaluator as part of the inception phase of the evaluation. Following these discussions, it was agreed that the evaluation would address the following aspects of the project:

1. Relevance

- How relevant is the project to the particular needs and constraints of the target countries?
- Is there a fit between the project design and the direct beneficiaries' needs?
- How well has the project adapted during implementation?
- How the project supports Country Programmes (strategic policy frameworks)?
To what extent does the project design help meet the ILO's strategic and national policy frameworks?

2. Effectiveness

- What progress has the project made towards achieving its specific objectives? What are the reasons/factors behind that progress?
- Did the project produce the intended results? What reasons/factors enabled the results to be achieved or not achieved?
- How and how well have stakeholders been involved in the implementation?
How many partners benefitted from the project, e.g., have been trained, improved skills, etc.?

- Are constituents satisfied with the quality of tools, technical advice, training and other activities, delivered by the project?
- Have there been any resulting changes in constituents' capacities?
- Has there been any additional demand created by the project? How does that influence/strengthen the outcomes?
- To what extent has the project contributed to the implementation of the Decent Work Country Programme?
- How has the project promoted fundamental principles and rights at work and international labour standards? Was it effective in assisting the country in translating such standards into national policies, programmes and results?

3. **Efficiency and management arrangements**

- Have the resources been used in an efficient manner? (technical expertise, staff, time, information and other resources)
- Has the project received adequate technical and administrative support from the ILO DWT/CO-Budapest, ILO HQ and partners?
- Is the management structure adequate?
- Is staffing adequate?
- How well did the project management processes work in delivering project outputs and results?

4. **Sustainability**

- What is the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes? Are the results and benefits likely to be durable?
- Are the national partners able to continue the project agenda and results after the end of the project (capacity of people and institutions, laws, policies)?
- What more should be done to improve sustainability? What is needed to leave sustainable results in the particular thematic areas addressed by the project?

5. **Impact**

- Is the project likely to have a tangible impact on target groups, systems, institutions?

6. **Lessons learned**

- What are the main lessons learned, good practices, innovations? What were the key factors of success?
- Are there any areas where difficulties are being experienced? What are the reasons? Are there any alternative strategies which would have been more effective?

Evaluation Criteria

As agreed in the ToR the OECD/DAC Criteria for Evaluation of Development Assistance were used for this evaluation. These are summarised as follows:

Relevance

- To what extent are the objectives of the project still valid?
- Are the objectives and outputs consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?
- Are the activities and outputs of the programme consistent with the intended impacts and effects?

Effectiveness

- To what extent were the objectives achieved / likely to be achieved?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?

Efficiency²

- Were objectives achieved on time?
- Was the project implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?

Impact

- What has happened as a result of the project?
- What real difference has the activity made to the beneficiaries?
- How many people have been affected?

Sustainability

- To what extent are the benefits of the project likely to continue after donor funding?
- What are the major factors which are likely to influence the achievement or non-achievement of the project?³

4. Evaluation Methodology

Evaluation methodology was based on assessments of the areas of influence on the tripartite social partners, namely trade union federations, employers' organisations, national government and the NESO and LESO consultative bodies. These influences were assessed through:

- Reviews of evidence of the project, [the products of the project- e.g. dedicated staff, agreements (procedural and substantive) at different levels, normative results (legislation, ratification of ILO conventions, policies etc), infrastructure, training packages and events etc];
- One to one interviews with key stakeholders influencing or influenced by the project [trade union officers, employers, government officials, project staff, ESC stakeholders].

Where available, findings are compared with similar initiatives in other countries as well as national statistics over the life of the project.

Evaluation criteria used to evaluate the project is the standard OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. Evaluative reasoning has consisted of defining key evaluation questions as set out in the ToR. The objectives against which the evaluation has been performed are set out in the Prodoc and an understanding of evidence required to assess whether objectives have been met has been agreed in discussions with the project team. An informal inception note was developed to identify different data sources that would allow an assessment of each evaluation question.

The primary evaluation activities were:

- Document review;
- Review of the results of the project and discussions with the project team around these;
- One to one interviews with direct stakeholders – project management, country management, and stakeholders as organised by project management.

² Please note that this evaluation did not assess the financial efficiency of the project that had been subject to earlier reviews.

³ <http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/daccriteriaforevaluatingdevelopmentassistance.htm>

The evaluation has a number of limitations, stemming from:

- Only documentation that was translated into English was reviewed;
- Ongoing project activities that were held during and after the evaluation period;
- The extremely tight timescale in which the evaluation was conducted;
- No formal inception report was required;⁴
- No financial reports, budgets or accounts were reviewed.

Measures have been taken against potential bias through the methodology of utilising multiple sources of data and discussing evaluation results with the project team. However, it should be noted that the evaluator has a background in trade union education in addition to his academic career.

Norms, standards and ethical safeguards

The evaluation has been carried out in adherence with the ILO Evaluation Policy, ILO Policy Guidelines for Results-Based Evaluation; UN Evaluation Group Norms and Standards, Ethical Guidelines, Code of Conduct⁵ and the OECD/DAC Evaluation Criteria.

In accordance with ILO Guidance note 4: “Considering gender in the monitoring and evaluation of projects”⁶ the gender dimension has been considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation. In terms of this evaluation, this implied involving both men and women in the consultation and evaluation analysis.

Ethical safeguards have been maintained during the evaluation process and women and men were interviewed in ways that avoided gender biases or reinforcement of gender discrimination and unequal power relations.

Interviews with stakeholders were recorded with the prior permission of the interviewee. All recordings will be destroyed on the acceptance by the ILO of the final report.

Evaluation Schedule

(1) Preparatory research in home country	4
(2) Field research:	
Thurs 23 rd Briefing in Budapest	1
Mon 27 th Travel to Skopje; Briefing in Skopje	1
Tues 28 – Fri 3 rd Interviews in FYR Macedonia	4
Mon 6 th March Debrief with NPC and ILO Backstop	1
(3) Analysis of interviews	3
(4) Initial Draft Evaluation Report	5
(5) De-briefing with ILO/Budapest (over Skype)	1
(6) Presentation of findings at closing conference 31.03.2017	1
(7) Finalization of Evaluation Report	3

⁴ An informal inception note was developed by the consultant and shared with the project team. Indicative interview questions that were developed in the informal inception note are presented in Appendix VI.

⁵ <http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct>

⁶ http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm

5. Main Findings

Relevance

1. How relevant is the project to the particular needs and constraints of the target countries?

The overarching purpose of the PSDP is its role in assisting FYR Macedonia in its ambition to join the European Union. The Stabilisation and Association Agreement between FYR Macedonia and the EU came into force in April 2004 and Macedonia achieved candidate country status in December 2005.⁷ Chapter 19 of the criteria for ability to assume the obligations of membership requires the country to make progress in the field of social policy and employment, including social dialogue at tripartite and bipartite levels.⁸ As reported in the mid-term evaluation, the PSDP supports the country's efforts to build a sound system of industrial relations as required by the EU.⁹

The project has built on previous ILO interventions that have identified the needs of the country to improve social dialogue mechanisms. These include the 2009 conference and report, 'Strengthening the Mechanisms of Labour Dispute Prevention and Amicable Resolution in the Western Balkan Countries and Moldova';¹⁰ the evaluation findings of the 2008 – 2011 project, 'Consolidating the Legal and Institutional Foundations of Social Dialogue in the Countries of Western Balkans and Moldova'¹¹; and the ILO regional technical cooperation project on 'Improved Labour Dispute Settlement' that was implemented between 2012 and 2014.¹²

One of the earliest project activities was to undertake a research assessment, 'Assessment of the Regulatory Framework concerning Social Partners and Collective Bargaining'. A review of the document shows that the report has been well researched with adequate references and is a solid piece of work on which to base project activities. The assessment research focussed on the critical issues of the capacities of the social partners and the system of employment relations in Macedonia. The report covers in some detail the current situation of collective bargaining, the legal framework in which collective bargaining takes place, the challenges to extending the scope of collective bargaining and draws conclusions for the benefit of the project partners. It provided good evidence for the needs of the beneficiaries to take part in social dialogue and improve the system of industrial relations.

Prior to submission of the bid, consultation meetings were held in February and March 2014 with the MLSP, ORM and SSM. Interview data also revealed that a one day workshop had been held in which social partner needs were discussed, although no agenda or report was available for evaluation.

Interviews with ILO staff indicated that the project was designed to address the perceived situation that tripartite functioning in the country was relatively inefficient and that there was a lack of capacity among the social partners that meant social dialogue was not sufficiently adequate at influencing national policy. The project addressed the shortcomings in social dialogue and tripartism at national and local levels that were identified in the European Commission Progress Report in 2014. Despite the progress in these areas that are reported in this evaluation, the EC progress report from November

⁷ European Commission, *The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia 2016 Report*. European Commission: Brussels, November 2016, 4.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 50-51.

⁹ Lejla Tonovic, *Report on the Midterm Internal Evaluation of the Promoting Social Dialogue Project*. ILO, March 2016, 9.

¹⁰ http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---europe/---ro-geneva/---sro-budapest/documents/publication/wcms_168827.pdf

¹¹ Summary findings can be found at http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_188586.pdf

¹² *Ibid.*

2016 confirms that there remains a need to ‘improve the efficiency of the bipartite and tripartite social dialogue.’¹³

The relevance of the project to the needs of the country was confirmed by the representative from the MLSP who stated that the project had met needs related to the amicable settlement of labour disputes and the strengthening of the NESC and establishment of LSCs. To give effect to these needs, the government amended the legal environment through the introduction of secondary legislation that the MLSP believe has helped to improve the visibility and functioning of the councils.

2. Is there a fit between the project design and the direct beneficiaries’ needs?

A review of the project document shows that the project design is well thought through and is supported by a logical framework methodology to link activities to outputs to results. The project is sophisticated in that it envisages the establishment of significant infrastructure to support improved social dialogue through the delivery of three complementary components. While the components are not strictly interlocking, they do buttress each other so that success in one helps to support success in the other components. For example, a robust amicable dispute settlement procedure will help to improve collective bargaining by ensuring conflicts can be resolved without relationships breaking down. The logframe was adequate for the purpose of establishing a clear conceptual pathway between the activities of each component and the overall objectives. However, there was no formal theory of change developed in order to underpin the project’s logic and the assumptions that has been made.

A project theory of change has been described as:

‘A comprehensive description and illustration of how and why a desired change is expected to happen in a particular context. It is focused in particular on mapping out or “filling in” what has been described as the “missing middle” between what a program or change initiative does (its activities or interventions) and how these lead to desired goals being achieved. It does this by first identifying the desired long-term goals and then works back from these to identify all the conditions (outcomes) that must be in place (and how these related to one another causally) for the goals to occur’.¹⁴

Interviews with the project team revealed that they had often come to an implicit understanding of the change theory that underpinned the project, for example by making the assumption that building physical and technical infrastructure and improving the knowledge and skills base of tripartite actors would enable them to engage more fully in social dialogue. Further, discussions at the retreats explored how change would come about through the project’s interventions. However, this could have been made more explicit and, by developing a theory of change, the project’s underlying assumptions could have been more fully developed and scrutinised.

3. How well has the project adapted during implementation?

The project has been confronted with a number of serious challenges in regards to the external environment in which it has operated. Most significant among these is the political situation that is described by the European Commission as ‘the most severe political crisis since 2001’.¹⁵ The crisis commenced in 2015 and it is still not certain that the country is emerging from it fully. In other words, for the past two years, the project has had to operate in turbulent political waters. Interview data

¹³ European Commission, *The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia 2016 Report*. European Commission: Brussels, November 2016, 50.

¹⁴ <http://www.theoryofchange.org/what-is-theory-of-change/>

¹⁵ European Commission, *The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia 2016 Report*. European Commission: Brussels, November 2016, 4.

from the MLSP shows that there have been a number of changes of job roles for personnel within the Ministry, leading to different focal points for the project within a critical national partner. In addition, there have been conflicts in one of the trade union federations, related to the political crisis which interview data suggests has been a distraction from the project work. As a consequence, for much of the duration of the project, elements of two of the three tripartite partners have been suffering from disruptions that have had an effect on the project.

The most visible impact of the crisis on the project was the need to postpone a number of project activities. As a consequence, the project obtained a no-cost 6 month extension that enabled it to complete its agreed activities. These are reflected in an updated Project Document and logical framework that set out the revised timetable and work plan. These were approved by the Steering Committee.

From the interview data there was a diverse response as to whether the project had adapted to meet their organisational needs. Broadly speaking, the employers' organisations believed that the project had been highly beneficial ('a dream come true' in one opinion). However, there was less positive response from the trade union side who felt the project had, in some respects, not adapted to meet their needs, for example in improving visibility and promoting membership growth which was one of the primary objectives, or, in the case of one union, to achieve representative status. These issues are described in more detail below. However, the trade union respondents were also satisfied that the project had the right focus and had been worthwhile for them, something that is reflected in the Steering Committee minutes.

The project has coped well with the challenges it faced, making good use of the extension period to finish activities. However, data from the interviews suggests that the project may have been overloaded with activities, especially in the final months, which left little time for beneficiaries to implement or support for them to do so. For example, project activities were continuing during and after the evaluation period with a number of activities scheduled for March 2017, including the publication of employer position papers, the release of an ILO legal assessment of two chapters of the labour relation law, and training on assisted collective bargaining. The compressed time frame was not ideal and caused difficulties for some of the social partners to gain maximum benefit from some of the activities. However, given the significant external challenges the project team faced, it was appropriate for them to ensure that the project bid document was delivered according to the revised plan as agreed by the Steering Committee.

4. How the project supports Country Programmes (strategic policy framework)?

The Decent Work Country Programme for Macedonia 2015-18 has effective social dialogue as one of its three priority areas. The priority contains four outcomes: i) Institutional and technical capacity of social partners is strengthened; ii) Economic and Social Councils at national and local level have enhanced capacity to fulfil their consultative role; iii) Social partners and government capacity to engage in collective bargaining processes are strengthened; iv) An operational mechanism of amicable settlement of labour disputes is in place¹⁶. The PSDP is fully in line with the DWCP and interview data confirms that the project has been the primary means to achieve the priority. Interviews also confirmed that the priority action area remains valid and that the project interventions to promote social dialogue have been appropriate.

The Employment and Social Reform Programme 2020, Objective 3.1.5. commits the country to strengthening social dialogue at tripartite and bipartite level, at national and local level, and improvement of collective bargaining.

¹⁶ DWCP, FYR Macedonia 2015-18, 14-17.

A review of the Republic of Macedonia Economic Reform Programme 2016 suggests that social dialogue is still not a high priority within the economic ministerial departments as there is no mention of the need to promote social dialogue or tripartism within the plan, that otherwise relies mostly on supply side measures and labour market reforms to boost the economy.¹⁷ Interview data also suggested that the tripartite NESC is seen as a body contained primarily within the MLSP and that other ministries are yet to fully utilise its services for policy and legislation for which it has competence to give opinions and recommendations.

5. To what extent does the project design help meet the ILO's strategic and national policy frameworks?

The project meets the strategic objectives for social dialogue contained in the ILO Programme and Budget for the periods covering the project. Outcome 12 of the P & B 2014-15 specifically requires the ILO to work towards promoting tripartism and labour market governance as a means to strengthen social dialogue and sound industrial relations.¹⁸ The P & B 2016-17 does not contain a specific outcome to promote social dialogue but has an indicator to promote social dialogue under Outcome 7 to promote workplace compliance through labour inspections.¹⁹ Social dialogue is also a cross-cutting issue under the same outcome. Given the project's objective to build the capacity of the social partner to engage in social dialogue, the project addresses outcome 10 of the P & B 2016-17 that is directed towards strong and representative employers and workers organisations.²⁰ Social dialogue is also a cross-cutting policy driver within the current P & B.²¹

In addition to ILO mandates, the project meets objectives set out in the UNDAF 2010-15 country programme which specifically argues that, 'strengthening social dialogue will notably lead to improving the quality of the reform strategies, but also assist the country to move closer to the EU social model of which social dialogue represents an important feature'.²²

The UNDAF programme has been followed by the Partnership for Sustainable Development United Nations Strategy 2016-20. Under the strategy, 'ILO will bolster the country's fledgling tripartite social dialogue by enhancing the role of the national Economic and Social Council in reviewing draft legislation and helping to create analogous councils at the local level'.²³

Effectiveness

6. What progress has the project made towards achieving its specific objectives? What are the reasons/factors behind that progress?

The project document states that the project had the following objectives:

Overall objective

The overall objective of this project is to extend and enhance tripartite and bipartite social dialogue as a means to achieve economic growth and social progress.

Specific objectives

The problem of social dialogue will be addressed from three levels and the project aims to achieve the following specific objectives:

¹⁷ http://www.finance.gov.mk/files/ERP_2016_en.pdf

¹⁸ <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/program/download/pdf/14-15/pbfinalweb.pdf>, 47-8

¹⁹ <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/program/download/pdf/16-17/pb-2016-17-en.pdf>, 30

²⁰ Ibid., 37-42

²¹ Ibid., 43

²² United Nations Development Assistance Framework 2010-15, 10.

²³ Partnership for Sustainable Development United Nations Strategy for 2016-2020, 25.

1. Enhanced institutional capacity of stakeholders in charge of tripartite and bipartite social dialogue in terms of sustainability, efficiency and functionality in order to provide a comprehensive participation of all the relevant stakeholders, especially of the social partners, in the creation, development and implementation of economic and social policies;
2. Strengthened social partnership on the industry/branch/company level including a coordinated and effective machinery for collective bargaining;
3. Establish an operational mechanism of amicable settlement of labour disputes and trained specialized conciliators and arbitrators for labour disputes.

To reach its objectives the project envisaged working on three complementary ('interlinked' in the project documentation) components that were designed to address the major challenges facing the tripartite partners in establishing and maintaining effective social dialogue. From the project document the three components are:

Component One: Enhancing the tripartite social dialogue on national and local level;

Component Two: Encouraging collective bargaining and setting sectoral collective bargaining infrastructures;

Component Three: Establishing an operational amicable settlement of labour disputes.

Given that the components are designed to achieve the objectives, it makes sense to deal with each component in turn to assess the extent to which each has been achieved which will, in turn, allow an assessment as whether the specific and overall objectives have been achieved.

Component One: Enhancing the tripartite social dialogue on national and local level

This component has been primarily concerned with developing the infrastructure and capacity of the National Economic and Social Council (NESC) and the local Economic and Social Councils (LESC). The NESC is a statutory body with a legal foundation. LESCs are voluntary bodies with no statutory basis.

NESC

On the national level, the project has equipped the NESC with infrastructure to allow it to function more effectively. From the narrative report and additional interview data, this infrastructure, physical and technical, has included the following elements:

- A tripartite action plan developed by the project and validated by the NESC on the functioning of the NESC;
- Amended rules of procedure (RoP);
- An annual operation plan;
- A communications strategy, including a new web site, new logo and promotional material;
- Five new standing working committees; - Committee on labour relations and salary; Committee on employment and labour market policy; Committee on social security; Committee on occupational safety and health, and Committee on issuing and revoking licenses to mediator and arbitrators;
- Enabling the NESC to move into its own premises within the MLSP;
- Establishment of a technical secretariat involving the social partners;
- Equipment, made up of 5 desktop computers, 3 laptop computers, 1 printer, 1 screen, 9 MS office, 1 big meeting table, 4 working desks, 14 meeting chairs, 4 working chairs, 15 conference chairs, 4 archive shelves, 4 sets of drawers, 2 air-conditioning units, and a library stocked with ILO materials;

- Specially developed bespoke computer software to track NESC opinions through the legislative and policy process;
- Training on the tracking software;
- Eight thematic training events. International Labour Standards – 16 May 2016; Gender Equality and Non-discrimination – 21 June 2016; Employment Policy – 28-30 June 2016; Project Cycle Management – 12-16 September 2016; Macroeconomics including informal economy – 26-27 October 2016; Wages including Minimum Wage – 22-23 November 2016; Social Security and Social Protection – 21 March 2017; Occupational Safety and Health – 23 March 2017.
- Retreats to monitor progress of the action plan.

Interview data supports a finding that the project has succeeded in building sufficient infrastructure to enable the NESC to operate as an effective body in providing opinions and recommendations on legislation and policy to government.

The provision of a significant amount of equipment, including computer software, can be justified on the basis that it has helped to overcome a potential barrier to operation, although it will now be necessary to ensure the equipment and technical capacity is fully utilised for the purpose for which it was bought.

In the latter respect, the functioning of the NESC was severely hindered by the political crisis when it was not possible to obtain a quorum for meetings, for example. However, there is evidence from the interviews that the NESC is now working reasonably well and it has been able to give opinions and inputs into employment and social legislation.

The MLSP has supported the NESC through the adoption of secondary legislation to facilitate its operation. Interview data has shown that the social partners valued the project team's efforts in developing the NESC, especially given the political situation. The fact that the NESC is a statutory body helps to give it a strong foundation. However, its location within the MLSP may hinder its ability to promote itself to other ministries, especially the economic and finance departments.

There is significant evidence of a sound infrastructure that has been supported by training that has been well-received by the participants. However, due to the problems caused by the political crisis, the NESC only met in its current form on two occasions in 2016. However, the NESC has already met twice in March 2017 and presented a future programme of work on March 20 2017.

Interview data revealed a degree of confidence, that, with the continued support of the MLSP and commitment of the social partners, the NESC can be an effective body to promote tripartism and social dialogue at the institutional level. The tripartite actors recognised that it was their responsibility to make use of the infrastructure that has been put in place. Ultimately, its success for the social partners may rest on how well they believe the NESC can influence policy and legislation in a positive way. To help the NESC achieve this aim, the project is assisting the NESC to initiate research papers that will help to establish its authority and credentials as a serious body. Due to the political crisis, this activity of the project was delayed and was not completed at the time of the evaluation, although the proposed research topics have been agreed and the analyses completed, but not published, at the time of the evaluation. The research topics are: Establishment of a Social Fund for Promotion of Social Dialogue and Collective Bargaining; Monitoring the Minimum Wage Effects; Sustainability of Pension Reform; and Effects of Income Tax and Social Contribution

LESCs

In respect of the LESCs there is some evidence of significant progress as a result of project interventions. Six new LESCs have been established in the following municipalities - Resen, Veles, Sveti Nikole, Struga, Kichevo and Radovish. The project identified three new municipalities when an original cohort decided not to participate. Interview data from two municipalities revealed positive messages about the potential role of two LESCs with evidence of planned continued financial support from the municipalities. There was enthusiasm about the potential of LESCs to better understand local labour market needs and thereby to influence local economic policy. Both LESCs had conducted some research on their local labour market and had presented the findings to the municipal government. For example, one LESC revealed that its municipality required more workers trained in catering and tourism.

The project also provided significant equipment for each LESC comprising of 3 desktop computers, 1 laptop computer, 1 printer, 1 screen, 4 MS office, 4 working desks, 12 conference chairs, 2 archive shelves, 4 sets of drawers, and a library. A web site for all fifteen LESCs was also developed for increased visibility. However, LESCs established by the project are in their infancy and still need to be embedded within local decision-making structures more fully, by being placed on a statutory basis for example. Unlike the NESC, the composition of LESCs has been opened up to other civil society actors apart from the tripartite partners. It is too early to say how effective this move will prove to be in regards to the functioning of these bodies.

Overall, there is evidence that progress has been made towards the achievement of Component One, especially in regards to the building of an infrastructure for tripartite dialogue. There is evidence that the NESC is now functioning and able to undertake its obligations. It is too early to say how effective it is in influencing policy and legislation or the extent to which it will make use of the infrastructure that has been provided, but with a programme of work presented on 20 March, the prognosis is promising.

The LESCs established by the project are in their infancy but interview data indicated that they have the potential to improve social dialogue and tripartite working at the municipal level. The commitment by municipalities to provide a budget for their continuing work is a promising sign.

Component Two: Encouraging collective bargaining and setting sectoral collective bargaining infrastructures

The strategy to achieve Component Two can be summarised as building the capacity of the social partners to fully engage in collective bargaining. The narrative report provides a checklist of infrastructure and activities that had been completed by October 2016.²⁴ These included a situational analysis; a tripartite action plan for collective bargaining; specialist advice and logistical support; training and expert inputs to improve the quality of collective bargaining; and marketing, communications and business strategies.

For this evaluation I have reviewed the marketing, communications and business strategies, and the training and materials that the project provided as these were major project intervention strategies to assist collective bargaining. I conclude by reviewing the overall collective bargaining environment.

Marketing, communications and business strategies for EOs

An innovative element of the project was to engage the services of professional marketing agencies to work with the social partners to help them promote themselves to their own constituencies and to improve their visibility to potential members and the general public.²⁵ By gaining greater legitimacy it

²⁴ *Promoting Social Dialogue Narrative Report September 2015-October 2016*, 13-15

²⁵ Note that the NESC was also the beneficiary of marketing agency support.

was assumed that the social partners would be able to grow and enhance their representative status as bargaining partners, which would, in turn, help to provide the foundations for improved collective bargaining processes and outcomes.

Growth in membership is important as only employers affiliated to a representative body, in this case the ORM, are bound by collective agreements. A barrier to collective bargaining that was raised in the interviews was the belief that non-affiliated employers could undercut affiliated employers, thus gaining an unfair competitive advantage as they would not be bound by collective terms.

The communications strategy for the ORM contains four sections – analysis, strategy, activities and implementation & evaluation. The analysis section reviews the external environment in which the ORM operates, a perception analysis of other stakeholders, and a SWOT analysis. The strategy section sets out core and specific objectives with target audiences identified and described with strategic principles established for the ORM offer, positioning and messaging. These strategic principles are translated into an activities programme with nine complementary elements, including development of a web site, business breakfasts and mobile applications. The final section briefly sets out principles of implementation and evaluation but does not provide a detailed plan for either.

A separate strategy was produced for the BKM. The strategy is presented with a business model analysis, market analysis, and a SWOT and organisation analysis. The analytic sections are quite detailed and provide a good overview of the situation of the BKM within the environment and its capacities to take advantage of the opportunities it affords. The strategy also sets out the marketing strategy for the BKM with target markets and an industry analysis, making use of Michael Porter's '5 Forces' analytic model. The analysis leads to a marketing and communications strategy that is set out in some detail.

Interview data from the employers' organisations confirms that the marketing and communications strategies that were developed by the agencies were a highly valued element of the project. Both organisations regarded this piece of work as one of the most important interventions that the project made, with the PR work and the business breakfasts singled out for mention as particularly useful in promoting visibility to potential new members. Both employers' organisation saw membership growth as a result of the strategies, thus indicating their effectiveness.

Overall, the marketing and communications strategies for employers has helped them build capacity, improve visibility, enhance services to members and increase membership that has the potential to improve collective bargaining and social dialogue as the employers' organisations gain greater credibility with their constituent members and social partners.

In addition to a marketing strategy and training interventions, the project also provided the ORM and BKM with separate business development strategies for the period 2015-20. The strategies helped the organisations clarify their vision, mission and goals with an outline strategy to achieve them. Interview data suggests that the business strategies, allied with the marketing strategy have been useful to help the ORM and BKM to improve services to members and to grow their membership. The business strategy was described as a 'living document' by one organisation that has helped it to achieve its goals. A review of the strategies suggests that they are appropriate for the needs of the organisations and will help to sustain project results.

Marketing, communications and business strategies for trade unions

The trade union side was also the beneficiary of marketing agency support. As a result of advice from the ACTRAV specialist and agreement among the participants unions, clarified in a joint Memorandum

of Understanding between them, a joint marketing strategy would be developed for the three federations. The objective was to improve the image and visibility of trade unions.

The trade union strategy recognised that there was already considerable media coverage of trade unionism, but that it was dominated by internal controversies concerning elections or disputes. There was very little media discussion of the benefits of trade unions for the membership or wider society and economy; lack of coverage of positive examples of benefits to workers, and most importantly, conflation of trade union concerns with the agenda of the government.

The agency found that trade union communications (web sites, monthly bulletins etc) had been dominated by a formal and ideological approach, rather than pragmatic issues, and it was mostly retrospective rather than important future plans and events. The workers themselves had a very low level of awareness of the role of trade unions, which continue to be perceived as a very slow, out-dated and undemocratic heritage from the old “socialistic system”, protecting government interests rather than those of workers.

In response, the strategy was developed to include:

- The development of a new generic web site and smart phone application to encourage education and awareness on workers’ rights;
- Production of new brochures and leaflets on workers’ rights;
- Events to raise public attention and media coverage;
- Informal meetings, social media and celebrity endorsements to generate interest among young workers and women workers;
- Regular briefings, meetings and a press conference with journalists to build credibility and trust with the media;
- Media training for trade union representatives.

It was evident that these activities were intended to be undertaken within a very short time-frame, with the whole programme initially scheduled to be completed within nine weeks, although this was later extended considerably to the end of the project.

Interviews with union representatives revealed that the common strategy for all the participating federations failed to sufficiently take into consideration internal conflicts and the differences between them. One federation claimed that it could not participate in the activities in the initial stages, due to “internal problems”, and therefore was unable to gain as much benefit from the project as others, and that while the external public relations element was helpful in raising their profile, it was overshadowed by external political events. Another federation complained that the strategy did not take sufficient recognition of the different approaches to workers’ rights, and that little could be achieved in the context of broader government-inspired barriers to an understanding of the role of unions. The third federation believed that the PR activity was particularly unsatisfactory in satisfying the needs of the unions. They believed the agency to be too passive and had expected them to be more proactive in attracting new members; events were organised with short notice, especially towards the end of the project; the ILO’s criteria for the selection of the agency were inadequate; the new web site generated new problems, with little customer support; and while the communications strategy was adequate, little was subsequently implemented.

Overall the marketing strategy for the trade unions was undermined by the attempt to build a common programme for all three rival federations, a lack of clarity in understanding the role of marketing agencies, and an over-ambitious work programme for what some of the social partners believed to be a very limited duration. Some of these problems have been addressed by the project, including working with the TUs to develop their own activity programme and extending the project to enable implementation to take place.

In contrast to the EOs there are no business development strategy documents for the trade union partners envisaged in the project.

Training, specialist advice and materials on collective bargaining

The project provided significant training opportunities to beneficiaries to enhance their capacity to engage in collective bargaining and to improve collective bargaining processes and outcomes.

From the narrative report, training, specialist advice and materials to support collective bargaining was a major intervention strategy for the project, with training provided for employers, trade unions, labour inspector and labour judges. ILO materials on collective bargaining were translated into Macedonian to provide further support to buttress the training interventions. The mid-term evaluation reported that training initiatives had been highly rated by the participants and this view is confirmed in this report. For this evaluation, a randomly selected sample of six evaluation forms from a diverse range of training events showed a highly commendable overall satisfaction score of 4.57 out of 5 for the training events.

My review of the employers training manual finds that the manual is well-written and clearly sets out the critical issues for collective bargaining from an employers' perspective with sections on the basics of collective bargaining, negotiating techniques, the role of the media and the content of agreements. Although it is described as a training programme, the manual is, in fact, a guidance document.

Interview data with employers confirms that the training interventions were regarded as of high quality, with particular mention of the value of international experts to assist with the training. The training was reported as having improved collective bargaining with its emphasis on negotiating techniques. However as reported below, the training was reported as not being able to overcome the structural barriers to collective bargaining.

A series of six seminars was delivered for trade union activists at branch level responsible for social dialogue and collective bargaining. The expertise and skills of the facilitators tutors were appreciated, and the training materials were thought to have been useful and of high quality. In general, the training was regarded as highly satisfactory, but the outcomes were limited and there was little implementation 'because of the external political context'. Nevertheless, from a reading of the seminar materials, the activities, hand-outs and trainers' presentations are of good quality, with clear aims, methods and tasks for each session.

It is unclear whether the training in collective bargaining / social dialogue was undertaken in isolation, or as part of broader training activity on trade union organisation and representation. Collective bargaining can only be successful in the context of strong, democratic and independent trade union organisation, rather than simply the good will of the bargaining counterparts / social partners.

Overall, the provision of ILO materials that have been translated into Macedonian and the use of ILO experts to provide input into workshops and training on gender equality, international labour standards and other issues, reinforces the ILO's comparative advantage to lead projects on the development of collective bargaining and social dialogue as it has an unparalleled resource base upon which to call.

The collective bargaining environment

The interview data revealed that the project had made limited progress in improving the collective bargaining environment but that there were still significant barriers that need to be confronted before free collective bargaining is firmly established in the country. The project was said to have had some influence on an improved collective bargaining situation based more on social partnership than adversarial conflict and that this was reflected in improved quality of bargaining in the private sector.

However, collective bargaining in the private sector remains low with low trade union density posing a particular problem.²⁶ However, a general private sector collective agreement that sets a broad framework of terms and conditions had been completed.

Other respondents believed the project had limited impact as the representative social partners were already involved in collective bargaining before the project commenced, although there was recognition that the project had helped with bargaining techniques. However, it was stated that barriers to collective bargaining exist at structural levels and the project was not designed to overcome these. Examples of these structural issues are the legal representivity of collective organisations so that some trade unions and employers bodies are not able to enter into collective agreements; the legal prohibition on company agreements where the trade union is not affiliated to a branch union; the employment legal framework, for example on guaranteed holiday entitlement, that limits the scope for bargaining; the reluctance of companies to enter into agreements that were not extended across the sector to cover employers that were not affiliated to the employers' body; and the slow process of achieving trade union registration with one case reported to have taken over two and a half years. Many of these issues are the subject of a new legal assessment by the ILO which has provided technical comments and recommendations relating to social partners' registration and representivity criteria for collective bargaining purpose. The recommendations were discussed in a tripartite workshop with participation of the NESC members with the aim to inform further legal changes designed to promote collective bargaining.

Interview data from the employers' organisations reveals that they benefitted from the capacity-building elements provided by the marketing and business strategies for their own organisational development. Evidence from the trade unions finds that similar organisational growth was not an outcome for them and, in any case, they did not benefit from a business strategy as part of the project's envisaged activities.

While the development of the employers' organisation is welcome *per se*, it is not possible to confirm that the project achieved its objectives in regards to Component Two in regards to improving the scope and quality of collective bargaining as a process or an outcome. Benefits accruing to the employers have not necessarily fed through to the collective bargaining arena. For example, I have been unable to assess whether collective agreements entered into during the lifetime of the project in the target sectors of agriculture and textiles materially differed from pre-existing agreements. Lack of progress on the trade union side has also hampered the development of collective bargaining.

Overall, the project has benefitted the employers who were able to take advantage of the opportunities afforded by the project. However, for collective bargaining to succeed both social partners need to be strengthened. These problems notwithstanding, the project made some limited progress in the field of collective bargaining by developing a tripartite action plan, providing high quality ILO materials to support collective bargaining and made use of specialists to assist the social partners to improve collective bargaining. The ongoing training will also prove useful once it is implemented on the ground.

Component Three: Establishing an operational amicable settlement of labour disputes.

The overarching strategy to improve the amicable resolution of labour disputes has been to establish an infrastructure and a machinery to allow that to happen. The narrative report of October 2016 outlines the measures taken to achieve this goal, including training of 90 conciliators, 41 of whom had been licensed at the time of the report (at the time of the evaluation this figure had risen to 49 licensed conciliators); the establishment and training of a tripartite licensing commission, a case management

²⁶ I don't have official statistics for trade union membership density in the private sector but it was informally reported as about 10% of workers employed in the sector.

information system installed; a publicity campaign to promote the conciliation system; ongoing training of conciliators to a high standard; and the promotion of ASLD as part of the process of social dialogue and tripartism.²⁷

The context in which the ASLD procedure has been developed was described in interviews as litigious with parties accustomed to recourse in the formal courts as the preferred means to settle disputes. Conciliation is seen as a complementary procedure to enable collective disputes that would not be admissible in court, to be resolved. The achievements of the project need to be seen in this light. The project has made significant progress with 90 conciliators trained and 50 granted licences. The licensing procedure, with a trained tripartite commission operating under the auspices of the NESCC, is a useful start in the process of developing an independent and credible conciliation service.

Training of conciliators involved the identification a small cohort of individuals who were given training of trainers' education and advanced conciliation techniques at the ILO ITC in Turin, making use of ILO and external experts. The training curriculum was approved by the MLSP. These trainers provided basic conciliation training to the rest of the cohort. The cohort was drawn from the social partners themselves as well as labour lawyers, private sector employees and mediators. To date, four cases have been referred to the ASLD procedure. It is not possible to say whether this is evidence of success or not as it is just the start. Only the future will tell. The quality and extent of the training and licensing process was appropriate for a fledgling system.

By exposing employees and associates of the social partners to the conciliation process, the project has usefully built the capacity of the partners to advocate for the benefits of conciliation in the future.

Interview data suggests that there is no need to train more conciliators and that the priority should be to promote the system as a complementary alternative to the courts. Evidence from the publicity campaign shows that interest in the system was incited as a result of the campaign with telephone enquiries made to the MLSP and ILO offices.

To date, the sole person to have undertaken conciliation work is a university law professor who does not work for any of the tripartite actors, and has been proactive in seeking cases. For conciliation to work, the conciliators must be, and **must be seen to be**, well-qualified, knowledgeable about labour disputes, and independent of social partners or government. According to the Law Commission of Ireland, 'the principles of neutrality and impartiality are fundamental to the success of alternative dispute resolution processes'.²⁸ The establishment of an informal network of conciliators outside of the project, the Professional Association of Labour Conciliators of Macedonia, is a useful starting point in creating a professional body for conciliators in the future that can operate independently of the tripartite actors.

The ASLD procedure is still in an embryonic stage. The fact that four cases have been referred is some evidence that the mechanism that the project has established has been effective. Disputing parties can appoint a mutually agreed conciliator of their choice. However, as a principle, ensuring that conciliation is neutral and impartial will be essential for the system to gain their confidence.

It is outside the scope of this report to comment on the wider legal environment for conciliation, except that interview data suggested that more legal amendments may be required in order to help establish conciliation as a viable and credible alternative to the courts also for resolving individual disputes in addition to collective disputes.

²⁷ *Social Dialogue Narrative Report September 2015-October 2016*, 15

²⁸ Law Reform Commission (Ireland), *Alternative Dispute Resolution: Conciliation and Mediation*, 2010, 60 http://www.lawreform.ie/_fileupload/reports/r98adr.pdf

Strong progress has been made towards achieving the objective of the project to establish a system for the amicable settlement of labour disputes but it is too early to say whether the system will become embedded as a significant alternative to the formal court system.

Achievement of Specific Objectives

Good progress has been made towards the achievement of Specific Objective One through the development of infrastructure to support the NESC and LESC. More needs to be done to embed the work of NESC within ministries outside of the MLSP. LESC need to become more embedded with their municipalities by being put on a statutory basis.

Limited progress has been made towards Objective Two though some progress has been made in respect of enhancing the ability of social partners to engage in collective bargaining. Wider structural issues are preventing further progress.

Objective Three has been achieved to the extent that a conciliation mechanism has been established and is ready for use. To date only limited actual use has been made of the service.

Achievement of Overall Objective

The overall objective of this project is to extend and enhance tripartite and bipartite social dialogue as a means to achieve economic growth and social progress. Partial progress has been made to the development of tripartite and social dialogue. Without further data on economic growth and more fully developed criteria on social progress it is not possible to assess whether these have been achieved.

7. Did the project produce the intended results? What are the reasons/factors that enabled the results to be achieved or not achieved?

1.5 Tripartite Action Plan for enhancing capacity of the National and Local Economic and Social Councils implemented.

A tripartite action plan developed by the project and validated by the NESC was agreed and is in the process of being implemented. See above for a detailed assessment of the status of NESC and LESC.

1.6 Six (6) new local ESCs established

Six local agreements have been signed and LESC established in Resen, Veles, Sveti Nikole, Struga, Kichevo and Radovich.

1.7 Monitoring mechanism of recommendations of the ESC in place.

A tracking system has been developed and installed and training provided. The system has been tested but, as yet, the system has not been used as no official recommendations have been made since testing.

1.8 Improved visibility of the ESCs

The project developed a marketing and communications strategy for the NESC. The strategy has been partially implemented with the development of a web site, greater regularity of meetings, and the planned presentation on 20th March 2017 of the NESC programme and work plan. A proposed Parliamentary meeting has not been implemented due to the political crisis.

2.1 A tripartite action plan on strengthening collective bargaining implemented

A tripartite plan has been agreed. See above for an assessment of collective bargaining.

2.2 A training programme for workers and employers on collective bargaining is in place

The training programme has been developed with separate programmes for each social partner. Six training events have taken place for trade unions and three for employers' organisations.²⁹ The training has been delivered on a sectoral basis in accordance with the sectors agreed by the project partners.

2.5 Database on social partners' membership and collective agreements is established

The database has been installed. Social partners are responsible for providing the data to populate the database. Interview data from the MLSP shows that the register is in use.

3.1 A training program for conciliators/arbitrators is in place

A training programme has been developed. The training programme includes a trainer of trainers programme developed by ILO ITC and a conciliators programme. A curriculum for continuous training of professional conciliators has been developed by the ILO and published in the country Official Journal.

3.2 A roster of specialized conciliators/arbitrators is created

To date 15 people have been trained as trainers and 90 people as conciliators. 50 trainees have been licensed by the licensing committee.

3.3 A case management system is created and in use

A case management system has been developed. It has been used for the four cases that have been referred to conciliation to date.

3.4 Awareness campaign targeting social partners and general public's on the advantages of amicable settlement of labour disputes is carried out.

An awareness campaign has been run and resulted in a substantial number of enquiries to the MLSP from the public. The ILO office also received enquiries.

Critical success factors

The critical success factors for where the project has been able to make progress despite the problematic external conditions can be attributed significantly to the skill and dedication of the project team and ILO support. Interview data consistently found that project partners were highly impressed by the national team and also by the ILO network of experts. Additional support has been provided by the ILO CO, Budapest. Critically, the project has benefitted from the commitment to the project from tripartite stakeholders even at times when internal pressures were a distraction.

8. How and how well have stakeholders been involved in the implementation?

Interview data shows that stakeholders were involved from the inception of the project through a round of individual meetings to gauge interest and commitment to the project. After the commencement of the project, the stakeholders were involved at the strategic level through membership of the Steering Committee that met twice a year. From the interviews, there were different views on the effectiveness of the SC, with some respondents satisfied with its operation as a project advisory board while other respondents were less satisfied, finding that it focussed on past events rather than upcoming activities, thus limiting the ability of the Committee members to shape the future direction of the project. A review of the Steering Committee agendas and minutes show that the earlier SC meetings were presented with plans for the future as well as reports on past activities. The minutes are detailed and show that the Steering Committee was kept fully informed of project developments with an opportunity to comment on them.

From a review of the narrative report and from interview data, there is strong evidence of stakeholder commitment to and involvement in project activities such as marketing strategies, training and

²⁹ *Social Dialogue Narrative Report September 2015-October 2016*, 29

workshops. For example, from personal observation, trade union social partners attended the event on Friday 3rd March 2017 on the employer position papers to improve the business environment, providing observational evidence that the social partners were committed to visibly supporting project events.

Overall, the stakeholders have been involved in the planning and implementation phases of the project with opportunities to shape the project through membership of the Steering Committee.

9. How many partners benefitted from the project, e.g. have been trained, improved skills etc.

The total number of participants trained through events organised by the project is 939 (459 men, 480 women). This number includes training events that took place in March 2017.

10. Are constituents satisfied with the quality of the tools, technical advice, training and other activities, delivered by the project?

Tools

The project provided beneficiaries with a number of physical and technical tools. The NESC benefited from significant physical equipment made up of 5 desktop computers, 3 laptop computers, 1 printer, 1 screen, 9 MS office, 1 big meeting table, 4 working desks, 14 meeting chairs, 4 working chairs, 15 conference chairs, 4 archive shelves, 4 sets of drawers, 2 air-conditioning units, and a library stocked with ILO materials. In addition, software was installed to track NESC opinions and recommendations. Interview data shows that the Council and MLSP were satisfied with these inputs but that it was now essential to make good use of them.

LESCs were supplied with 3 desktop computers, 1 laptop computer, 1 printer, 1 screen, 4 MS office, 4 working desks, 12 conference chairs, 2 archive shelves, 4 sets of drawers, and a library. A web site for all fifteen LESCs was also developed for increased visibility. Interview data confirms that the LESCs are satisfied with these inputs but, once again, they need to be put to good use.

A database has also been installed in the MLSP to record social partner membership, strikes and collective agreements. Responsibility lies with the social partners to provide the relevant data. Interview data from the MLSP indicates that the database is in use.

Case management software was installed for conciliation and details of conciliation cases to date entered. The system is in use. I have not been able to ascertain the views of the parties on how well it is working.

A tracking mechanism for recommendations made by the NESC was developed and installed and is fully tested and available for use.

Technical advice

The project has provided significant technical advice for beneficiaries. The NESC benefitted from a tripartite action plan on the functioning of the NESC; amended rules of procedure (RoP); a tracking mechanism; an annual operation plan in 2015, 2016 and 2017; and a communications strategy, including a new web site. Data from the interviews with the NESC and MLSP shows that there is a high degree of satisfaction with the level of technical advice provided and that the needs of the NESC have been met in this regards. Interview data from across the tripartite actors were clear that it was now the responsibility of the social partners to make best use of these project benefits.

A significant part of the project involved providing beneficiaries with technical advice on marketing and communications and business strategy. Stakeholder satisfaction with these elements of the project has been reported above.

The EOs were also the recipients from substantial technical advice from the ILO ACT/EMP Officer based in the Budapest Office. Both EOs were highly satisfied with the advice and assistance the Officer provided during the project.

The trade unions received assistance from an ACTRAV Officer at the start of the project but due to exceptional circumstances this assistance could not be maintained. The assistance provided has not been evaluated.

Other areas of technical assistance, including tripartite action plans on collective bargaining and dispute resolution, ILO analysis of the legal framework, and other documents that are written in Macedonian, have not been evaluated.

Training

A consistent message from all the respondents was to comment on the very high quality of the training, the external experts and the overall high standard of training documentation such as manuals. This element demonstrates the comparative advantage that the ILO can bring to projects as much of the training has been provided by ILO experts on gender and ILS for example. The ILO ITC at Turin has also provided specialist training inputs on dispute resolution that were validated as high quality. In addition, the ILO has made use of associate experts from Netherlands, Belgium and Ireland. Overall, the training elements of the project garnered positive reviews from interviewees confirming the mid-term evaluation finding that training had been positively evaluated by participants in immediate post-course evaluation exercises.³⁰

11. Have there been any resulting changes in constituent capacities?

MLSP

The MLSP has been the recipient of significant IT software including a database for social partners' memberships and collective agreements and a case management system for conciliation; and a tracking mechanism for NESC opinions. MLSP staff has received training to operate the software. The project has, therefore, helped the MLSP to exercise its functions as an enabler of an improved system of social dialogue.

NESC

The NESC has seen a significant enhancement in capacity. This includes a technical secretariat involving the social partners; new premises based in the MLSP; significant equipment; IT software for tracking opinions; capacity to license conciliators through a trained licensing committee based in the NESC; standing committees; an operational plan and rules of procedure; a tripartite action plan; and increased visibility through a marketing strategy. Evidence that the NESC is now able function comes from the number of opinions it managed to give, despite the political situation that meant it only met twice in 2016. Opinions were given on the following topics:

- Project Macedonia Employs;
- Amendments to the Law on Employment and Insurance in case of Unemployment;
- Law on Writing Off Interest on Debts for Social Insurance;
- Amendments to the Law on Pension and Disability Insurance;
- Amendments to the Law on Minimum Wage;
- National Youth Employment Action Plan 2016-2020;
- Law on National Database on Disability.³¹

³⁰ Lejla Tonovic, *Report on the Midterm Internal Evaluation of the Promoting Social Dialogue Project*. ILO, March 2016, 9.

³¹ Narrative report, 7

LESCs

Six LESCs were established by the project. Agreements for the establishment of the LESCs in Resen, Veles, Sveti Nikole, Struga, Kichevo and Radovish have been signed by the presidents of the social partners present at the municipal level and by the mayors of the respective municipality.³² Each LESC has been provided with equipment to help it undertake its functions and a common platform web site to enable greater visibility and communication. Training has been provided in the eight thematic areas. Rules of Procedure have been developed and, in some cases, an action plan.

Employers Organisations

Both employers' organisations had seen membership growth with the ORM seeing expansion by 12% and the BKM witnessing growth of 10%

From the interview data, one of the employers' organisations was satisfied that their internal capacities had been improved through the development of a business plan and marketing strategy that had enabled it to improve services to members and expand membership so that it was in a position to apply for representivity. Employers have benefitted from training and technical advice from the ILO.

The other employers' organisation reported higher technical skills, but that there was also a cost/benefit trade-off through involvement in the project. On the one hand the project was valuable, especially by offering marketing support, but on the other hand the project became very time consuming and prevented the organisation from undertaking its own capacity-building activities, such as training events for members from which it derived revenue.

Each EO has received equipment consisting of one computer, one printer and one display screen.

Trade Unions

The trade union organisations benefitted especially from the high quality training. At the final steering committee meeting held on March 31 2017, one federation informally reported that its membership had grown by 20%. Other federations did not report membership growth at this stage. Representative trade unions have been able to influence the operation of the NESC and LESCs. Structural issues, such as laws on representivity and collective bargaining hinder trade union effectiveness as do historical issues that undermine the perceived independence of unions from government. Other problems include low membership density in the private sector and the political crisis that affected the ability to bargain in the public sector. Internal conflicts were also a problem in some unions which prevented full uptake of project benefits.

Each TU has received equipment consisting of one computer, one printer and one display screen.

12. Has there been any additional demand created by the project? How does that influence/strengthen the outcomes?

Interview data reveals that the project incited the social partners to consider what more support or activities that they would find useful. These included:

Learning from other countries on their experiences of social dialogue processes was found to be especially valuable. This included an express desire to visit other countries to learn first-hand about their systems and cultures of industrial relations.

³² Ibid., 8

The social partners requested that they should be provided with more computer equipment and HR support in order to enable them to be able to deal with the extra work that the project imposed on them. In Steering Committee meetings it was stated that the project did not have supply of equipment as a specific project objective but that it had been provided on a needs basis to ensure that the NESC and LESC could function. Social partners are able to make use of equipment provided in the NESC and LESC, as they are part of the secretariats.

It is beyond the scope of this evaluation to comment in detail on legal issues, but a persistent theme during interviews was the need to provide for a more facilitative legal environment to allow conciliation to take hold as an alternative means to settle labour disputes. This included expanding the scope of issues that could be settled by conciliation.

As noted above, trade unions demanded greater specificity for their own promotion and a more proactive stance from the marketing company. The project team is now meeting this need at the end of the project.

It was recognised that social partners need to build up their own internal expertise on labour issues in order to be taken seriously as an actor. Allied to this demand was a desire for more training on lobbying, advocacy and campaigning skills in order to exert influence at a higher strategic level. The employer position papers and event show that this demand is being met.

LESC also expressed a need for a full-time secretariat and support with communications and PR strategies

13. How has the project promoted fundamental principles and rights at work and international labour standards? Was it effective in assisting the country in translating such standards into national policies, programmes and results?

The ILO has undertaken a comprehensive analysis on the compliance of the national legislation with the ILS. In addition, the project hired a national expert to develop analysis on the practical implementation of the Labour Relations Law and of other specific laws that contain provisions on freedom of association, collective bargaining and strikes.

Data provided by the ILO project team states the project has been designed with the aim, *inter alia*, to promote and assist in aligning national law and practice with relevant international labour standards and practices, especially those relating to Freedom of Association, Right to Organize and Collective Bargaining. In 2013, Macedonia ratified Labour Relations (Public Service), No. 151 and Collective Bargaining Convention no. 154. The project has contributed technical work in assisting the country to implement ratified conventions in particular C87, 98, 135, 151, 154 (see ILO technical comments and recommendations) and promoted ILO standards on ASLD (Voluntary Conciliation and Arbitration Recommendation no. 92, Conventions nos. 151, Conventions nos. 150, 151, 154).

Efficiency and Management Arrangements

14. Have resources been used in an efficient manner (technical expertise, staff time, information and other resources)?

While I have not conducted a financial assessment so cannot comment with any specificity, my overall finding is that the project has been well-managed at the country and regional levels and that the ILO has provided significant added value via its extensive resources base, technical expertise, project management backstopping, and training inputs, making good use of its comparative advantage. These are reported on above. Further, the ROM report prepared by the European Commission concluded

that 'the efficiency is overall assessed as satisfactory taking into account the quality of inputs and outputs produced'.³³

15. Has the project received adequate technical and administrative support from the ILO DWT/CO-Budapest, ILO HQ and partners?

A major finding of this evaluation has been the significant value of the comparative advantage of the ILO in supporting the project with backstopping, technical and administrative support from the ILO DWT/CO-Budapest and ILO HQ.

The Budapest Office provided technical backstop and overall project management support from the Officer for Social Dialogue and Labour Law who acted as Team Leader. Given the significant external problems the project faced, this support was essential in keeping the project on track. Additional support for the employers' organisations was provided by the ACT/EMP Officer who was fully involved in providing technical support and training inputs. An ACTRAV Officer was also involved in the earlier stages of the project. Administrative support was also provided by the Budapest office which was highly valued by the country team. The ILO made use of in-house expertise, for example by making use of training experts from the International Training Centre in Turin to provide additional educational support for six conciliators. In addition the ITC provided tutor input on project cycle management training. Further, the ILO made use of its experts in gender, social security, social protection and ILS for training on those topics. The ILO was also able to provide extensive sets of materials, including technical manuals that were translated into Macedonian for use in NESC and LESC libraries. For example, the ILO new Practical Guide for Professional Conciliation in Collective Labour Disputes has been translated into Macedonian and extensively used as a training tool.

Overall, the ILO was able to make a significant contribution to the project through its own resource base and technical expertise.

16. Is the management structure adequate?

The project is managed by a national project coordinator with a project assistant. Reporting is to the Team Leader in the ILO Budapest Office. The Regional Director retains ultimate responsibility. The project is advised by a national stakeholder Steering Committee. The structure is typical for a project of this size and appears to have worked well.

17. Is staffing adequate?

The project has depended highly on the commitment and endeavour of the country team. Staffing is adequate given the ILO's extensive capacity to provide backstopping and technical support.

18. How well did the project management processes work in delivering project outputs and results?

The project management processes worked well to meet project deadlines and activity schedules. The ROM report found that the project team showed 'adequate flexibility in implementation, modality of workshops and adaptability to specific requests of beneficiaries (for example related to the organisation of separate workshops for TUs and EOs)³⁴. My own findings confirm this view that the project team have responded well to requests from the social partners. ,

Sustainability

19. What is the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes? Are the results and benefits likely to be durable?

From the interview data, nearly all respondents were positive that results would be sustained although they recognised that to do so would require an active effort on their part to ensure that was the case.

³³ ROM Report, 3

³⁴ ROM Report, 3

There was general agreement that the project had created a significant infrastructure for all the three components, especially in relation to the NESC and LSCs and for amicable settlement of labour disputes. However, there was also general agreement that the capacity built had only been partially utilised, for example, the software developments for databases, conciliation case management and NESC opinion tracking.

In respect of the NESC, the ROM report noted that the MLSP had not guaranteed its continued funding. Interview data indicated that the MLSP was willing to continue to support the NESC but also maintained that it was the responsibility of the social partners to take the body forward. Other interviewees regarded sustainability of the NESC as the responsibility of government although it was recognised that the social partners had an important role to play in making the NESC work effectively. Critically, the NESC has a legal foundation which provides some confidence that it will continue as a functioning body. The NESC has provided its upcoming programme as one of the final project activities on March 20th 2017 which indicates that it has a sustainable immediate future.

Interview data with the LSCs provided welcome indications that local municipalities were prepared to offer financial support in the future to sustain them. However, at present LSCs are not statutory bodies and while that remains the case their future is likely to remain precarious. Further, LSCs are also subject to the influence of political affiliations at national level and these pressures may distract the social partners from focussing on the potential gains that could be made at the local level by concentrating on local labour market needs.

In regards to the amicable settlement of disputes, the MLSP indicated that it would pay the costs of the process which will be an important factor for future take up. Similarly, the physical equipment provided as well as case management software and other IT support provides a degree of confidence that the project results to date will be maintained. However, interview data also revealed that for conciliation to become embedded more firmly there needed to be a shift in culture towards non-litigious dispute settlement approaches. In addition, legal changes may be required to widen the scope of issues for conciliation and to mainstream conciliation as a dispute resolution mechanism that operates along a single track with the court system rather than on an alternative track.

In respect of collective bargaining, the ROM report noted that the social partners needed to 'move towards more open communication and show dedication to [the] collective bargaining process'.³⁵ Since the report was written, collective agreements have been concluded in the textile and agriculture sectors, with negotiations ongoing in the tobacco industry. However, it is not clear how these negotiations differ from the long established pattern of collective bargaining that was in existence before the project began. While respondents were extremely satisfied with the collective bargaining training that had been provided, there was no certainty that lessons learned through the training had been implemented.

The project has not developed a formal project sustainability plan and no plan has ever been agreed, although sustainability is a feature of the project document. However, in the case of this project it is proposed that sustainability will be achieved through a continuation project, a proposal for which has been submitted to the MLSP. For project sustainability to be achieved in the longer term it is necessary for sustainability to be a project objective from the outset, with an agreed work plan with associated activities, budget lines and responsible partner(s). Project sustainability tools and sample sustainability plan templates can be found at <https://sustaintool.org/>

20. Are the national partners able to continue the project agenda and results after the end of the project (capacity of people and institutions, laws, policies)?

³⁵ ROM report, 4

The increased capacities of the partners have been described in Question 11. The EOs have been able to improve their visibility, increase services to member, grow their membership base and improve their technical skills in regards to collective bargaining. Allied with an appropriate resource mobilisation strategy to take advantage of these improvements, the EOs should be able to continue with the project agenda.

The NESC has seen a significant increase in capacity with a secretariat established, and with MLSP financial assistance and continued commitment from the social partners should be able to maintain the progress made during the project.

The LESC are also equipped to continue project results but may need to be put on statutory basis in the longer term.

The legal environment is outside the scope of this evaluation and has been the subject of a new ILO analysis.

21. What more needs to be done to improve sustainability? What is needed to leave sustainable results in the particular thematic areas addressed by the project?

A sustainability plan is essential and, even at this late stage, a plan that can be agreed on by the project partners should be developed.

A theory of change for the project would also be useful as it would help identify critical nodal points of influence where activity can be directed to most effect. For example, to improve collective bargaining it is arguable that interventions should be made at the branch union level where sectoral negotiations take place, thus influencing collective bargaining at its critical point.

For the amicable settlement of disputes, the priority now is to build confidence in the system by demonstrating its independence from the social partners, its cost effectiveness and benefits over other dispute settlement methods. A theory of behaviour change needs to be developed and activities directed towards influencing behaviour towards the desired outcomes. As noted in the ROM report, further changes in the law may be required to help embed conciliation as a viable process. Building a core cohort of independent conciliators with a professional body to guarantee standards would be useful.

As noted above, the NESC requires a long-term budget line to secure its future and LESC may need to be put on a statutory basis and be secured with municipal government budgets. There is evidence that this is starting to be put in place. However, these moves must also be met by the social partners' own commitment to the NESC and LESC.

As some respondents indicated, the social partners themselves need to demonstrate their value by producing high quality research to underpin their position papers and advocacy strategies for example. Social partners need to ensure that they are representing their members and develop democratic processes that enable their members to make demands of their leaders who, in turn, secure a representative mandate to engage in social dialogue.

Impact

22. Is the project likely to have a tangible impact on target groups, systems, institutions?

Impact evaluations are especially difficult, requiring, for example, a counter-factual situation in order to be able to make a proper assessment. Further, project activities are still continuing after the evaluation period making it too early to assess the impact of the project.

However, as described above, the project has built a considerable infrastructure in each of the three components that will enable social dialogue to be continued provided there is a willingness and commitment by the social partners to do so.

Component One is regarded as having good potential for longer term impact as the NESC starts to function better and the LESC become more embedded within local municipality decision-making structures. Much will depend on how much credibility is granted to NESC opinions with government, especially in the economic and finance ministries.

Component Two has established some good foundations for improved collective bargaining but it is not possible to say how much impact this will have in the long-term due to structural barriers to collective bargaining.

Component Three has strong potential for long-term impact provided conciliation can be promoted as a good alternative to other methods of settling disputes. Guaranteeing the neutrality and impartiality of the conciliation service will be paramount in this regard.

Lessons learned

23. What are the main lessons learned, good practices, innovations? What were the key factors of success?

See below

24. Are there any areas where difficulties are being experienced? What are the reasons? Are there any alternative strategies which would have been more effective?

At the high level, the political crisis was a problem, especially in relation to the public sector.

Internal problems within the union movement were also a difficulty that has resulted in reduced benefits for the union side from the project.

Other difficulties mentioned included the 'hastiness' of the project - as mentioned above the project may have been overloaded with activities, especially in the latter stages, and this put pressure on partners and also reduced the benefits of the activities as they could not be fully assimilated; the competing interests within the project made for some difficulties, although this could be expected in a situation where there is more than one employers' body and three trade union federations involved.

There are clear differences in the challenges of collective bargaining between workers in public and private sectors, and important differences in the meaning of social dialogue – especially where the state remains the largest employer. Problems of dealing with the government are recurrent themes of those interviewed, either because of perceived relationships between the state and the trade union movement, or because of lack of robust procedural agreements in times of political instability.

Some of these difficulties could not be avoided as they were outside of the control of the project, but a project that had fewer activities and was underpinned with a more rigorous theory of change may have avoided some of the problems of activity overload, giving more time for change to occur before moving on to the next activity.

Already detailed above, the decision to produce a joint marketing strategy for three trade union federations caused later difficulties as a single strategy proved insufficiently flexible to handle competing interests and differentiated union strategies. A strategy per union may have been a more effective approach and the project has now started to adopt that approach.

Cross-cutting issues

Gender equality assessment

Interview data shows that project stakeholders were satisfied that the project promoted gender equality through fair and equal access to project activities and benefits. In total, 480 women and 459 men attended project events.

A thematic workshop on gender equality was held with input from ILO technical experts that helped to promote the ongoing need for equality in the workplace.

The project management and Steering Committee had a good gender balance and direction from women.

The evaluation interviews had a good gender balance.

The EC Progress Report, November 2016 requires that further steps are needed to promote social inclusion and address issues of the gender pay gap and gender inequality in the labour market.³⁶

Tripartite issues assessment

The Steering Committee was made up of tripartite actors. Attendance was good and enabled the project to be appropriately influenced as a tripartite action.

Tripartite action plans have been developed for the NESC and, in some cases, LESC. Tripartite Action Plans on social dialogue and collective bargaining have been developed and approved.

The project design has tripartism as a critical interlocking feature with each component requiring action from each of the tripartite actors.

Further development of tripartism has been restricted due to the political crisis affecting government and internal difficulties affecting trade unions as reported above.

International Labour Standards Assessment

As reported above, data provided by the ILO project team states the project has been designed with the aim, *inter alia*, to promote and assist in aligning national law and practice with relevant international labour standards and practices, especially those relating to Freedom of Association, Right to Organize and Collective Bargaining. In 2013, Macedonia ratified Labour Relations (Public Service), No. 151 and Collective Bargaining Convention no. 154. The project has contributed technical work in assisting the country to implement ratified conventions in particular C87, 98, 135, 151, 154 (see ILO technical comments and recommendations) and promoted ILO standards on ASLD (Voluntary Conciliation and Arbitration Recommendation no. 92, Conventions nos. 151, Conventions nos. 150, 151, 154).

³⁶ European Commission, *The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia 2016 Report*. European Commission: Brussels, November 2016, 51.

5. Conclusions

Evaluative Reasoning

Evaluation criteria used to evaluate the project are the standard OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. A preliminary stage of evaluative reasoning consisted in defining key evaluation questions as set out in the ToR; the objectives against which the evaluation has been performed are set out in the Prodoc and an understanding of evidence required to assess whether objectives have been met has been agreed in discussions with the project team across the course of the evaluation. These have included an initial Skype call on February 13th 2017 to scope the evaluation and delimit its remit; preliminary meetings held in Budapest on February 23rd with the responsible Country Office and regional managers; discussions with the national project team on February 27th; a presentation and discussion of initial findings with national project team and regional representative on March 6th; and a Skype conference discussion with regional and national ILO team on March 23rd to discuss the preliminary final report. These discussions centred mostly around developing an understanding of the evidence required to enable an assessment of achievement of the project objectives, prospects for sustainability, lessons learned and emerging good practice..

An informal inception note was developed to identify different data sources that would allow an assessment of each evaluation question. The note also set out the generic and specific questions that would be asked of each interviewee. The data collection instrument of a structured/semi-structured interview schedule was developed in order to ensure that respondents were asked the same questions so that similarities, comparisons and contrasts could be drawn from the interview data. Interviewees were nominated by the project team on the basis of their involvement as proximate stakeholders in the project. As such, the interview data is specific to this project and is not generalisable.

Data collection activities primarily consisted of document reviews, discussion with project team and interviews with project stakeholders. A rubric of evidence has been developed based on the principles of triangulation whereby more than one, and preferably three, sources of data are examined in order to have confidence in the reliability of data to support conclusions. As part of this process, where possible, interview data has been composited to elicit key points that were raised by different interviewees using inductive reasoning to extrapolate from individual 'facts' or 'opinions' to project-wide 'truth' or 'judgements'. Documentary evidence has been sought to confirm, refute or otherwise problematise the interview data. Conclusions have been drawn, after discussion with the project team, on the basis of the totality of evidence available to the evaluator.

Conclusions

Relevance

- The PSDP met the needs of FYR Macedonia to improve the infrastructure in which social dialogue can take place in order to meet the requirements set out by the European Union for accession to the EU.
- The PSDP was in line with ILO global mandates and ILO regional and national strategic priorities to improve social dialogue and increase the capacities of the social partners to engage effectively in dialogue and tripartism.
- The project adapted well to the challenging political environment in which it had to operate and made good use of a no-cost six month extension to complete project activities.
- The compressed timescale in the closing months of the project led to an overloaded activity schedule that put pressures on the social partners to keep up with the high pace of the project, resulting in reduced benefits for the organisations involved.

Effectiveness

- The value of social dialogue has been increased within the MLSP but there is still work to be done to disseminate that value across other government departments, notably the economic and finance ministries.
- A significant infrastructure has been established for the NESC and there is embryonic evidence that the infrastructure is working, enabling the NESC to exercise its functions as a tripartite advisory body.
- The six LESC established by the project have the potential to influence decision-making at the municipal level provided they continue to gain the support of the local tripartite actors, and if the municipalities guarantee continued funding.
- The project has made limited progress in the field of collective bargaining, notably by developing a tripartite action plan, providing high quality ILO materials to support collective bargaining and making use of specialists to assist the social partners to improve collective bargaining.
- Multiple structural barriers remain to effective and free collective bargaining. These barriers include restrictive laws on the representative status of employers bodies and trade unions; unwieldy trade union registration procedures; low trade union density in the private sector; unresolved historic affiliations of trade unions with government; limited membership democratic influence over trade union decision-making processes; and lack of extension of collective agreements to employers not affiliated to EOs.
- An operational machinery has been established that meets the objective of the project to establish a system for the amicable settlement of labour disputes by establishing the infrastructure in which conciliation can take place.
- With four referrals to ASLD there are early signs that the system is working, but it is too early to say whether ASLD process will become embedded as a significant alternative to the formal court system.
- Stakeholder involvement in the project has been strong with good attendance at Steering Committee meetings and significant commitment to project activities and events.
- Significant capacity has been built for the NESC and LESC which has enabled them to start to exercise their functions.
- Employers' organisations have witnessed membership growth and enhanced capacity to provide services to members as a result of the project.
- Due to the political crisis, structural issues and internal problems, trade union federations have not been able to take full advantage of the project benefits.
- Demand has been created by the project, notably to continue to learn from other countries; to improve the legal environment to support social dialogue and; to continue to build the expertise of the social partners for enhanced credibility.
- The project has helped the country to incorporate international labour standards into national law through the provision of technical expertise, materials and analysis.,.
- The critical factors that underpinned the project results were: the commitment of the national project team; the comparative advantage provided by ILO backstopping and technical expertise; and the support of the national tripartite actors.

Efficiency and Management Arrangements

- The project has been managed efficiently and transparently, largely achieving the project results, and making good use of ILO comparative advantage in social dialogue and employment relations.

Sustainability and Impact

- The project has strong potential for sustainability due to the infrastructure that has been built but it will require the tripartite actors to make good use of the infrastructure in the future.
- The lack of a clear sustainability plan is a risk to long term sustainability as project continuation plans are based primarily on a new externally funded project.

Gender Equality

- The project adequately promoted gender equality through its management structure, programme of activities and monitoring of data.

6. Lessons Learned

- Establishing an infrastructure in which social dialogue can take place through, *inter alia*, provision of equipment, bespoke software, capacity-building practices (tripartite action plans, communications strategies, business plans, operational plans, formalised procedures etc), and high quality training interventions is validated as an effective project strategy that meets the needs of the country to improve social dialogue and tripartism..
- Separate marketing and communications strategies developed for EOs proved to be highly successful with increased membership and capacity. A single strategy developed for three trade union federations proved less successful as a capacity-building tool. Each organisation needs a separate strategy to reflect their uniqueness and to differentiate themselves from other, similar organisations.

7. Emerging Good Practice

- The use by ILO of its comparative advantage in the field of social dialogue, collective bargaining and industrial relations, working at the tripartite level is validated as a good practice that added significant value to the project. The ILO made effective and efficient use of technical backstopping and project management support that is validated as providing added security to funders and national stakeholders. Critically, this good practice can be replicated regionally and globally.

8. Recommendations

For future ILO projects

High priority

- A sustainability strategy and implementation plan should be developed at an early stage of the project.
 - Resource implication: low
 - Timeframe: next project
- Sustainability should be a mandatory item on the Steering Committee agenda.
 - Resource implication: low
 - Timeframe: next project

Medium priority

- A theory of change should be developed that allows for fuller understanding of the assumptions and change logic that underpins the project.

- Resource implication: medium if a theory of change consultant is used. Low if no consultant used.
- Timeframe: next project
- Any project extensions should be of sufficient duration to allow activities to proceed at a pace that allows partners time to assimilate and embed benefits.
 - Resource implication: unknown as depends on project and terms of extension
 - Timeframe: unknown

For project partners

High priority

- Steps should be taken to ensure the neutrality and impartiality of conciliation and to promote its independence from the tripartite actors as a means to settle labour disputes.
 - Resource implication: financial support to develop an independent professional body; ongoing training; publicity and marketing.
 - Timeframe: next 12 months
- Trade unions should take steps to ensure they can benefit from a continuation project by resolving or otherwise dealing with internal problems that distract from project objectives.
 - Resource implication: low, but possibly some external assistance from ITUC/ETUC.
 - Timeframe: as soon as possible

Medium priority

- The good practice of deploying the ILO's comparative advantage in project activities should be disseminated through the region and globally.
 - Resource implication: publicity, training, materials
 - Timeframe: next 12-24 months
- The national government should take steps to ensure that social dialogue is a central feature of the strategies for all economic ministries.
 - Resource implication: publicity, training, materials
 - Timeframe: next 12-24 months
- The NESC should promote its capacity and functions to ministries outside of the MLSP.
 - Resource implication: publicity, training, materials
 - Timeframe: next 12-24 months
- LESC should be put on a statutory basis as soon as practicable.
 - Resource implication: low - research, advocacy
 - Timeframe: next 12-24 months
- Employers' organisations should consolidate gains made under the project and continue to enhance their representative status.
 - Resource implication: invest in own capacity
 - Timeframe: next 12-24 months
- Individual unions that are not affiliated to a Global Union Federation should examine the benefits of affiliation for capacity-building support.
 - Resource implication: affiliation fees

PROMOTING SOCIAL DIALOGUE: FINAL INDEPENDENT EVALUATION

- Timeframe: next 12-24 months

APPENDIX I: LESSONS LEARNED

ILO Emerging Lesson Learned Template

Evaluation Title: Promoting Social Dialogue Independent Final Evaluation

Project
TC/SYMBOL:

Name of Evaluator: Dr Andy Harvey

Date: 30
March 2017

The following Lesson Learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.

LL Element	Text
Brief summary of lesson learned (link to project goal or specific deliverable)	Establishing an infrastructure in which social dialogue can take place through, <i>inter alia</i> , provision of equipment, bespoke software, capacity-building practices (tripartite action plans, communications strategies, business plans, operational plans, formalised procedures etc), and high quality training interventions is validated as an effective project strategy.
Context and any related preconditions	Willingness of tripartite actors to engage with the project and commit to its objectives. Prior associated interventions
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	Tripartite actors, notably MLSP, NESC, LESCOs, EOs, TUs
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	Political crisis created unfavourable external conditions. Internal problems within some TUs diminished project benefits
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	Skill of national project team, support by ILO backstopping and technical experts; commitment of tripartite actors
ILO administrative issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	Contractual obligations of partner organisations delivering activities with ILO financial support.
Other relevant comments	

ILO Emerging Lesson Learned Template

Evaluation Title: Promoting Social Dialogue Independent Final Evaluation

Project
TC/SYMBOL:

Name of Evaluator: Dr Andy Harvey

Date: 30
March 2017

The following Lesson Learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.

LL Element

Text

Brief summary of lesson learned (link to project goal or specific deliverable)	Separate marketing and communications strategies developed for EOs proved to be highly successful with increased membership and capacity. A single strategy developed for three trade union federations proved less successful as a capacity-building tool. Each organisation needs a separate strategy to reflect their uniqueness and to differentiate themselves from other, similar organisations.
Context and any related preconditions	Every organisation has its own interests, positioning and business objectives.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	EOs, TUs
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	Joint strategy failed to account for need for differentiation between competing unions in a highly charged political environment
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	Tailored strategies for EOs were highly valued and successful
ILO administrative issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	Contractual obligations of partner organisations delivering activities with ILO financial support.
Other relevant comments	

APPENDIX II: EMERGING GOOD PRACTICE

ILO Emerging Lesson Learned Template

Evaluation Title: Promoting Social Dialogue
Independent Final Evaluation

Project TC/SYMBOL: MKD/13/02/MKD

Name of Evaluator: Dr Andy Harvey

Date: 30
March 2017

The following Lesson Learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.

GP Element	Text
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	The use by ILO of its comparative advantage in the field of social dialogue, collective bargaining and industrial relations, working at the tripartite level is validated as a good practice that added significant value to the project. The ILO made effective and efficient use of technical backstopping and project management support that is validated as providing added security to funders and national stakeholders.
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	Commitment by tripartite actors to the project. Prior interventions to build a platform for project and ILO inputs
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	ILO expertise in training interventions, technical advice and manuals improved social dialogue infrastructure and processes
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	Increased capacities of NESC and LSCs. Increased membership of EOs. Number of conciliators trained and licensed.
Potential for replication and by whom	Other social dialogue and technical assistance projects coordinated by ILO
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	Improved sustainability of actions in support of social dialogue priority in DCWP and P & B.
Other documents or relevant comments	

APPENDIX III: TERMS OF REFERENCE

TERMS OF REFERENCE

FINAL INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT

Project Title: Promoting Social Dialogue / MKD/13/02/MKD
Country: Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Sub-region: Central and Eastern Europe
Lead Office: ILO Budapest
Duration: 30 months (October 2014- March 2017)
Donor agency: Ministry of Finance, Central Financing and Contracting Department (CFCD) (funding by European Commission)
Budget: EUR 1,149,690

National Counterparts: Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, Employers' Organizations and Trade Unions

I. Introduction and Rationale for Evaluation

The final independent evaluation of the IPA funded Social Dialogue project is undertaken in accordance with the project workplan and in line with the ILO Evaluation Policy (November 2005) and ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation³⁷ (2012) which provide for systematic evaluation of programmes and projects in order to improve quality, accountability, transparency of the ILO's work, strengthen the decision-making process and support constituents in forwarding decent work.

Due to the size of the budget the project is subject to two evaluations – a midterm evaluation (February/March 2016) and a final independent evaluation (scheduled for the end of the project February 2017). The overall purpose of the Mid-Term Evaluation was to look for ways on how to improve project programming, for the remaining duration on the project. The overall purpose of the Final Independent Evaluation will be to look at the achievement of project results and outcomes, and on how the project concept could be improved for the future (i.e. applied to this and other regions of the world). The Final Evaluation will build on the findings of the Mid-Term Evaluation.

II. Brief Background on Project and Context

In FYR Macedonia, the ILO promotes decent work as a national objective and assists constituents to make progress towards achieving that objective. Advancement of social dialogue is one of the priorities in the DWCP for FYR Macedonia in the period 2015-2018.

The EU funded project "Promoting social dialogue" contributes to achievement of the goals under this priority of the DWCP. This project builds on the extensive work done by the ILO to support the establishment of the National Economic and Social Council, develop amicable settlement of labour disputes legislation, and strengthen the capacities of Employers and Workers organizations. The overall objective of the project is to extend and enhance tripartite and bipartite social dialogue as a means to achieve economic growth and social progress. The problem of social dialogue is addressed from three levels and the project aims to achieve the following specific objectives:

³⁷ ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_168289/lang--en/index.htm

1. Enhanced institutional capacity of stakeholders in charge of tripartite and bipartite social dialogue in terms of sustainability, efficiency and functionality in order to provide a comprehensive participation of all the relevant stakeholders, especially of the social partners, in the creation, development and implementation of economic and social policies;
2. Strengthened social partnership on the industry/branch/company level including a coordinated and effective machinery for collective bargaining;
3. Establish an operational mechanism of amicable settlement of labour disputes and trained specialized conciliators and arbitrators for labour disputes.

The project is managed and technically backstopped by the ILO DWT and Country Office for Central and Eastern Europe, based in Budapest, which provides the necessary administrative support and technical and project-backup services. A Local project office is set up in Skopje to manage and coordinate the activities with one National Project Coordinator and a Project Assistant. The project team reports directly to the Senior Specialist on Social Dialogue and Labour Law based in DWT/CO Budapest.

A Steering Committee of the project was established for provision of strategic, political and technical guidance to the project, monitoring progress and assistance where possible in overcoming any obstacles to progress in any aspect of the contract. The Steering Committee members include the ILO, the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy (Labour Department and the IPA Coordinator) and other relevant ministries, Employers Associations; Trade Unions, etc. The CFCD and EU Delegation will participate to the Steering Committee as observers. The Steering Committee is chaired by the MLSP.

The Steering Committee ordinarily meets twice a year.

III. **Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation**

The purpose of the final independent evaluation is accountability, programme improvement and planning of the next steps, including the envisaged second phase of the project.

The objectives of the evaluation are to:

- a. Determine the extent to which the outcomes of the project have been achieved, the kind of changes produced, and the intended or unintended effects of the project, and an assessment of the reasons/factors that helped to produce these changes and effects;
- b. Obtain feedback from the national partners and other stakeholders: what is working, what is not and why and to assess that feedback against broader evaluation evidence;
- c. Provide suggestions, recommendations to better target the next steps, future strategies and new areas of technical cooperation.

The evaluation covers the project as a whole, 2014 – 2017, in all three pillars. The final evaluation should build on the findings of the mid-term evaluation.

The evaluation will serve the following - external and internal - clients' groups:

- ILO tripartite constituents and national project partners
- The Donor

- ILO management and technical specialists (in the ILO /Budapest and cooperating departments at the Headquarters)
- Project staff

IV. Evaluation Questions

The evaluation will address the following aspects of the project:

1. Relevance

- How relevant is the project to the particular needs and constraints of the target countries?
- Is there a fit between the project design and the direct beneficiaries' needs?
- How well has the project adapted during implementation?
- How the project supports Country Programmes (strategic policy frameworks)?
To what extent does the project design help meet the ILO's strategic and national policy frameworks?

2. Effectiveness

- What progress has the project made towards achieving its specific objectives? What are the reasons/factors behind that progress?
- Did the project produce the intended results? What reasons/factors enabled the results to be achieved or not achieved?
- How and how well have stakeholders been involved in the implementation?
How many partners benefitted from the project, e.g., have been trained, improved skills, etc.?
- Are constituents satisfied with the quality of tools, technical advice, training and other activities, delivered by the project?
- Have there been any resulting changes in constituents' capacities?
- Has there been any additional demand created by the project? How does that influence/strengthen the outcomes?
- To what extent has the project contributed to the implementation of the Decent Work Country Programme?
- How has the project promoted fundamental principles and rights at work and international labour standards? Was it effective in assisting the country in translating such standards into national policies, programmes and results?

3. Efficiency and management arrangements

- Have the resources been used in an efficient manner? (technical expertise, staff, time, information and other resources)
- Has the project received adequate technical and administrative support from the ILO DWT/CO-Budapest, ILO HQ and partners?
- Is the management structure adequate?
- Is staffing adequate?
- How well did the project management processes work in delivering project outputs and results?

4. Sustainability

- What is the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes? Are the results and benefits likely to be durable?

PROMOTING SOCIAL DIALOGUE: FINAL INDEPENDENT EVALUATION

- Are the national partners able to continue the project agenda and results after the end of the project (capacity of people and institutions, laws, policies)?
- What more should be done to improve sustainability? What is needed to leave sustainable results in the particular thematic areas addressed by the project?

5. **Impact**

- Is the project likely to have a tangible impact on target groups, systems, institutions?

6. **Lessons learned**

- What are the main lessons learned, good practices, innovations? What were the key factors of success?
- Are there any areas where difficulties are being experienced? What are the reasons? Are there any alternative strategies which would have been more effective?

6. **Recommendations:**

- Are there any suggestions, recommendations for further programming (i.e., per each of the specific objectives of the project)?
- What would be the most appropriate next steps?
- What would be the future priorities?

Note: OECD/DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance will be used to interpret the answers to the evaluation questions.

V. **Methodology**

Document Review: The evaluator will review project background materials before conducting any interviews or trips to the region:

- Literature Review
- Decent Work Country Programmes
- Country Brief, National Policy Documents
- Project Document
- Baseline Surveys and Needs Assessments
- Logical Framework
- Work plans
- TORs
- Progress reports
- Report on the Midterm Internal Evaluation of the Promoting Social Dialogue Project (22 March 2016)
- Surveys, studies, analytical papers produced
- Reports on specific activities
- Training tools and service packages used and/or produced
- Publications and promo materials
- Mission reports
- Project staff list and roles + support staff list and roles
- Reports of financial assessments

Planning Meeting: The evaluator will have a consultation with the ILO representatives, Specialists and project team in Budapest. The objective of the briefing is to reach a common understanding regarding the status of the project, the project background and materials, the follow-up on the findings of the midterm evaluation, priority assessment questions, available data sources and data collection instruments and the structure of the final evaluation report.

Individual Interviews and/or Group Interviews: Individual or group interviews will be conducted with the following:

- a. ILO Budapest Management Team, Senior Specialists, Project Executive Team members, Project Staff, ILO National Coordinator in FYR Macedonia and other relevant ILO staff
- b. Representatives from the following groups:
 - National Project Steering Committees members and constituents
 - Government staff who have worked with the project,
 - Employers, unions, individual experts who have received training or otherwise worked with the project
 - UN, other development agencies in the countries
 - Where pertinent – representatives of industry, branch, company level staff who participated in project capacity building events or other activities.
 - Other stakeholders, e.g. academics, think tanks, NGOs as appropriate

Field Visits: The evaluator will visit Skopje/FYR Macedonia for meetings with the project stakeholders. Meetings will be scheduled in advance of the field visits by the ILO project staff, in accordance with the evaluator's requests and consistent with these terms of reference.

Debrief in the Field: The final day of the field visits, the evaluator will present preliminary findings to the constituents and the ILO field staff.

Post-Trip Debriefing: Upon completion of the report, the evaluator will provide a debriefing at the ILO/Budapest on evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

VI. **Main Outputs (Deliverables)**

- A. Initial Draft Report in English (in electronic format);
- B. Final Report in English (in electronic format);
- C. Translation of essential parts of the Final Report into Macedonian (to be arranged by the project).

SUGGESTED REPORT FORMAT

The final version of the report will follow the below format³⁸ and be in the range of 30 – 40 pages in length, excluding the annexes:

1. Title page
2. Table of Contents
3. Acronyms
4. Executive Summary
5. Background and Project Description

³⁸ Please refer to the ILO Evaluation Unit checklist for formatting requirements at http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165967/lang--en/index.htm

6. Purpose, scope and clients of Evaluation
7. Methodology
8. Project Status (or review of implementation)
9. Findings (organized by evaluation criteria)
10. Conclusions, Lessons Learned, Recommendations
11. Annexes (TOR, list of interviews, meetings' notes, relevant country information and documents, completed Lessons Learned and Good Practice templates per each of the lessons or good practices identified in the Conclusions³⁹)

VII. Management Arrangements

EVALUATION TEAM

The evaluation team will be comprised of: (i) one External Evaluator (team leader) and (ii) possibly one in-country representative who will provide interpretation and inputs as necessary and appropriate.

REQUIREMENTS

The External Evaluator will have extensive experience in the evaluation of development or social interventions, i.e. in the UN system, an understanding of the ILO's mandate, tripartite culture, the Decent Work Agenda and the role of International Labour Standards as a means of achieving DW objectives and promoting fundamental principles and rights at work.

The External Evaluator should have an advanced degree in economics or social sciences, expertise in evaluation methods, expertise in the subject matters covered by the project. Knowledge of the region and research history in the region would be preferable.

Full command of English is required. Working knowledge of Macedonian and/or other national languages would be an advantage.

The Evaluator will be guided by high professional standards and principles of integrity, in accordance with the guiding principles of the International Evaluation Professionals' Associations. He/she will abide to the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System⁴⁰.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The External Evaluator is responsible for conducting the evaluation according to the terms of reference (TOR). He/she will:

- Review the TOR and provide input, propose any refinements to assessment questions, as necessary
- Review project background materials (e.g., project document, progress reports)
- Develop and implement the assessment methodology (i.e., prepare interview guides, conduct interviews, review documents) to answer the assessment questions
- Conduct preparatory consultations with the ILO prior to the assessment mission

³⁹ <http://www.ilo.org/legacy/english/edmas/eval/template-lesson-learned.doc> and <http://www.ilo.org/legacy/english/edmas/eval/template-goodpractice.doc>

⁴⁰ <http://www.unevaluation.org/uneqcodeofconduct>

PROMOTING SOCIAL DIALOGUE: FINAL INDEPENDENT EVALUATION

- Analyse interview recordings.
- Prepare an initial draft of the assessment report
- Conduct briefing on findings, conclusions and recommendation of the assessment
- Prepare a final report based on comments obtained on the initial draft report

The Evaluation Manager is responsible for:

Drafting the TOR
Finalizing the TOR with input from colleagues
Preparing a short list of candidates with a proposal of the evaluation consultant for submission for senior management approval including RO Europe evaluation focal point and EVAL
Hiring the consultant
Providing the consultant with the project background materials
Participating in preparatory meeting prior to the assessment mission
Assisting in the implementation of the assessment methodology, as appropriate (i.e., participate in meetings, review documents)
Reviewing the initial draft report, circulating it for comments and providing consolidated feedback
Reviewing the final draft of the report
Submitting the final draft report to RO Europe evaluation focal point and EVAL for final approvals
Disseminating the final report to all the stakeholders
Coordinating follow-up as necessary

The Project Manager (NPC) is responsible for:

- Reviewing the draft TOR and providing input, as necessary
- Providing project background materials, including surveys, studies, analytical papers, reports, tools, publications produced
- Participating in preparatory meeting prior to the assessment mission
- Scheduling all meetings
- Reviewing and providing comments on the assessment report
- Participating in debriefing on findings, conclusions, and recommendations

TIMEFRAME

The following is a tentative schedule of tasks and anticipated duration of each:

<u>(1) Preparatory research in home country</u>	4
<u>(2) Field research:</u>	
Wed 22 nd Travel to Budapest	
Thurs 23 rd Briefing in Budapest	1
Fri 24 th Travel to London	
Sun 26 th Travel to Skopje;	1
Mon 27 – Fri 3 rd Interviews in FYR Macedonia	4
Mon 6 th March Debrief with NPC and ILO Backstop	1
Tues 7 th March Travel to London	
(3) Analysis of interviews	3
(4) Initial Draft Evaluation Report	5
(5) De-briefing with ILO/Budapest (over skype)	1

(6) Presentation of initial findings at closing conference 31.03.2017 (Thurs 30th March Travel to Skopje Fri 31 st March Presentation of findings Sat 1 st Apr Travel to London)	1
(7) Finalization of Evaluation Report	3
Work days in total	24 plus travel

Overall duration: 8 weeks, starting from mid February 2017

VIII. Norms and Standards

The evaluation will be carried out in adherence with the ILO Evaluation Policy, ILO Policy Guidelines for Results-Based Evaluation; UN Evaluation Group Norms and Standards, Ethical Guidelines, Code of Conduct^[1] and the OECD/DAC Evaluation Criteria.

In accordance with ILO Guidance note 4: “Considering gender in the monitoring and evaluation of projects”^[2] the gender dimension should be considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation. In terms of this evaluation, this implies involving both men and women in the consultation, evaluation analysis and, if feasible, the evaluation team. Moreover the evaluator should review data and information that is disaggregated by sex and assess the relevance and effectiveness of gender-related strategies and outcomes to improve lives of women and men. All this information should be accurately included in the inception report and final evaluation report.

Ethical safeguards should be maintained during the evaluation process and women and men will be interviewed in ways that avoid gender biases or reinforcement of gender discrimination and unequal power relations.

[1] <http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct>

[2] http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm

APPENDIX IV: PROJECT STATUS

Project Activity	Status of Implementation
0.1 - Mobilisation of team	implemented
0.2 - Establishment of the Project Steering Committee	implemented
0.3 - Assessment of what is running in the country for each component	implemented
0.4 - Midterm review	implemented
0.5 - PSC meetings	implemented
0.6 - External evaluation	implemented
0.7 - Final conference	implemented
0.8 - Draft final report	implemented
0.9 - Delivery of the final report to the Contracting Authority	implemented
1.1.1 Assessments of three year functioning of the ESC	implemented
1.1.2 Assessments of the functioning of JCC EESC	implemented
1.1.3 Validation WS of the two assessments and development of Action Plan	implemented
1.1.4 Monitoring of the implementation of the recommendations (ESC's retreats)	implemented
1.1.5 Eight (8) thematic tripartite training workshops (knowledge exchange)	implemented
1.1.6 Equipment for the national ESC Secretariat	implemented
1.1.7 Research for ESC	implemented
1.2.1 Advisory missions for establishment/support of local ESC	implemented
1.2.2 Equipment for the newly established local ESC Secretariat (computers + furniture + information tools/library)	implemented
1.3.1 Monitoring mechanism: drafting of TOR/checklist	implemented
1.3.2 Validation and Capacity Building Workshop	implemented
1.4.1 Communication strategy	implemented

PROMOTING SOCIAL DIALOGUE: FINAL INDEPENDENT EVALUATION

1.4.2 Creation of web sites and promotional material	implemented
1.4.2a Creation of a platform for networking and communication of and among the LESC's and NESC	implemented
2.1.1 CB gap analysis	implemented
2.1.2 Validation WS	implemented
2.1.3 Sectoral seminars to promote the collective bargaining	implemented
2.1.4 Training for Ministry officials on role of public authorities in promoting CB	implemented
2.1.5 Training for LI on FOA and protection of trade union representatives	implemented
2.1.6 Negotiation techniques training for Ministry officials in the capacity of negotiating CB in public sector	implemented
2.1.6a Negotiation techniques training for Ministry officials in the capacity of negotiating CB in public sector	implemented
2.1.7 Training for Judges on relevant ILS (C.87, C.98, C.151, C.154)	implemented
2.2.1 Development of collective bargaining skills for EOs, including new product (Guide for EOs on CB) and service (collective bargaining skills training programme in six sectors)	implemented
2.2.1a Training of the negotiating team of EOs on collective bargaining using the developed Guide	implemented
2.2.2 Development of collective bargaining skills for TUs, including new product (Guide for TUs on CB) and service (collective bargaining skills training programme)	implemented
2.2.2a Training of the negotiating team of Tus on collective bargaining using the developed Guide	implemented
2.3.1 Development of strategic plan for EOs	implemented
2.3.2 Governance training and development of governance charter for EO's	implemented
2.3.3 Development of employers position papers of enabling business climate	implemented
2.3.4 Developing and implementing marketing and communication strategy for EOs	implemented
2.3.4a Provision of computer equipment for EOs	implemented
2.3.4b PR and communication training for EOs	implemented

PROMOTING SOCIAL DIALOGUE: FINAL INDEPENDENT EVALUATION

2.3.5 Developing and implementing marketing and communication strategy for TUs	implemented
2.3.5a Provision of computer equipment for TUs	implemented
2.3.6 Developing incentives for recruiting union members (“young trade unionist school”)	implemented
2.4.1 Gap analysis and policy paper developed	implemented
2.4.2 Tripartite workshop to present ILO recommendations on full compliance with fundamental rights at work.	implemented
2.5.1 Assessment of existing regulatory framework for data collection and compilation (SP membership and CA)	implemented
2.5.2 Tripartite validation workshop	implemented
2.5.3 Development of the database	implemented
2.5.4 Training of users of the database	implemented
3.1.1 A curriculum for training of conciliators/arbiters is developed and validated	implemented
3.1.2 Pilot Training of trainers for conciliators and arbiters	implemented
3.2.1 Training of 6 persons in ILO/ITC	implemented
3.2.2 Training of conciliators	implemented
3.2.3 Training on assisted collective bargaining	implemented
3.3.1 Assessment, concept and TOR for case management system	implemented
3.3.2 Database /software developed	implemented
3.3.3 Training for the users of the database	implemented
3.4.1 Campaign on ALDS	implemented
3.4.1a Promoting ASLD through MLSP	implemented
3.4.2 International conference on ASLD institutions	implemented

APPENDIX V: PERSONS INTERVIEWED

	9.00 a.m.	10.00 a.m.	11.30 a.m.	12.00 p.m.	1.00 p.m.	2.00 p.m.	3.30 p.m.	4.00 p.m.
Monday, 27 Feb.				Project Team	Project Team	Project Team	Project Team	Project Team
Tuesday, 28 Feb.		Ms. Lenche Kocevska, State Councilor, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy	Mr. Goran Neshevski, Secretary of the Economic and Social Council, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy			Ms. Slagjana Jakimovska-Naskovska, member of the tripartite licensing commission	Mr. Slobodan Antovski - President of the Union of Independent and Autonomous Trade Unions of Macedonia	
Wednesday, 1 Mar.	Ms. Belinda Nikolovska and Ms. Svetlana Ristovska, Organization of Employers of Macedonia		Mr. Zhivko Mitrevski, President of the Federation of Trade Unions of Macedonia		Mr. Lazar Jovevski, Conciliator	Mr. Mile Boshkov, President of the Business Confederation of Macedonia		Mr. Emil Krstanovski, National Coordinator of the ILO

PROMOTING SOCIAL DIALOGUE: FINAL INDEPENDENT EVALUATION

<p>Thursday, 2 Mar.</p>		<p>Local Economic and Social Council Veles</p>				<p>Local Economic and Social Council Resen</p>		
<p>Friday, 3 Mar.</p>	<p>Mr. Blagoja Ralovski, President of the Confederation of Free Trade Unions of Macedonia</p>			<p>Mr. Angel Dimitrov, President of the Organization of Employers of Macedonia Mr. Nafi Sarachini, Task Manager, EU Delegation</p>				

APPENDIX VI: EVALUATOR’S INCEPTION NOTE

Inception note (for internal discussion only).⁴¹

INTRODUCTION

Evaluation methodology is suggested to be based on assessments of the areas of influence on the tripartite social partners, namely trade unions (federation), employers (associations) and national government as well as consultative bodies (ESCs). These influences will be assessed through reviews of evidence of the project, [the products of the project- e.g. dedicated staff (e.g. union officer etc), agreements (procedural and substantive) at different levels, normative results (legislation, ratification of ILO conventions, policies etc), forums, training packages and events etc], one to one interviews with key stakeholders influencing or influenced by the project [trade union officers, employers, government officials, project staff, ESC stakeholders]. Where available, findings will be compared with similar initiatives in other countries as well as national statistics over the life of the project.

This methodology and work plan proposal, based on the supplied TOR, outlines the main areas of work and issues that appear to need to be addressed. This note is for internal evaluation use only and is not an expected output of the evaluation.

The areas of influences are seen as:

- In the Trade unions and their federation(s) – staffing, policies, practices, culture
- In the employers and their association(s) - staffing, policies, practices, culture
- The external environment– consultative bodies (ESCs), government legislation, policies and practices.

DATA COLLECTION METHODOLOGY

The primary evaluation activities will be:

- Document review as per the ToR
- Review of the results of the project – discussions with project team around these
- One to one interviews with direct stakeholders – project management, country management, and stakeholders as organised by project management
- Comparison with any benchmarks from similar projects and national statistics.

EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluation data to assess the realisation of each objective will be drawn from:

Relevance	Indicative Data Sources?
How relevant is the project to the particular needs and constraints of the target countries?	Lit review; Baseline survey/needs assessment; Mid-term eval; Discussions with project team; Interview with national govt.
Is there a fit between the project design and the direct beneficiaries’ needs?	Needs assessment; Prodoc; Mid-term eval; Benchmark projects; Interviews with trade unions and employers.
How well has the project adapted during implementation?	Prodoc; Mid-term eval; SG meeting minutes; Progress reports; Discussions with project management.

⁴¹ A formal inception report was not a requirement of the evaluation. This informal note was developed by the evaluator to assist the evaluation process.

PROMOTING SOCIAL DIALOGUE: FINAL INDEPENDENT EVALUATION

How the project supports Country Programmes (strategic policy frameworks)?	DWCP; Discussion with ILO Regional and National Managers; Interview with national govt; Interview with academics/think tanks
To what extent does the project design help meet the ILO's strategic and national policy frameworks?	Prodoc; ILO frameworks; Mid-term eval; Discussion with ILO managers; Benchmark projects
Effectiveness	
What progress has the project made towards achieving its specific objectives? What are the reasons/factors behind that progress?	Prodoc; Progress reports; Mid-term eval; Discussions with project managers; Interviews with national partners.
Did the project produce the intended results? What reasons/factors enabled the results to be achieved or not achieved?	Prodoc; Progress reports; Monitoring data; Project products; Mid-term eval; Discussions with project managers; Interviews with national partners.
How and how well have stakeholders been involved in the implementation?	Progress reports; Minutes of SG meetings; Mid-term eval; Interviews with stakeholders
How many partners benefitted from the project, e.g., have been trained, improved skills, etc.?	Progress reports, monitoring data;
Are constituents satisfied with the quality of tools, technical advice, training and other activities, delivered by the project?	Minutes of meetings; Progress reports; Evaluation of events etc; Interviews with constituents;
Have there been any resulting changes in constituents' capacities?	Baseline study; Needs analysis; Training records; Staff records; Progress reports; Mid-term eval; Interviews with constituents;
Has there been any additional demand created by the project? How does that influence/strengthen the outcomes?	Progress reports; Mid-term eval; Discussions with project staff; Interviews with stakeholders
To what extent has the project contributed to the implementation of the Decent Work Country Programme?	See under relevance
How has the project promoted fundamental principles and rights at work and international labour standards? Was it effective in assisting the country in translating such standards into national policies, programmes and results?	Progress reports; Mid-term eval; Discussions with project staff; Interviews with national govt; Interviews with social partners and wider stakeholders.
Efficiency and Management Arrangements	
Have the resources been used in an efficient manner? (technical expertise, staff, time, information and other resources)	Progress reports; Interviews with project staff; Financial assessment reports; Mid-term eval; Benchmark projects
Has the project received adequate technical and administrative support from the ILO DWT/CO-Budapest, ILO HQ and partners?	Progress reports; Interviews with project staff; Discussions with ILO CO and HQ staff. Mid-term eval

Is the management structure adequate?	Staff lists and roles; Discussions with project staff and ILO staff; Benchmark projects; Mid-term eval
Is staffing adequate?	Staff lists and roles; Discussions with project staff and ILO staff; Benchmark projects; Mid-term eval
How well did the project management processes work in delivering project outputs and results?	Progress reports; SG minutes; mid-term eval; Discussions with project staff and ILO staff; Interviews with SG members; Mid-term eval
Sustainability	Indicative Data Sources?
What is the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes? Are the results and benefits likely to be durable?	Sustainability plan; Progress reports; Mid-term eval; Benchmark projects; Discussions with project staff and ILO staff; Interviews with national partners and wider stakeholders
Are the national partners able to continue the project agenda and results after the end of the project (capacity of people and institutions, laws, policies)?	Progress reports; Mid-term eval; Sustainability plans; Interviews with national partners; Discussions with project staff
What more should be done to improve sustainability? What is needed to leave sustainable results in the particular thematic areas addressed by the project?	Benchmark criteria (to be developed); All interviews
Impact	
Is the project likely to have a tangible impact on target groups, systems, institutions?	Progress reports; Mid-term eval; All interviews and discussions
Lessons Learned	
What are the main lessons learned, good practices, innovations? What were the key factors of success?	Progress reports; Project products (e.g. training materials etc); Mid-term eval; All interviews and discussions
Are there any areas where difficulties are being experienced? What are the reasons? Are there any alternative strategies which would have been more effective?	Progress reports; SG minutes; All interviews; Benchmark projects

THE INTERVIEW PLANS

Note: It is proposed to record interviews by a mobile phone app and for a selected number of those recordings to be shared with a second evaluator for contemporaneous analysis. Any interviewee who does not consent to this process should alert the evaluation manager at the earliest opportunity.

Direct interviews

Core questions

- What is your position (in stakeholder/project/ILO etc) and what has been your role in the project?
- Overall, how well has the project met the needs and objectives of your organization? Give a couple of concrete examples of what you are doing now that you would not have done without the project. What, if anything, has changed for your organization as a result of the project?

- Overall, how well has the project met its own ambitions? How would you account for successes/shortcomings?
- How much involvement have you had in project implementation? (might already have been answered in Q 1).
- In your opinion how useful have you found the project products and activities (such as training events, forums etc?). Give some examples. Why were they useful/not so useful? How could they be improved?
- Is there anything more or different that you would like to see the project do? Give examples.
- Do you think the project has made a difference at the level of legislation and policies? Has there been any cultural change? What might account for these changes (if any)?
- From your perspective do you think the progress the project has made will be maintained in the long term? What accounts for your view?
- What needs to be established and put in place to ensure that project progress can be maintained? What might need to be done differently?
- Has the project had any impacts on the way that your organization works in ways that might be unexpected? Has it affected your relationships with other partners? If so, in what ways?
- What have been the biggest difficulties and problems that you have faced during the project?
- What are the most important lessons your organization has learned from the project?

Specific questions

- *ILO CO (and HQ?)* – Why was this particular country chosen for this intervention? In what ways does this project fit into wider ILO strategic objectives priorities? To what extent has the project contributed in practice to ILO frameworks and strategies? Give concrete examples. How well managed has the project been at national level? How well have resources been utilized? What support has the project been given? How was the management structure decided? Relationship with donor? Specific in-country issues affecting project?
- *Country management [NPC]*, - What changes have you had to make during the project to adapt to changing circumstances? How has the project contributed to national ILO priorities? Have the resources available to the project been sufficient? Has staffing been adequate in terms of numbers and skills? What processes have been put in place to deliver project activities and results? Planning meetings, communications systems, activity organizing, data monitoring, feedback loops etc?
- *Trade unions*. In what ways has the project helped to build your internal capacity to engage in collective bargaining? Has the project enabled the union to recruit members? In which sectors? How has the project helped members become more involved in the decision-making processes of the union? Assess the impact of the project on social dialogue at the three levels, national, industry, branch. Has the project helped the union to advocate for legislation and policy at government level? Has the project helped to improve industrial relations? In what ways? How well do the ASLD procedures work? How well has the ESC and LESC worked as a result of the project?
- *Employers*, - In what ways has the project helped to build your internal capacity to engage in collective bargaining? Has the project enabled the employers' associations to recruit members? In which sectors? How has the project helped members become more involved in the decision-making processes of the association? Assess the impact of the project on social dialogue at the three levels, national, industry, branch. Has the project helped the employers' associations to advocate for legislation and policy at government level? Has the project helped to improve industrial relations? In what ways? How well do the ASLD procedures work? How well has the ESC and LESC worked as a result of the project?

- *Govt* – What specific country needs were identified that the project could address? What legislative and other policy plans do you have for implementing ILO conventions etc? What resources will be made available to support ongoing social dialogue?
- *Other stakeholders* – tbd after documentation review and meeting with ILO staff

RESOURCE SUPPORT REQUIREMENTS

- Transport
- Interpreters and local guides where required
- Workstation with internet connectivity
- Local organizer to set up meetings and venues.

DR ANDY HARVEY
94 ELDON ROAD
WOOD GREEN
LONDON
N22 5EE

Tel: +44 208 374 6323 (w)

+44 7939 652029 (m)

Skype: styletraveller

E-mail: andy_harvey@blueyonder.co.uk

APPENDIX VII: BIBLIOGRAPHY

European Commission, *The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia 2016 Report*. European Commission: Brussels, November 2016

ILO, *Decent Work Country Programme* FYR Macedonia 2015-18

ILO, *Promoting Social Dialogue Narrative Report* September 2015-October 2016

Law Reform Commission (Ireland), *Alternative Dispute Resolution: Conciliation and Mediation*, 2010

Lejla Tonovic, *Report on the Midterm Internal Evaluation of the Promoting Social Dialogue Project*. ILO, March 2016

Partnership for Sustainable Development United Nations Strategy for 2016-2020

United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2010-15