

EXTERNAL EVALUATION SOCIAL-DIALOGUE IN COLOMBIA AND EAST AFRICA (2015-2019)



ULANDSSEKRETARIATET – DTDA
DANISH TRADE UNION DEVELOPMENT AGENCY



Confederation of Danish Industry



EVALUATION REPORT

Diemen, 11 December 2019

Frans Van Gerwen
Van Gerwen for a Change

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms.....iii

Executive Summary.....v

1. Introduction 1

 1.1. Context 1

 1.2. Objective and scope of the evaluation 2

 1.3. Key evaluation questions on the Social Dialogue projects 3

 1.4. Approach and Methodology 3

 1.4.1. Approach 3

 1.4.2. Methodology 3

 1.4.3. Evaluation framework 4

 1.4.4. Steps and activities..... 4

2. The Social Dialogue projects in EAC and Colombia 5

 2.1. Short description of the specific Social Dialogue projects..... 6

 2.1.1. Social Dialogue for Growth and Decent Jobs in Colombia (2016-2019)..... 6

 2.1.2. Social dialogue in East Africa (2015-2018) 7

 2.1.3. Main common characteristics and results of the SD projects in EAC and Colombia ... 8

3. Key Findings 11

4. Conclusions and Lessons Learned 23

5. Final Recommendations 27

Annexes 29

ANNEX 1: ToR External evaluation Social-dialogue in Colombia and East Africa 29

ANNEX 2: List of people consulted..... 36

ANNEX 3: List of documents consulted 39

ANNEX 4: Evaluation Matrix 43

ANNEX 5: Summary overview of outputs, outcomes and impact and process aspects of the SD dialogue projects in EAC and Colombia 45

ANNEX 6: Field Visit Programmes 48

ACRONYMS

AEB	Association des Employeurs du Burundi
ADR	Alternative Dispute Resolution
ANDI	Asociación Nacional de Empresarios de Colombia
ATE	Association of Tanzania Employers
BMO	Business Membership Organisation
CBA	Collective Bargaining Agreement
CESTRAR	Centrale des Syndicats des Travailleurs du Rwanda
CGN	Consejo Gremial Nacional/National Business Council
CGT	Confederación General del Trabajo de Colombia
CMP	Common Market Protocol
COSYBU	Confédération des Syndicats du Burundi
COTU	Central Organization of Trade Unions
CTC	Confederación de Trabajadores de Colombia
CUT	Central Unitaria de Trabajadores de Colombia
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DI	Dansk Industri/Confederation of Danish Industry
DTDA	Danish Trade Union Development Agency
EAC	East African Community
EAEO	East African Employers' Organization
EATUC	East African Trade Union Confederation
EIU	Economist Intelligence Unit
ENS	Escuela Nacional Sindical
EU	European Union
FKE	Federation of Kenya Employers
FUE	Federation of Uganda Employers
GNI	Gross National Income
ILO	International Labour Organisation
ITUC	International Trade Union Confederation.
L&A	Lobby and Advocacy
LO/FTF	Former LO/FTF council (currently DTDA)
MFA/DANIDA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs/Danish International Development Agency
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NIR	The International Council for Swedish
NOTU	National Organization of Trade Unions
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OSH	Occupational Safety and Health
PSF	Private Sector Federation
SD	Social Dialogue
SENA	Servicio Nacional de Aprendizaje/National Apprenticeship Service
SPA	Strategic Partnership Agreement (Danish Government/DANIDA)
TA	Technical Assistance
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers
TVET	Technical and Vocational Training
TUCTA	Trade Unions Congress of Tanzania

ZANEMA
ZATUC

Zanzibar Employers Association
Zanzibar Trade Union Congress

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction and context

In 2012, the Danish Trade Union Development Agency (DTDA) (formerly named LO/FTF Council) and the Confederation of Danish Industry (DI) entered into collaboration to promote and improve bi-partite industrial relations between social partners within the East African Community (EAC) region.

In 2015, MFA/DANIDA launched the Better Labour Markets facility with a view to encourage Danish labour market actors to join forces and develop targeted, innovative projects in collaboration with local partners to contribute to inclusive growth and decent jobs in developing countries, including in new countries, such as in Colombia.

In that year, DTDA and DI jointly submitted two projects to the better labour markets facility:

- ***Social dialogue in East Africa (2015-2018);***
- ***Social Dialogue for Growth and Decent Jobs in Colombia (2016-2019).***

Both Social Dialogue (SD) projects are ending at the end of 2019 and therefore were subjected to an independent external evaluation. This evaluation also feeds into the broader cooperation between DTDA and DI under the Strategic Partnership Agreement with the Danish Government.

Evaluation objective and main evaluation questions

The objective of the evaluation of the two Social Dialogue projects is to:

- Review whether the strategic approaches to collective bargaining and social dialogue between workers and employers have been relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable;
- Assess main lessons learned from the social dialogue interventions;
- Provide concrete findings and recommendations as input and guidance for the future work of DTDA and DI in other like-minded partner countries.

The following evaluation criteria and questions have been addressed in this evaluation:

- Project relevance and impact:
 - Contribution of objectives and strategies of social dialogue projects to bi- and tripartite social dialogue priorities of key social partners and beneficiaries and key lessons learned;
 - Contribution of projects to bi-and tripartite social dialogue mechanisms.
- Effectiveness of different approaches to social dialogue;
 - Best practices, effects and prospects of using inputs from Danish and international external resource persons;
 - Comparative advantages and limitations of different social dialogue approaches.

- Efficiency: Cost-effectiveness relation of technical assistance and activities compared to benefits.
- Sustainability:
 - Local ownership of projects and involvement as experienced by social partners;
 - Use of lessons learned & social dialogue competencies gained in future by partners & DTDA/DI;
 - Sustainable effects of joint actions, mediation & collaboration between social partners on the labour relations climate and on conciliating & reducing industrial unrest and labour disputes;
 - Institutionalisation of project actions into national policies, collective/local agreements, structures, codes of conduct, MoU's, guidelines etc.

Methodology and main steps in evaluation process

This evaluation exercise, realised from September to December 2019, was a collaborative, interactive and outcome-oriented process, in which a mix of data-collection instruments/approaches was used:

- Desk Study: written documentation was subjected of a qualitative analysis;
- Semi-structured interviews with implementing partners and a number of relevant stakeholders;
- Country visits to Colombia, Zanzibar and Uganda and at the regional level in EAC (Arusha);
- Debriefing and sense-making meetings in Colombia and by email-exchange with DTDA and DI;
- Reporting first in draft and after a round of feedback as a final report.

Key findings on the SD projects in the East African Community and Colombia

The SD projects in the East African Community (EAC) and in Colombia have applied a strong focus on priority issues in social dialogue shared between social partners in all countries. Some of the priority issues covered were: labour law, Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBA), alternative dispute resolution, Technical and Vocational Training (TVET) and the labour market, minimum wage, social security and free movement of labour. Important results were reported by the projects during the implementation period, which are amply discussed in this evaluation report, among which:

- Improved functioning of social dialogue mechanisms in all countries, due to improved understanding of different partners of their specific role and responsibilities in social dialogue and thanks to improved relations and mutual trust between workers' and employers' organisations;
- Increased capacity and clear contribution of social partners to improvement in social dialogue and in results obtained in themes and issues prioritised in the SD projects in all countries;
- Development of Alternative Dispute Resolution and Minimum Wage instruments and proposals, particularly in Kenya, Uganda and Zanzibar;

- Development of joint position papers and proposals on linkages between TVET and the labour market in Kenya, Tanzania and Zanzibar;
- Development of (sector-level) CBA formats and procedures Kenya, Rwanda and Tanzania;
- Proposals for improvements in labour law developed by the social partners and establishment of a bipartite consultation framework of the social partners in Burundi;
- Establishment of departmental subcommittees for wage and labour policies in Colombia.

The most significant challenge faced by both workers' and employers' organisations is their limited reach of membership that within sectors does not reach out to the whole sectors, across sectors some sectors are not reached and also informal sector is commonly not reached by both organisations.

The SD project design and change strategy of all projects under the SD projects was to work on bi-partite social dialogue and build upon this, lobby and advocacy towards other external partners, particularly government institutions. While the bi-partite social partners have advanced significantly in the development of policy and legislative proposals on CBA, conflict resolution and TVET, translation of these proposals into policies, legislation and programmes is mostly still ongoing.

The examples of working together in all countries clearly show that the SD projects have built upon emerging and careful initiatives for cooperation between the workers' and employers' organisations. While the projects did not trigger these partners to engage in cooperation, they have given an important boost to cooperation between social partners in all countries.

The SD projects in EAC and Colombia have been clearly visible and recognised by Government institutions and the ILO. These stakeholders also indicate that the credibility of the workers' and employers' organisations has improved a lot since collaboration is more intensive and joint positions are taken. The international support by DTDA and DI has contributed to this visibility and credibility.

In Colombia, the SD project has worked with only two national workers' organisations, because the largest workers' organisation dropped out from the project. This shows that the trade union movement in Colombia still faces challenges in reaching unity in action of a pluralistic movement.

Employers' organisations in Colombia are historically strong institutions and have longer experience in social dialogue together with Workers' organisations. In some East African countries, the workers' organisations have had a longer history and thus a head-start compared to employers' organisations.

Key conclusions

On relevance and impact

1. Social Dialogue between social partners is a long-term process. Due to political and social unrest and disruptions, social dialogue has been interrupted in several countries to a significant extent, but it never ceased to exist. The SD projects in EAC and in Colombia were built on this reality and thus have been nurturing further consolidation of bi-partite social dialogue mechanisms in an innovative way. The combination of building innovation on historical antecedents and experience of DTDA and DI and their homologue partners at country level can be considered highly relevant;
2. The SD projects in EAC and Colombia focused on strengthening social partners' capacities in bi-partite social dialogue. The conscious choice in the SD projects to work on bi-partite social dialogue has proven to be key to building bilateral trust and experience in dialogue and cooperation. This careful process has been beneficial for visibility and credibility of social partners in the policy environment and in tri-partite social dialogue. With the experience gained, the time now might be ripe to step up the experience and further consolidate it at tri-partite level;
3. The SD projects have chosen a clear focus on a limited amount priority issues in social dialogue, jointly identified and selected by the social partners in each country. This has had two important advantages: ownership of the local social partners and long-consistency in strategic plans of these partners, needed to produce changes in labour related legislation and procedures;
4. The regional and international exchange approach chosen in the SD projects adds value to specific national-level experiences. In the first place this is done by enabling exchange of expertise between partners, not only in a North-South relation but also in a South-South partnership, extending also between workers' and employers' organisations. Furthermore, the international exchange and support provided by the Danish social partners has increased visibility of the social partners at country level and has also increased their political cloud at national and regional level.

On effectiveness

5. The SD projects have generated significant results in terms of policy proposals, models for implementation of CBA and conflict resolution. However, this evaluation also shows that there are still significant challenges faced by both the workers' and employers' organisations to further roll out and replicate the experience and lessons learned at the sector and particularly company level. The most significant constraint felt by both social partners is their limited reach: not all sectors are covered by the social partners, as their membership is limited;

6. The originally anticipated sector-level social dialogue components of the SD project in EAC were discontinued soon after its start. This, in hindsight, was not bad because it enabled the project to focus support activities on the level of national social partners and on some clear specific priority issues identified by these partners. This focus has improved effectiveness of the projects, by not dispersing too many actions among too many actors;
7. Attention in reporting on the SD projects on processes that did not progress well, such as the sectoral social dialogue initiatives in EAC and Colombia, or results that were not obtained or weak has been modest. This has limited the capacity to learn from mistakes, instead of learning from best practices, which has been a strong focus in the SD projects.

On efficiency

8. Implementation arrangements and efficiency in SD project implementation were generally considered satisfactory, with one major bottleneck reported: while project planning was annual, at the same time transfers of project funds for specific activities were subject to approval of specific activity budgets. This has slowed down project implementation and flexibility in planning of activities and it has taken significant time and effort for realising smaller transfers;
9. Project implementation has been good in most countries, sometimes in remarkably challenging environments such as in Colombia, Burundi and Rwanda. In Tanzania and Kenya implementation rates were significantly lower, among others also due to lower levels of commitment and performance of the social partners in these countries.

On sustainability

10. The social partners in EAC and Colombia show a strong ownership of the SD projects and this is thanks to a strong and consistent approach in the project and the behaviour of DTDA and DI to allow all national partners choosing their own country-specific priorities and to involve them consistently in planning, reporting and exchange of experience. The MoU's between several social partners now show good potential for further continuation of social dialogue at the bilateral level;
11. The SD projects show that changing of policies, legislation and regulatory frameworks at the national level takes considerable time, often even many years. Sustainability of results at this level requires a long-term vision and continuous efforts, which is not often recognised in support projects. The 5-year time-frame of the SD projects under the DANIDA Labour Market framework, even while it seems long, in the light of obtaining tangible policy results, is still rather short.

Main recommendations

The following main recommendations are addressed to DTDA, DI and their international partners:

- Continue joint cooperation of DTDA and DI within the strategic framework with the Danish Government and investigate possibilities to jointly develop follow-up social dialogue projects with joint social partners abroad within this framework and beyond, possibly also engaging other development partners active in Social Dialogue;
- Consider in the next generation social dialogue projects to include also government partners and to in addition to strengthening bi-partite social dialogue between workers and employers also work on strengthening tri-partite social dialogue;
- Continue identifying shared workers' and employers' issues for joint cooperation in SD projects with clear benefits for all partners to ensure continued ownership by all partners involved;
- Further explore possibilities to continue and expand the SD project in EAC, as a project with a regional, national and possibly also sectoral components. Such a regional approach could also be relevant in other African, Asian and Latin American regional economic communities;
- Complement efforts in social dialogue initiatives with an increased effort in organising workers and employers and to expand the membership base of both organisations as a long-term effort. This might require only considering joint social dialogue projects in those countries where both DTDA and DIA are interested in working with national partners for the long-term;
- Now that experience in regional and national social dialogue is built in the SD projects, the time is ripe to also consider working at sector level. This level can strengthen the bridge between national organisations, member unions and individual companies;
- Pay equal attention to good and best practices and progress obtained in project implementation and to failures and problems encountered. This will increase the capacity of all implementing partners to learn from project experiences for further rolling out and replication of SD projects;
- Continue and expand the recently introduced practice of advance payments to partners to allow them to engage better in longer-term planning and budgeting to implement activities;
- Introduce performance and results-based management principles in project design and implementation, as a mechanism to direct scarce financial resources to those countries, partners and activities that show better perspectives for progress and results in SD project implementation.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Context

In 2012, the Danish Trade Union Development Agency (DTDA) (formerly named LO/FTF Council) and the Confederation of Danish Industry (DI) entered into collaboration to promote and improve bi-partite industrial relations between social partners within the East African Community (EAC) region. A two-year pilot project funded by the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA/DANIDA) was launched and implemented from 2012 to 2016, focusing on aspects of free movement of workers across the EAC-region. Joint policy recommendations were developed and used for policy advocacy at Regional EAC-level as well as national level in five EAC Partner States¹ (Kenya, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania (including Zanzibar), Rwanda and Burundi)

During this phase, collaboration between employers' organisations and trade union organisations at regional and national levels within the EAC was considered successful and there were signs of improvement in bi-and tripartite social dialogue. The national strategy and partnership approach have brought together "both sides of the table" in the East African countries to promote a consensus seeking approach, settle conflicts through dialogue and negotiations, improve framework conditions for business development, and encourage peaceful industrial relations and decent work.

In 2015, MFA/DANIDA launched the Better Labour Markets facility with a view to encourage Danish labour market actors to join forces and develop targeted, innovative projects in collaboration with local partners to contribute to inclusive growth and decent jobs in developing countries.

Based on previous experience from the pilot project in East Africa, DTDA and DI jointly applied for funding for two projects under this MFA/DANIDA funding facility:

- *Social dialogue in East Africa (2015-2018)*
- *Social Dialogue for Growth and Decent Jobs in Colombia (2015-2019)*

The first Social Dialogue (SD) project is a continuation of the pilot-project in EAC and builds on the previous experience between the social partners in the five EAC countries. The new SD project was a smooth transition to the next phase. The SD project started in 2015 and it was extended beyond the original planning period that reached 2018 until the end of 2019. DANIDA approved a no-cost extension of the project.

¹ South Sudan joined EAC in April 2016, but is not included in the SD project

The SD project in Colombia was newly developed and it was a response to the peace process in the country and the increased interest of Denmark in socio-economic and trade development in this country. Denmark established an Embassy in Colombia in 2014. DTDA (formerly LO-FTF) prepared the grounds for the SD project in 2013 with a study on trade union situation and development in Colombia. DI was involved in a trade mission to Colombia in 2014 and since then DTDA and DI joined hands in the development of the SD project to be submitted to the MFA/DANIDA better labour markets facility. This facility was open for Colombia and permitted DTDA and DI to support partners in Colombia with project funding. The SD project in Colombia started in 2016. Both SD projects are further introduced and described in section 2.1 of this report.

Both SD projects and also the MFA/DANIDA better labour markets facility are ending at the end of this year. Therefore; DTDA-DI SD contracted an independent external evaluation of the projects in the last Semester of 2019. DTDA and DI also cooperate under the Strategic Programme Agreement (SPA) with MFA/DANIDA and similar projects are supported under this arrangement. Therefore, this evaluation is also feeding into the broader SPA evaluation that is conducted parallel to this evaluation.

1.2. Objective and scope of the evaluation

The objective of the evaluation of these two Social Dialogue projects is to:

- Review whether the strategic approaches to further collective bargaining and social dialogue between workers and employers has been **relevant, effective, efficient** and **sustainable** at regional, national, sectoral and organisational levels?
- Assess main **lessons learned** from the interventions on how to make social partners aware of the benefits of improved and consensus-seeking social dialogue as well as providing best practices on how to bring social partners together most effectively to conduct consensus-seeking negotiations, collective bargaining, bi/tripartite consultations, dispute handling/prevention, joint coordination, policy development, and
- Provide concrete **findings and recommendations** as input and guidance for the future work of the Danish consortium in other like-minded partner countries.

The scope of the evaluation is the period of implementation of both Social Dialogue projects during the period of funding under the Better Labour Markets facility of MFA/DANIDA: 2015 – 2019. However, when and where relevant, previous historical developments under the pilot project in East Africa can be considered. In addition, the bilateral organizational cooperation relations that exist between DTDA and the national and regional centres, funded under the Strategic Partnership Agreement with MFA/DANIDA can be considered as a relevant context to the Social Dialogue projects.

The scope of the evaluation in Colombia is national, with specific attention to sub-national actions developed in the regions of Valle del Cauca (visited during field research), Guajira, Cesar and Magdalena. The evaluation focus in the East African Community is on the regional level, addressing the regional level social partners and on the national level, covering five countries (Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania mainland and Uganda) and one autonomous region (Zanzibar), with visits to

Uganda and Zanzibar. The final level of the project in EAC, focusing on specific sectoral level dialogue in three countries (Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania), was not continued after the inception phase and no research activities were implemented on these sectors, though the reasons for discontinuation of the three sectors are addressed in this report.

1.3. Key evaluation questions on the Social Dialogue projects

The ToR (see Annex 1) request to look at the following evaluation criteria:

- a. Project relevance and impact;
- b. Effectiveness of different approaches to social dialogue;
- c. Efficiency;
- d. Sustainability.

These evaluation criteria, during the inception phase have been further developed and reorganised in a set of four main evaluation questions in an evaluation matrix that is presented in Annex 4.

1.4. Approach and Methodology

1.4.1. Approach

This evaluation exercise is a collaborative, interactive, and outcome-oriented process. The approach is evidence based and utilisation-focused with the intent to generate applicable findings to contribute to further strategic reflection and learning by DTDA and DI and their key partners in the SD project countries. In order to contribute to organisational learning and to work efficiently, the evaluation was organised as a participatory learning process in itself, with ample room for briefing and debriefing of findings during the research phase, This is also beneficial for *fostering ownership of the evaluation findings* and the provision of inputs for the design and implementation of social dialogue projects by DTDA and DI in the future under the SPA arrangement with MFA-DANIDA and possibly under other alternative arrangements.

1.4.2. Methodology

A mix of data-collection instruments/approaches was used in this evaluation process:

- **Desk Study:** written documentation was subjected of a qualitative analysis. See annex 3 for the documents reviewed during this evaluation process;
- **Semi-structured interviews** (face-to-face and via skype): Semi-structured interviews were conducted with implementing partners and a number of relevant stakeholders: in Denmark, by Skype and in the countries to be visited. See Annex 2 for the people interviewed;
- **Country visits:** in Colombia, Zanzibar and Uganda and at the regional level in EAC (Arusha) a limited number of partners in social dialogue were visited and interviewed. See Annex 6 for the country visit programme);

- **Debriefing and sensemaking meetings:** debriefing and sense-making meetings were conducted in Colombia and by email-exchange with DTDA and DI;
- **Reporting:** based on primary and secondary data-collection and inputs from evaluation stakeholders during debriefing and sensemaking meetings the evaluation report was finalised, first in draft and after a round of feedback as a final report.

1.4.3. Evaluation framework

During the inception phase, an evaluation framework (see annex 4) was developed to further concretise the evaluation questions in the ToR into more detailed research questions and indicators. For each cluster of evaluation question, further guiding questions and indicators, sources of verification and research methods were specified.

1.4.4. Steps and activities

Inception phase (August 25 – September 30, 2019)

- Initial desk study, visit to Denmark (September 10) and interviews with staff and consultants of DTDA and DI;
- Development of a briefing note for the research and field visits.

Research Phase (October 1 – 30, 2019)

- Continuation of the Desk Study;
- Follow up interviews with key informants and stakeholders, based in Denmark;
- Field visits:
 - o Colombia: 7-11 October;
 - o Zanzibar: 24-26 October;
 - o Arusha: 27-30 October (participation in closing conference of SD project in EAC on 29 October and interviews with all workers' and employers' organisations at the regional and country level in EAC);
 - o Uganda: 31 October – 1 November.

Debriefing and sensemaking of findings (October 9 – November 4, 2019)

- In country;
- By email.

Analysis and Draft and Final Reporting (1 October – 15 December, 2019)

2. THE SOCIAL DIALOGUE PROJECTS IN EAC AND COLOMBIA

The Social Dialogue projects in the East African Community and in Colombia, were designed as workers' and employers' organisations cooperation projects. This was also the case for the supporting Danish partners. This is illustrated in the table below:

	Denmark	EAC							Colombia
		Regional	Burundi	Kenya	Rwanda	Tanzania	Uganda	Zanzibar	
Workers	DTDA	EATUC	COSYBU	COTU	CESTRAR	TUCTA	NOTU	ZATUC	ANDI
Employers	DI	EAE0	EAB	KFE	PSF	ATE	FUE	ZANEMA	CTC & CGT

This design implied that the different social partners have their own homologue partners some of which already supported for a long time. However, at the same time, the social partners team up together to work on priorities in social dialogue in different countries. An explicit goal of the SD projects was to allow for Danish experiences of DTDA and DI in social dialogue to serve as a source of inspiration for cooperation of national and regional level partners in EAC and Colombia in the development of experiences in social dialogue.

The two projects in EAC and Colombia share many characteristics, but have been implemented in parallel. During the implementation of the projects no exchange of experiences nor joint reviews and studies were conducted covering both SD projects. This end-evaluation of the two projects is the first exercise in which these two experiences are brought together.

The SD project in EAC included exchange and joint collaboration of partners at national and regional level as well as exchange and collaboration between specific countries. This was done at regional conferences where experiences were shared and at more specific issue-based workshops in specific countries where a number of partners sharing an interest in these issues participated.

Both SD projects have promoted a strong focus on priority issues in social dialogue shared between the social partners in each country and at the regional EAC level. The priority issues that were chosen are presented in the table below:

	EAC							Colombia
Themes	Regional	Burundi	Kenya	Rwanda	Tanzania	Uganda	Zanzibar	Colombia
Labour law		X		X				
Social Dialogue structure	X	X		X				X
CBA				X	X	X		X
ADR	X		X			X	X	X
TVET	X		X		X		X	X
Minimum Wage						X		
Social Security (portability)	X							X
Free movement of labour	x							

The table above shows that there has been significant convergence of priorities in and between countries and also between the EAC and Colombia SD projects, allowing for substantial collaboration and exchange between and among partners. This has happened at the country level and between national partners and DTDA and DI and also at the regional level in EAC. However, there has not been any exchange between EAC and Colombia.

A final joint characteristic of design of the SD projects, at least at the time of development and inception of the projects, was the identification of specific sectors to develop more focused specific SD project activities. This was done in three countries (Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda) in EAC and in Colombia. However, the sectoral project components in the three EAC countries were not continued after the inception of the SD project. In practice, the social partners in some countries continued to apply a sector specific focus, such as in sectoral minimum wage activities in four sectors in Uganda and in ADR activities in the hospitality sector in Zanzibar. In Colombia, three sectors were identified for the development of SD initiatives, of which one proved to be too difficult to develop, due to limited presence of trade unions and reluctance for cooperation of employers in the flower sector. In the sectors of Mining and Sugar, specific regional and sector level activities were developed in the SD project in Colombia.

2.1. Short description of the specific Social Dialogue projects

2.1.1. Social Dialogue for Growth and Decent Jobs in Colombia (2016-2019)

The overall strategy of the SD project in Colombia has been to bring social partners together and create space for exchange of experiences and consultations. The project works on enterprise levels with a focus on soft skills development of the youth, mediation and conflict resolution. This is done through training seminars of social partners, ANDI, CTC and CGT, where union representatives have been trained in mediation techniques, conflict resolution and labour laws in order to prepare them to enter in a structured dialogue with employers and enterprise managers. Likewise, enterprises have received parallel trainings to prepare them to enter into consultations with union representatives. Local capacity building of social partners is essential in order to bring both parties closer to each other.

Moreover, training of 15 skilled trainers was done to replicate training on a large scale to specific target groups such as youth to become motivated and confident decision makers, and as such contributing to creating environments of democratic involvement, negotiation and consensus building. In the project, social partners have developed training materials for business owners and labour union representatives focusing on best practices in social dialogue at the workplace.

At the policy level, the aim of the project was to formulate realistic policy proposals of mutual interests for both employers and workers to support a more stable labour market characterised by decent jobs and sustainable businesses. Social partners have focused on the Permanent

Commission for Consultation under the Ministry of Labour. In formulating policy proposals and providing inputs to the Ministry of Labour, local experiences of social dialogue have been documented and used as best practices.

Development Objective:

Contribute to a more stable and well-functioning labour market in Colombia paving the way for inclusive growth, decent jobs and sustainable enterprises.

Immediate Objective 1:

Policy level: Strengthen the engagement and institutional set-up of social partners in bi- and tripartite labour market dialogue.

Immediate Objective 2:

Enterprise level: Strengthen social dialogue competencies at enterprise level with a focus on soft skills development of the youth, labour rights, mediation and conflict resolution.

2.1.2. Social dialogue in East Africa (2015-2018)

The SD project in EAC used the momentum that emerged in 2013, when 12 of the most representative and independent employers' and workers' organisations in East Africa joined forces for the first time in history. After having approached DTDA and DI, the East African social partners decided to synchronise their lobby and advocacy work to remove barriers of free movement of labour in the region. In East Africa, the project operates on regional, national and company level.

Overall, the main strategy of the SD project was to bring social partners together and to create forums and space for joint consultation, coordination and exchange of experiences to strengthen and coordinate advocacy and lobby towards governments on national policy and socio-economic development issues. At the regional level, the strategy was to establish a social dialogue round table for social partners i.e. regional apexes EAEO and EATUC and national workers' and employers' organisations from the six EAC countries². Through these social dialogue forums, the social partners collaborate and develop joint positions to qualify and influence tripartite social dialogue with national governments, as well as the EAC institutions, and other regional stakeholders.

The project's strategy has been to rethink the traditional and (often) adversarial labour relations between workers' and employers' organisations by building capacity within national and sectoral social partners jointly to deepen their cooperation in the labour market and to understand the

² Zanzibar is considered a country in the project, because its autonomous status in the united republic of Tanzania and Zanzibar it has its own labour legislation and labour institutions, such as a Ministry of Labour and Industrial Court. To avoid confusion with South Sudan as the newest (sixth) member of EAC, at the level of the project, South Sudan is not included. When reference is made to six countries this is to: Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda and Zanzibar.

strategic value of collective bargaining, skills development, dispute prevention etc. To illustrate this, the aim was for partners to develop and sign bipartite agreements in form of MoUs, codes of good conduct, joint training materials, collection of evidence-based labour market data etc. Likewise, lobby and advocacy has been a strategic priority backed up by conducting public national/local sensitisation meetings and campaigns on decent work and employment. The strategy has been to meet key government stakeholders, government line ministries and national media while at the same time disseminate relevant materials to constituents at workplaces.

Development Objective:

Social dialogue in the EAC region has been improved with more focus on decent work, consensus and constructive agreements and effective dispute handling.

Immediate Objective 1:

Strengthened institutional capacity of social partners in East Africa to advocate and raise awareness about free movement of labour and productivity.

Immediate Objective 2:

Bi-partite social dialogue mechanisms have been strengthened to improve decent working conditions and productivity in private industries.

2.1.3. Main common characteristics and results of the SD projects in EAC and Colombia

This sub-section presents a brief summary of main findings on characteristics and results that have been obtained in both SD projects until the first half of 2019. The detailed findings that have been used in this summary can be found in Annex 6 of this report. The findings are based on all available reporting on the SD projects at central level and by the specific partners at country and regional level in EAC and Colombia in combination with information obtained during interviews and field visits during the research phase of this evaluation.

Common characteristics and results found in all project countries:

- There is considerable consensus on priority issues in which workers' and employers' organisations have a common interest and are willing to explore possibilities to arrive at an agreement to cooperate and prepare joint position papers and policy proposals. The key issues are shared between countries and also between East Africa and Colombia. The commonly identified key issues are: CBA's, conflict resolution and TVET. And often shared are issues of Occupational Safety and Health (OSH), minimum wage, mobility of labour. There are possibilities for broader cooperation between workers' and employers' organisations at the institutional level;
- The most significant challenge faced by both workers' and employers' organisations is their limited reach of membership that within sectors does not reach out to all companies and workers. And additionally, some specific economic sectors are not reached sufficiently and most notably the informal sector is generally still not widely reached by both employers' and

- workers' organisations. This is in spite of notable efforts by NOTU (Uganda), COTU (Kenya) and COSYBU (Burundi), among which COTU has been able to reach out to a significant number (471,000) workers in the informal sector. The limited reach of workers' and employers' organisations poses serious limitations to the successful replication and rolling of successful models, projects and programmes at national level and in the region;
- Successful examples of embedding and institutionalisation of policy proposals and models are limited. While the bi-partite social partners have advanced significantly in the development of policy and legislative proposals on CBA, conflict resolution and TVET, the translation of these proposals into policies, legislation and programmes is still ongoing in most cases, in some cases after a process of Lobby and Advocacy that started right from the beginning of the social dialogue projects;
 - The project design and change strategy of all SD projects were focusing on working in the first place on developing and improving bi-partite social dialogue between workers and employers. This was a conscious decision with the rationale that more trust and experience was needed to be built among the social partners and also to obtain specific bi-partite results in dialogue such as in CBA and ADR processes. A second step was to translate outcomes of bipartite dialogue and cooperation into policy proposals (position papers, legislative proposals etc.) and exercise lobby and advocacy addressing national and regional governments and government institutions. While dialogue and relations with the Ministries of Labour and related institutions are generally good, also a more formal strengthening and use of tri-partite social dialogue mechanisms and instruments is identified by most partners as a future priority to achieve more effects in institutionalisation;
 - The examples of working together in all countries clearly show that the Social Dialogue projects have built upon emerging and careful initiatives for cooperation between the workers' and employers' organisations. While the projects did not trigger these partners to engage in cooperation, they have given an important boost to cooperation in all countries, except in Colombia where one of the national workers' organisations did not participate. The cooperation in practice and the support and examples provided by DTDA and DI have contributed a lot to building of trust and constructive dialogue between the social partners;
 - The Social Dialogue projects in EAC and Colombia have been clearly visible and recognised by Government institutions and the ILO. These stakeholders also indicate that the credibility of the workers' and employers' organisations has improved a lot since collaboration is more intensive and joint positions are taken. Also, the international support by DTDA and DI has contributed to this visibility and credibility;
 - In the project reports and in the general reporting only limited attention is given to bottlenecks and limitations in collaboration and social dialogue. This is a missed opportunity for learning in the programme and across programmes, because the analysis of more difficult processes, problems in implementation and of expected results that were not obtained, can produce powerful learning.

Main differences in characteristics and results obtained between countries in the SD projects:

- In Colombia, the SD project has worked with two national workers' organisations, while it was originally intended to work with all three major workers' organisations. CUT, the largest workers' organisation has dropped out from the project. This shows that the trade union movement in Colombia still faces challenges in reaching unity in action, even when pluralism of organisations exists. In Uganda, to a lesser extent, this has also been the case in the recent past, but less in recent years. In Colombia the absence of the most important trade union partner and lack of unity in action between all trade unions has weakened their role in bi and tri-partite social dialogue. This might have been a reason that the SD project in Colombia has mainly focused on specific sectors, those sectors in which the presence of CTC and CGT unions was stronger. In EAC, the actions in the SD project have reached more effectively to the national and even regional level;
- Employers' organisations in Colombia are historically strong institutions and have longer experience in social dialogue with Workers' organisations. In some East African countries, the workers' organisations have had a longer history and thus a head-start compared to employers' organisations. In some countries, as in Rwanda, and at the regional level, employers' organisations have to go through a steeper learning curve in the implementation of the social project in EAC.

3. KEY FINDINGS

The key findings of this evaluation are presented in this section and organised according to the key evaluation criteria and question presented in the evaluation matrix that was developed during the inception phase of this evaluation (see Annex 4). In this brief overview, the results of analysis of documents and reports of the project partners and interviews in East Africa and Colombia are combined and integrated. For more specific findings on the process and results in each country and at EAC regional level, the reader is referred to Annex 5.

A. Project relevance and impact

Contribution of objectives and strategies of social dialogue projects to bi- and tripartite social dialogue priorities of key social partners and beneficiaries and key lessons learned

The key issues and themes (ADR, CBA's, TVET, Minimum Wage, portability of social security, free movement of labour) were chosen in a participatory way by the national and regional partners in the Social Dialogue (SD) projects in the East African Community (EAC) and Colombia. Both social partners at the country level and regionally in the EAC have identified their priority issues and jointly agreed upon the ones to include in the project implementation. In most cases, social dialogue was already established in which the national social partners participated and also prior to start of the SD projects there were already preceding initiatives for cooperation between social partners. In the case of EAC, there was also a prior DTDA-DI pilot project on social from 2012 to 2016 that preceded the current SD project. The issues identified have been consistently addressed by the social partners, throughout the implementation period and in several countries significant progress was booked in social dialogue, and more concretely in collective bargaining and conflict resolution. The processes to embed new models and approaches developed in the SD projects into national and regional legislation, are often tediously slow and take a lot of effort. The social partners, at the end of the project period indicate that their priorities have not changed significantly and most of them recommend to continue efforts to consolidate the results obtained in the past years and further replicate them at the company and sector level both for workers and employers. To some extent new issues were also identified by the social partners that have obtained a higher priority status during the more recent years. These issues are not suggested as replacements for the current priorities in the social dialogue projects but as possibilities for replication and expansion of the projects in the near future. New emerging issues, most often indicated by partners are:

- Informal economy;
- Precarious and casual work;
- Migrant workers (e.g. in the Middle East for Ugandan workers) and mobility of labour;
- Sectoral CBA negotiation (although maybe not always seen as a priority at company level).

All social partners involved in the SD projects see significant changes and progress in the project initiatives to promote and improve social dialogue and indicate that trust and transparency in their

mutual relations have improved. An important improvement identified by both internal and external partners is the fact that when employers and workers are together and coordinate in processes of tri-partite dialogue and consultation, both partners also individually become stronger and more credible. This is a significant change from the past when relations between social partners were more antagonistic and also in some countries, as in Colombia and Uganda, where internal relations within the trade union movement have not always been smooth. The SD projects have clearly strengthened the understanding and acceptance of social partners (including also government partners and stakeholders) that social dialogue is among the strongest and most productive mechanisms to achieve individual objectives of each partner and collective objectives of all social partners. The existing coordination and cooperation between partners are proven by the existence of numerous MoU's between the social partners, both in Colombia and in EAC, to work together on specific issues and also more broadly at the institutional level.

The examples of the DTDA-DI experiences and expertise in social dialogue in Denmark are highly valued and considered relevant to East Africa and Colombia. Partners state that the fundamentals of tri- and bi-partite social dialogue are the same world-wide. Furthermore, presence and support of international partners provide also political support and political clout to the social partners in the project and this strengthens their political roles and recognition by government actors. This need was also recognised in the DANIDA Better Labour Markets facility. On the other hand, it is commented that DTDA-DI knowledge and experience could go more hand-in-hand with deploying local and regional experts that have the capacity to contextualise the DTDA-DI experience and also analyse the specific regional and national bottlenecks that need to be overcome to strengthen social dialogue. Specifically, with respect to Alternative Dispute resolution (ADR) and Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) in EAC, local partners recognised the added value of models and experiences of their Danish partners.

Contribution of projects to bi-and tripartite social dialogue mechanisms

(To which extent have partners been motivated to re-think labour relations into more cooperation, consensus and compromise-seeking consultations & negotiations?)

As already indicated above, according to internal and external stakeholders in EAC and Colombia the SD projects have contributed to strengthening social dialogue in the countries and at regional level in EAC, particularly and more directly at the bi-partite level. In the design and development of the SD projects, strengthening bi-partite collaboration and social dialogue between workers' and employers' organisations was chosen as the focus and priority result area of the projects. Tri-partite dialogue mechanisms, that already have a longer history in Colombia and EAC, have not yet been addressed and included in the SD projects, but it well may be that more attention in follow-up activities and projects is needed to strengthen impact of the bipartite social dialogue actions also at the sectoral, national and regional policy level. In some notable occasions, such as in the case of the Secretariat of EAC, the Ministry of Labour in Colombia and Uganda and the Industrial Court in Zanzibar, the social partners in the SD projects have engaged with government entities and this has

provided a perspective for more closer cooperation and influence on policy development processes. This could be further strengthened in follow-up actions towards the future.

The existing social dialogue mechanisms in the countries and at EAC level, according to the stakeholders are now performing better, mainly due to the improved understanding of the different partners of their specific role and responsibilities in social dialogue and also due to improved relations and mutual trust between workers' and employers' organisations. In Colombia, this was overshadowed by the fact that the largest trade union central, CUT, withdrew from the project in the inception phase. This has limited the scope and reach of the project in Colombia, as some of the larger enterprises and groups of workers could not be reached, such as was the case in the mining sector. In the interviews and meetings, during the regional closing conference of the social dialogue projects and at country level in EAC, the social partners showed good mutual understanding and close and constructive cooperation;

A clear bottleneck encountered in all projects, both in EAC and Colombia, is the fact that membership of the participating workers' and employers' organisations is limited to a relatively small percentage of workers and companies in different sectors. This is, worldwide, a structural limitation of trade unions and employers' organisations that cannot be easily overcome. This poses a limitation to roll-out and replicate the social dialogue experience to more companies and to different sectors, including the informal sector. Another bottleneck is the global trend of growing informalisation of labour relations that excludes growing groups from mechanisms for social dialogue and labour related legislation and regulations. Therefore, it should be concluded that within the specific environment of the project partners and in project activities conducted at the workplace, the effects of the SD project at that level clearly are less pronounced and less extended. Due to limitations in reach and membership of both workers' and employers' organisations, the potential for increasing scope and expansion are also limited. And additionally, meetings conducted at work-floor level in this evaluation also showed that effects of training are limited because not all workers and managers are involved in training activities and also because many training activities are focusing on large groups and are mainly focused on information provision and less on skills building. Due to rotation of staff, continuity of shop-stewards and trained membership of unions and managers of companies, the efforts of training at the company level show a tendency of rather rapid dilution. To avoid this, regular Training of Trainers (ToT) to transfer training capacity to local partner organisations and allow them to replicate trainings at the decentral level, and training of managers and workers at company level need to be consistent and consistently repeated.

External project partners and stakeholders (Government representatives, ILO, EAC-secretariat) interviewed during the field work, indicate they see a clear value and contribution of the social projects at national and international level, in the form of position papers, research documents, policy proposals, models etc. They also see an increased capacity and clear contribution of social partners to improvement in social dialogue and in results obtained in the themes and issues prioritised in the projects at national and international level. In spite of this general recognition, the

process of embedding and institutionalisation of models and approaches in social dialogue (in conflict resolution, minimum wage, TVET, etc.) is moving slower than anticipated in the project design and planning. Linking up with policies and legislation is a strong and continuous element in the SD projects, but as direct relations and participation in these projects was with bi-partite partners, embedding and institutionalisation of models and approaches had to be achieved primarily through lobby and advocacy, which are time-consuming processes.

B. Effectiveness of different approaches to social dialogue

Best practices, effects and prospects of using inputs from Danish and international external resource persons (e.g. in single vs. bipartite missions)

The international bi-partite assistance provided by DTDA and DI as a consortium, has been very important as an international solidarity and political support from international partners to the social partners. This supports increases visibility of partners and increased recognition by other partners (in conferences and media).

The examples that DTDA and DI can give of well functional models and approaches and the experience and expertise of the partners in applying these are very relevant for the partners in East Africa. Particularly the Danish experiences in TVET and ADR were often referred to by local partners in EAC.

The combination of DTDA and DI in activities and training was highly appreciated and this 'acting together' by both has also served as a learning experience. This 'acting together' of international partners in the social dialogue project has been unique and innovative and serves as an example to other projects.

The combination of international, regional and national expertise in training and capacity development activities was also appreciated, though partners indicate that combining expertise from different origins and particularly the use of local and regional expertise could be stronger and more structural in the SD project implementation. This is also likely to have a positive effect on costs and on flexibility in planning of TA missions.

Provision of short-term training and Technical Assistance missions was the most important modality of capacity development in the SD projects and in several cases, this was done by a sequence of missions, jointly constituting a trajectory of capacity development. These missions were not only contributing to human capacity development but also to systems and process design. In some occasions, short-term missions were accompanied by on the job assistance and coaching by email and skype contacts between partners and experts, although this was not common. The capacity building approach included elements of coaching but didn't follow a coherent coaching approach.

The partners in EAC indicate that there have been opportunities for exchange and learning between partners in the regional SD project, usually in the realisation of training conferences and in the annual conferences. However, these moments of exchange and mutual learning were mostly confined to the conferences and events themselves. Possibilities for exposures and exchange between partners around conferences and between conferences were used, though maybe a bit modestly and maybe mostly at the bilateral level.

The project reporting at different levels in the social dialogue projects has produced a wealth of information on social dialogue processes and reporting is particularly focussed on the successes that have been achieved, while difficulties and bottlenecks receive less attention. This lack of attention in the SD reports to processes that did not go so well, is posing a limit to the capacity to learn from these processes in the future. Good learning would require not only looking at and trying to replicate best practices but also avoiding mistakes and strive for constant improvements.

Comparative advantages and limitations of different social dialogue approaches and extent to which training and skills development have promoted consensus- and compromise seeking, negotiations & dispute handling to reach immediate objectives

On methodology and reach:

- Leadership and senior technical staff of national partners has been reached in many training activities and this intensive involvement of senior staff and leaders is also clearly visible in increased capacity and a change in attitude and behaviour in social dialogue processes. In Colombia this reach was extended to the regional level (in Cauca) and in the sugar and mining sectors, though not successfully in the flower sector;
- While the changes in capacity and behaviour obtained at the national level are clear, reach to companies has been limited and reaching out to more companies will also require significantly more time, by increased involvement of trainers that have been trained in ToT's and by organising more workers and companies by both the workers' and employers' organisations;
- Awareness raising on basic issues related to social dialogue and collective bargaining and conflict resolution, has had an effect among shop stewards and managers at the company levels though more in-depth information provision and training is needed to make these shop stewards and managers capable to train others at the company level;
- Resuming the above, investments done by the project at national centres levels have been productive, but now need more follow up at the sector and company level. The fact that in the initial stage of the SD project in EAC the sector projects were discontinued in hindsight is seen as a positive thing, because it created a stronger focus of the project on some key aspects of social dialogue, while the addition of sectoral projects might have diluted this focus. But now at the end of the SD project in EAC, many partners indicate that it would be a good and logical step to also include sector level actions, as was done more systematically in the SD project in Colombia.

On contents:

- Social dialogue and conflict handling at first instance are seen as time consuming but with more experience in these processes, participants also see clearly that there are enormous gains in time and effort for all parties involved;
- This is particularly clear in developing the proposals for ADR in some East African countries and in Colombia, where the potential cost- and time gains are clear for all parties, including for the Government (the industrial courts that will get less conflicts on their agenda, diminishing their backlogs). It is still early to assess these effects, as the ADR model is not yet systematically implemented at company level and recognised and secured in legislation. An interesting additional non-planned effect, as seen for example in Zanzibar, is that awareness raising and installation of pilot ADR committees at the company level has had an effect on reducing conflicts in the company already at the manager-worker relationship level: In the Serena Hotel only one conflict was handled (and resolved) by the ADR committee in one year and no conflicts at all had reached the industrial court in that same year;
- On the other hand, the Zanzibar experience with ADR committees also shows a weakness: only 5 of the 10 pilot ADR committees in the past years are still operational. Possibilities to expand are limited, because trade unions and employer organisations have only a limited number of members. In the Hotel sector. Most companies and workers are not organised and still resort to legal processes in the industrial court, lawyers being the most important beneficiaries by gaining fees from dragging on conflicts for a long period of time;
- In practice, ADR is a preferred and first-step conflict resolution mechanism. The word “Alternative” in the ADR acronym might not help to make this point clear. In fact, the company level ADR mechanisms should (also legally) be the preferred mechanisms. There is nothing alternative about that. The goal should be working on this mechanism as the primary level and mechanism where conflicts are attempted to be solved;
- TVET is another important priority indicated in both EAC and Colombia. Some partners in EAC choose it as priority, but in practice TVET is also on the agenda of unions and employers that didn’t prioritise it. The policy and institutional embedding of TVET is complex and this requires multiple partners to be involved. There is a call to move TVET to Ministry of Labour, but that solution might not solve the challenges of linking education with the labour market. It really requires both Ministries to be part of the dialogue. A multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder approach is needed to adequately address this priority;
- National social partners generally show a keen interest in developing sectoral CBA’s, but the buy-in at company level, for example as seen in Uganda at company union level, is not always strong. At this level, both workers and managers interviewed showed fear of loss of influence and control and they also showed fear that sector CBA’s will not respect the diversity of companies. More awareness raising and training on this subject is needed to be able to get stronger support for sector CBA’s at company level. It is not clear if this same challenge exists to the same extent in all countries, as only a few company visits could be realised in this evaluation, only in Uganda and Zanzibar;

- Sectoral vis-à-vis national minimum wage has been an important (and still not resolved) discussion and process in Uganda and it also features highly on the agenda in Colombia. The social partners in Uganda have a clear preference for sectoral Minimum Wage and have been consistently pushing on legislation of this matter and came close until the president did not approve of the bill and returned it to parliament. The final outcome will depend on re-tableting the proposal of partners and ministry of labour or approval of an alternative national minimum wage bill from a private member of parliament. This Ugandan example shows clearly how slow and time-consuming legislative change processes can be.

Social dialogue in adverse environments:

- The processes in Rwanda and Burundi show that social dialogue is an important contribution to establishing and consolidating peace, also at the national and general level. The same effects are noted in electoral times, such as in Kenya, where it was witnessed that after the 2017 elections, COTU and FKE jointly were spearheading the public pressure on president Uhuru and opposition leader Raila to enter into dialogue and this contributed to the famous 'handshake' of these leaders. These actions will be repeated for the next upcoming elections. This example shows clearly that social dialogue can contribute to more peaceful election processes;
- Central political control is slowing down progress of social dialogue as it is more difficult to build trust and exercise transparency. The slower progress in Rwanda, therefore, should not be primarily seen as a weakness of the SD project and the partners in this country. On the contrary; the fact that social dialogue is gradually being strengthened is a remarkable result of the good performance partners in this country. Similarly, in Colombia, the pressure of the trade unions [and on this aspect the trade union action is collective, also including CUT) on the Government to maintain the peace process in this country. It is now considered as a matter of utmost priority for the workers' and employers organisations, that fear that the peace process is being dismantled by the current president.

Overall comparative assessment of results of project:

- As shown in the table in annex 6, in all countries significant progress and results have been booked in all countries.
- The most remarkable examples of progress are Zanzibar and Uganda, where best practices in the development of ADR and minimum wage instruments and proposals can be identified;
- Tanzania mainland, Kenya and Rwanda have booked considerable progress in developing CBA formats and procedures and in Kenya, COTU and FKE have submitted a joint ADR guideline to the General Assembly as part of the reform of the Industrial Relations Charter. These partners are also included in the newly established joint national Technical Working Committee. These are good results, though it should be recognised that these were booked in countries that already have a long history of social dialogue and many SD mechanisms are well developed and institutionalised;

- Rwanda is struggling in accelerating social dialogue in its country, but it is now advancing, which is a remarkable result considering that this country is still recovering from a total breakdown of society only 25 years ago. The social partners are now embarked upon a constructive process of mutual cooperation and dialogue. It should be recognised that the Private Sector Federation is not a typical employers' organisation, as in other countries in the region and this requires more time in initial explorations. Progress in Burundi is also significant, most notably in terms of a new Labour-Code with significant joint inputs from COSYBU and AEB. This progress is also remarkable because of political challenges and the poor level of institutionalisation in this country;
- In Colombia, results were booked in the establishment of departmental subcommittees for wage and labour policies in Bogotá, Cundinamarca, Valle del Cauca and Cesar, although embedding in national policies is not ensured. Good progress was booked in the development of soft skills in conflict resolution and collective bargaining and in identifying best practices in social dialogue CBA. These were documented and distributed among the membership of ANDI and CTC and CGT. Good examples of CBA and conflict resolution at the workplace could be identified during the fieldwork in this evaluation in the sectors of mining and sugar in the Cauca region, while these effects were not achieved in the flower sector.

C. Efficiency

Cost-effectiveness relation of technical assistance and activities compared to benefits.

No specific costs-effectiveness and value for money analysis could be conducted in the analysis. However, it is possible to provide a number of findings and conclusions that relate to aspects of efficiency in project implementation:

- Value for money of Technical Assistance (TA) is generally perceived high by the partners and the TA missions are highly appreciated and no single complaint was reported in documents or mentioned in interviews. The high level of relevant expertise and experience of the DTDA and DI experts was generally acknowledged;
- International TA missions were in some cases combined with local and regional experts and national experts. Recruitment of national experts was done mostly in commissioning research activities. According to national partners, deploying more regional and local experts (also from other partners in the region) might improve possibilities to contextualise TA and provide more practical local examples. It could also reduce costs of missions and increase flexibility in planning of training events and capacity development activities;
- National and regional conferences were regularly organised, though there were usually short in duration (1 or a few days), resulting in relative high costs of mobilisation of persons compared to the available time for exchange and exposure. In EAC, an opportunity was identified by partners to combine conferences and training events with more exposure activities to local

contexts, while rotating events between the countries. This could have significant positive effects on exchange and synergy between national partners without a massive increase in costs;

- The activity-based budgeting and payments applied in the SD project were flagged by most partners as a factor reducing efficiency in project implementation, because regularly activities had to be postponed and changed. A procedure of advance payments might be beneficial for efficiency and flexibility in planning, though associated risks of accountability towards funding partners still need to be assessed. This procedure, in fact, was introduced in the final year of project implementation in 2019, and therefore it is still too early to assess the effects of this introduction at the time of realisation of this evaluation.

D. Sustainability

Local ownership of projects and involvement as experienced by social partners.

The social partners in Colombia and EAC show a very high appreciation of ownership and involvement in the SD projects. The SD project design and planning and the behaviour of DTDA and DI in promoting and enabling local and regional ownership is considered a best practice that should be followed by many other development partners.

The partnership of DTDA-DI in the project implementation and their joint missions and also mirroring this in Colombia and EAC with the national and regional project partners, is considered a best practice and model for other social dialogue projects in region. A remarkable result is that both employers and workers equally appreciate this ownership and in establishing and signing MoU's between them also try to continue with this practice, which can be observed by the growing number and scope of MoU's signed between the social partners in EAC.

The ILO structurally involves the tri-partite partners in its projects, though this involvement generally might be more at the level of consulting and implementation by all partners and less as a process of co-creation and co-implementation. The DTDA-DI social dialogue project, where all partners co-owned and co-managed and implemented the project, seems to be a fundamental innovation and should be taken as a reference for future social dialogue projects of other partners.

At the end of the SD projects, many partners now identify a risk of returning to the previous approach of supporting individual partners in social dialogue by their respective partners and in specific countries, which would mean a loss of bi-partism in project implementation and in the case of EAC this would also compromise regional exchange and cooperation between partners. This risk is also seen by external partners and stakeholders interviewed, who express the wish to see more of the type of SD projects as implemented by DTDA and DI.

Government partners were not formally involved in initiatives as the SD projects were primarily designed as a bi-partite project. This was done to ensure that workers and employers could reach

joint positions and solutions on relevant issues in Social Dialogue. Government involvement could have interfered negatively in this bi-lateral building of relations and trust, particularly when relations with the Government are more antagonistic. Now that more experience in joint positioning and solution seeking is achieved among the workers and employers, the limited participation of the Governments in the project and actions focusing more on tri-partite social dialogue mechanisms and institutions, becomes more urgent, now that it is regularly seen that the joint positions are not yet effectively translated in labour related policies, legislation and regulations.

Use of lessons learned & social dialogue competencies gained in future by partners & DTDA/DI

Although it is still early to assess, as the SD projects are not yet finalised, first signs of use of lessons learned can already be seen in partners' strategic plans and in MoU's that are signed and being signed between social partners in different countries. These MoU's are also more comprehensive and thus contribute to a more intensive and encompassing collaboration between the social partners.

Another example in which the use of lessons can be seen is in the development of joint position papers and researches on subjects to prepare such papers in many of the SD implementation countries. In both EAC and in Colombia joint experiences in the SD project implementation have also been translated in the development of guidelines and methodological suggestions in conducting CBA and conflict resolution processes.

The continuation of these joint practices still needs further consolidation and growing expertise at the level of national social partners and particularly further trickling down of this expertise in lower-level and decentralised organisations at the sector and company level become a higher priority. This will require continued involvement and support of external partners such as DTDA and DI, preferably working in consortium to ensure that capacities of employers' and workers' organisation are strengthened in tandem, avoiding disequilibrium between the capacities of each of them.

Sustainable effects of joint actions, mediation & collaboration between social partners on the labour relations climate and on conciliating & reducing industrial unrest and labour disputes

The effects of joint actions of employers' and workers' organisations on industrial and labour conflicts is not yet possible to measure. This is because most experiences are still recent. But this is also caused by the fact that these conflicts (and their resolution) depend on many factors and to a large extent also on economic growth itself. A larger private sector will also show a larger number and greater diversity of conflicts. Therefore, one should be cautious in interpreting a decrease in number of conflicts handled by the industrial courts as an indicator for successful conflict resolution at the company level. And, additionally, in some countries, such as Kenya, Uganda and Zanzibar, it will probably still take years before the industrial courts can get rid of their backlogs.

In some pilots, effects at company level can be seen in CBA's signed and in ADR committees established and in the appreciation of dialogue and mediation by the direct stakeholders involved. Some of these effects at the company level already occur at the manager-worker relations, where the existence of an ADR committee already is helpful in creating awareness among managers and workers that conflicts preferably are solved at the lowest possible level. CBA's and installation of ADR committees often are accompanied by an increased effort in reaching to the company and work floor with awareness raising and training activities. However, as noted before, these effects are still limited to a relatively small number of companies.

At the level of the national workers' and employers' organisations, the effects of the SD projects are sustainable and behaviour of these actors has changed. This could be witnessed in the joint meetings with the social partners in all countries and at regional level and this refers both to the self-assessment of own behaviour and performance as well as assessment of the other party's behaviour and performance. At the level of all participating social partners at the national level in EAC and Colombia and regional partners in EAC, without exception these assessments were positive. At regional and sector level in Colombia this could also be witnessed between the social partners in the sugar sector in the Valle del Cauca department. In confidential individual meetings of the evaluators with the respective social partners in all countries there was not a single case in which dissatisfaction in the behaviour and performance of other partners was voiced, though sometimes challenges were identified. In East Africa this related to the fact that workers' organisations have a longer history of existence and generally more experience in dealing with projects and L&A processes, including social dialogue. Some of the employers' organisations are facing a steeper learning curve in these processes and possibly need some finetuning of their mandates to engage in a proper workers-employers dialogue. A common bottleneck felt by both social partners is the fact their membership is still limited, resulting in limitations to further replicate and roll out the SD experiences. At company and sector level, replication still requires a significantly larger reach of the projects, train the trainer and cascading capacity development approaches. The limited membership also results in limited structural budgets for the social partners to finance these activities, creating an on ongoing dependence on international development partners to support these activities.

Institutionalisation of project actions into national policies, collective/local agreements, structures, codes of conduct, MoU's, guidelines etc.

Institutionalisation of results in legislation and procedures is the weakest element in the social dialogue project. Such institutionalisation has happened only to a limited extent at national level. This was also recognised in the design and planning of the project, where project indicators went as far as the submission of joint position papers by the social partners, which was done in several occasions. Adoption of proposals in legislation or institutionalisation in programmes, structures and regulation was considered ultimate impact of the SD projects, which is in the sphere of concern of

the SD project but not within the sphere of control and only to a small extent in the sphere of influence. The experiences in the SD projects show that processes for legal change are very time-consuming. Two good examples of this are: The Sectoral Minimum Wage Bill that was worked on by the social partners in Uganda since the start of the project in 2015 is still in the pipeline; the departmental sub-committees for Coordination of Wages and Employment Policies in Colombia are still operating without proper embedding in national legislation and structures as the national committee is not yet established. These examples point to a need for more close involvement of government partners in SD projects and working in and on tri-partite social dialogue mechanisms and structures in addition to the bi-partite ones. This might be considered in the future design of a next generation of SD projects in EAC and Colombia, where bi-partite social dialogue experience is already built. In other context, with no such prior experience, it could still be a proper approach to start social dialogue projects first a bi-partite constellation before moving on to tri-partite constellations.

At international level in the EAC region, a significant bottleneck encountered in the SD project is the lack of adherence and compliance of countries to EAC decisions, recommendations and measures. This compliance at the national level is not reliable, particularly not in Tanzania, that shows a different belief in EAC than the other countries in the community. Particularly the axis of Kenya, Uganda and Rwanda is moving forward with the integration process and Common Market Protocol (CMP) with high speed, creating more favourable conditions for developing and implementing proposals for harmonisation and opening of borders etc.

As noted already before, but also relevant for institutionalisation, a big achievement at the level of national partners and the regional partners in EAC are the MoUs between workers' and employers' organisations, that are a historically new phenomenon in this region. It is also noteworthy to state that these MoU's are gradually moving from specific case-based cooperation to institutional cooperation.

More well-established models and practices in CBA are institutional practices that exist in most countries, but this doesn't mean that these are applied in practice and at all levels. In general, in spite of gradual increase of numbers of CBA's at the company level and a small number of sectoral CBA's (in Kenya and Rwanda), the overall number of CBA's signed in the EAC region are still low, considering the number of companies and workers covered by these CBA's. In Colombia this number is slightly higher. In all countries the social partners face the challenge to expand the number of CBA's among companies and sectors. Particularly institutionalisation of CBA's in the informal sector and for new groups such as migrant workers are growing challenges. The reach of the workers' and employer organisations, as also observed under effectiveness, needs to be enlarged and particularly at the company level, practical skills in CBA negotiation and settlement needs to be improved, replicated and expanded. This is a requirement for further institutionalisation of CBA's not only in labour law but in company level practice.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

On relevance

12. Social Dialogue between social partners is a long-term process. In European countries, such as Denmark, this process is ongoing already for over a century. In other regions, such as in East Africa and Colombia, it is more recent, though in most countries, experiences with social dialogue and bi- and tri-partite social dialogue mechanisms and institutions also go back for many decades. Due to political and social unrest and disruptions, social dialogue has been interrupted in several countries, particularly in Colombia, Rwanda and Burundi, to a significant extent, but it has never ceased to exist. Workers' organisations, in most countries already have a long history, while in several occasions, employers' organisations have a shorter history, but over the past decade both social partners have been around and participating in bi- and tri-partite social dialogue mechanisms and processes, though not always consistently and constructively. The Social Dialogue projects in East Africa and in Colombia funded under the DANIDA Better Labour Markets facility, have been built on this reality and thus have been nurturing further consolidation of bi-partite social dialogue mechanisms in recently more favourable economic and policy environments. DTDA and DI have been providing support to strengthen workers' and employers' organisations to become more effective and constructive in social dialogue, contributing to political stability, economic growth and economic and political integration at the level of the East African Community (EAC). This was done in innovative way by joint projects of DTDA and DI in Denmark, bringing together their homologue partners at the country level in EAC and Colombia and in EAC also at the regional level. This joint project and programming approach in social dialogue is unprecedented in development projects. The combination of building innovation on historical antecedents and experience in the Social Dialogue projects of DTDA and DI is highly relevant.
13. The Social Dialogue projects in EAC and Colombia focused on strengthening social partners' capacities in bi-partite social dialogue, while interacting with national and regional Governments. The conscious choice for working on bi-partite social dialogue by DTDA and DI, has proven to be correct. Due to political and social contexts in the project countries, at some points in time very unfavourable for social dialogue between workers and employers, the social partners were in need to strengthen their own capacities and to build trust through coordination and cooperation with each other. This was best done in a project design where bi-partite cooperation between DTDA and DI on the one hand served as inspiration and example to partners in EAC and Colombia to engage in bilateral cooperation and slowly but consistently build trust. This has been beneficial for the visibility and credibility of social partners in the broader policy environment and interacting with Government counterparts in tri-partite social dialogue. With the experience gained, the time is now ripe to step up the experience and further consolidate it at tri-partite level, increasing effects at the policy level, considering that most policy effects of the Social Dialogue projects thus far are still in the process to materialise.

14. The Social Dialogue projects in each country and at the regional level have chosen a clear focus on a limited amount (mostly 2) priority issues in social dialogue, jointly selected by both social partners in each country. This has had two very important advantages. The ownership of the social partners of the projects is very strong and the project activities are strongly embedded in strategic programming at the individual and collective level. Additionally, the efforts of the social partners were consistent and long-term, which proved to be necessary considering the time and effort needed to produce change in labour related legislation and procedures.
15. The regional approach chosen in EAC and the international dimension of the projects in EAC and Colombia by cooperating in a twinning relation between national and regional partners and Danish partner is useful and adds value to specific national-level experience. In the first place, this is done by enabling exchange of expertise between partners, not only in a North-South relation but also in a South-South partnership, extending also between workers' and employers' organisations. The projects have enabled the exchange of experiences and expertise between national partners through conferences and training activities in the projects, though this possibly could have been done more regularly and consistently. In the second place, the international exchange and support provided by the Danish social partners has increased visibility of the social partners at country level and has also increased their political clout at national and regional level. This was particularly the case in EAC where all the key national level social partners participated, but less strongly in Colombia, due to the decision of CUT, the largest workers' organisation in the country, to not participate in the SD project in this country.

On effectiveness

16. The Social Dialogue projects in the different countries have generated significant results in terms of policy proposals, models for implementation of CBA and conflict resolution and particularly in increased trust between the national social partners, as is shown in the previous chapters. However, this evaluation also shows that there are still significant challenges faced by both the workers' and employers' organisations to further roll out and replicate the experience and lessons learned at the sector and particularly company level. The most significant constraint felt by the partners is their limited reach in the countries: not all sectors are covered by the social partners, as their membership is limited. This is particularly the case in the informal economy where both workers' and employers' organisations are still only covered to a limited extent, in spite of some significant efforts by some partners, particularly by NOTU in Uganda, but also by COTU in Kenya and COSYBU in Burundi. In sectors, where the partners are present, the membership is often limited to a relatively small number of companies. While the national social partners in the SD projects have clearly shown improved capacities and performance, this is much less the case at the company level. This will still require significant efforts by the social partners to increase their membership and to replicate training (using Trainer of Trainer (ToT) approaches) at company level, among managers and workers.

17. The originally anticipated sector-level social dialogue components of the project in EAC were discontinued soon after its start. This, in hindsight, was not bad because it enabled the project to focus support activities on the level of national social partners and on some clear specific priority issues identified by these partners. This focus has improved effectiveness of the projects, by not dispersing too many actions among too many actors. However, at the same time, both the Colombia and several EAC experiences show that in developing proposals and models, in practice often a sector approach is chosen, because this allows a more practical approach and limits the amount of effort in conducting research. This was seen in the countries visited in this evaluation, in the sector focus chosen in dispute settlement mechanisms in Zanzibar (hotels), in sector Minimum Wage in Uganda (agriculture, manufacturing, construction and hotels) and in social dialogue and CBA in Colombia (sugar and mining). The sector level has proven to be relevant for CBA processes and is considered by partners in several countries, though a more focused approach on the sector-level can be useful in increasing impact at that level and at the same in more effective reach out to the company level in specific sectors.
18. Attention in reporting on the SD projects on processes that did not progress well, such as the sectoral social dialogue initiatives in EAC and Colombia, or results that were not obtained, though not absent has been at best a bit modest. This lack of attention to failures and things that can be improved has limited the capacity to learn from mistakes, instead of learning from best practices, which has been a strong focus in the projects.

On efficiency

19. Partners, generally, are satisfied with the implementation arrangements and efficiency in project implementation. Only one mayor bottleneck was encountered: The projects in EAC and Colombia applied annual planning and budgeting of activities, but at the same time transfer of project funds for specific activities were subject to the submission, processing and approval of specific activity budgets. Many partners have indicated that this has slowed project implementation and activity planning and some of the activities with international consultants had to be postponed considerably (because particularly international missions are more difficult to plan). These limitations were recognised by DTDA and DI in the last year of the project implementation in EAC and half-yearly advance payments were introduced. To what extent this change has improved satisfaction of partners is too early to assess at the time of realisation of this evaluation.
20. Project implementation has been slower in some countries, such as in Tanzania and Kenya, due to a variety of reasons, though also because of commitment and performance of the national partners in realising the planned project activities. In other countries, such as Rwanda and Burundi, much progress was booked by the social partners, but the base-line situation in these countries didn't allow for the same results in social dialogue as in other countries. In Zanzibar,

Uganda and in Colombia, progress and results have been considerable and this was particularly thanks to joint partners' efforts, while in these countries the external environment was also more enabling. This variety in progress and results obtained in the project, shows that commitment and performance of the implementing partners is an important factor in achieving progress and results, but also should be seen and interpreted in their local contexts.

On sustainability

21. The social partners in EAC and Colombia show a strong ownership of the Social Dialogue projects and this is thanks to the very strong and consistent approach in the project and the behaviour of DTDA and DI to allow all national partners choosing their own country-specific priorities and to involve them consistently in planning, reporting and exchange of experience. Several of the MoU established between social partners on specific project activities are now in the process of being expanded to the institutional level covering a much wider range of subjects. This is a clear indicator of ownership and a guarantee for institutional and organisational sustainability of the project activities and results, because these are embedding in organisational strategies and joint MoU's. The MoU's between social partners show a potential for further continuation of social dialogue at the bilateral level.
22. The project experiences in both EAC and Colombia show that changing of policies, legislation and regulatory frameworks at the national policy level take considerable time, often even many years. Some of the labour laws in project countries date from several decades ago and have not reviewed. Projects of law, sometimes after years of careful preparation and even with the support of the Ministry of Labour can be unsuccessful, when the top leadership in a country is not in favour of signing off, such as was the case in Uganda on the sectoral minimum wage proposal forwarded by the social partners. Sustainability of results at the policy level requires a long-term vision and continuous efforts, and this is not often recognised in support projects. The time-frame of the Social Dialogue projects under the Labour Market framework of DANIDA of 5 years, even while it seems long, in the light of obtaining tangible policy results is still too short.

5. FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations in this final section are numbered to indicate their alignment with the ten conclusions in the previous section. Two recommendations have combined and integrated two conclusions in one, resulting in eight final recommendations.

1. DTDA and DI are recommended to continue their joint cooperation within the strategic framework with the Danish Government and to investigate possibilities to jointly develop follow-up social dialogue projects with joined social partners abroad within this framework and beyond. The innovative character of a joint workers' and employers' organisations initiative supporting homologue partners in other countries, still needs more time to produce sustainable results and deserves to be further replicated and expanded. In addition, to work with available funds under the Danish strategic framework, DTDA and DI could share this experience with other social partners in Northern European countries and investigate if other social partners could join and follow-up on this initiative to allow for continued support to strengthening social dialogue in East Africa and Colombia. (Conclusions 1 and 11)
2. DTDA, DI and their national social partners in a next phase of the Social Dialogue projects or in future similar projects should consider to include government partners and, in addition to strengthening bi-partite social dialogue between workers and employers, also work on strengthening tri-partite social dialogue. This is needed to ensure that joint proposals of workers and employers can more easily and successfully find their way in government institutions and policies. The best approach seems to be on the one hand to combine continued bilateral social dialogue with a strong lobby and advocacy component and on the other hand to also work, where possible and appropriate, in tri-partite forums and mechanisms for social dialogue.
3. DTDA, DI and their national partners are recommended to continue with the approach in social dialogue projects to identify joint workers' and employers' issues as priorities in a joint cooperation, with clear benefits for both partners. This will ensure a continued ownership of local partners. Several of the priorities chosen in past still require continued efforts, such as: CBA (including sectoral CBA), TVET, Alternative Dispute Resolution (including also making it into the preferred mode of conflict resolution). Possible new priorities that are identified by the social partners in EAC and Colombia are: informalisation of labour relations, including precarious work and informal economy, migrant workers, (conclusions 3 and 10)
4. DTDA and DI are recommended to further explore possibilities to continue and expand the regional set-up of the Social Dialogue project in EAC, as a project with a regional component and several national components (possibly reintroducing also sectoral components). This set-up increases relevance of the project in regional political and economic integration process and it also enables mobilising and pooling more resources and knowledge at the regional level

between partners. Such an approach could possibly be also relevant in other African, Asian and Latin American regional economic communities.

5. DTDA, DI and their social partners at national level, should complement their efforts in social dialogue initiatives with an increased effort in organising workers and employers and to expand the membership base of both organisations. The limited membership of the organisations, across and within sectors, limits possibilities for replication and rolling out among companies and workers, which is needed for nation-wide and sustainable impact. DTDA and DI with their respective bilateral partners will need to continue their long-term efforts in organising workers and employers. This necessary combination of efforts in organising workers and employers and in promoting and supporting joint social dialogue projects, might require to prioritise working in those countries where both DTDA and DIA are interested in working with their national partners for the long-term.
6. For possible future projects in Social Dialogue in EAC and Colombia, DTDA, DI and their social partners, should, now that experience in regional and national social dialogue is build, also consider to work at sector level. This level can strengthen the bridge between national organisations, member unions and individual companies. And this level is also a possibility to achieve results that can benefit a wider group of companies and workers, when this is not (yet) possible at the national level.
7. DTDA and DI and their national and regional partners in the SD projects are recommended to pay equal attention to good and best practices and progress obtained in project implementation and to failures and problems encountered. This will increase the capacity of all implementing partners to learn from the project experiences for further rolling out and replication of social dialogue projects in EAC, Colombia and other countries and regions.
8. DTDA and DI, in dialogue with DANIDA and possible funders of future social dialogue projects, should investigate possibilities for allowing local partners to benefit more from longer-term planning and budgeting horizons, allowing for longer (at least half-yearly) time-frames to plan and implement activities. This recently introduced advance payments to implementing partners, should be continued and expanded, while guaranteeing compliance with minimum accountability requirements.
9. DTDA and DI are recommended to introduce performance and results-based management principles in their project design and implementation. This can be mechanism to direct scarce financial resources to those countries, parties and activities that show more perspectives for progress and results. At the same time this performance-based mechanism can be beneficial to stimulate performance of partners, when they observe that commitment and good performance can lead to more financial resources.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: TOR EXTERNAL EVALUATION SOCIAL-DIALOGUE IN COLOMBIA AND EAST AFRICA

Introduction and background

In 2012, the Danish Trade Union Development Agency (DTDA) (formerly named LO/FTF Council) and the Confederation of Danish Industry (DI) entered into collaboration with a view to promote and improve bi-partite industrial relations between social partners within the East African Community (EAC) region. A two-year pilot project funded by the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA/DANIDA) was launched and implemented from 2012 to 2015, focusing on aspects of free movement of workers across the EAC-region. Joint policy recommendations were developed and used for policy advocacy at Regional EAC-level as well as national level in the five EAC Partner States (Kenya, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania (incl. Zanzibar), Rwanda and Burundi).

The collaboration between employers' organisations and trade union organisations at regional and national levels within the EAC was successful and contributed towards strengthening bi-and tripartite social dialogue. Similarly, the national strategy and partnership approach have brought together "both sides of the table" in the East African countries to promote a consensus seeking approach, settle conflicts effectively through dialogue and negotiations, improve framework conditions for business development, and encourage peaceful industrial relations and decent work. In doing so, the strategy aims at displaying the positive contributions that social dialogue can make to create both job-rich and inclusive growth. With the assistance of Danish experiences, social dialogue is considered an important element to create stable and well-functioning labour markets to pave the way for industrial peace, increased productivity, decent working conditions and poverty reduction. In 2015, MFA/DANIDA launched the Better Labour Markets facility with a view to encourage Danish labour market actors to join forces and develop targeted, innovative projects in collaboration with local partners to contribute to inclusive growth and decent jobs in developing countries. Based on previous experience from the pilot project in East Africa, DTDA and DI jointly applied for funding for two projects:

"Social Dialogue for Growth and Decent Jobs in Colombia" (2016-2019)

"Social dialogue in East Africa" (2015-2018)

Colombia:

The preparatory work for the Colombian project was initiated in 2013 when DTDA published a report on the situation of the Colombian trade union movement and the possibilities to increase the cooperation with Denmark. The decision of the Danish government to establish an embassy in Bogotá in 2014, headed by the Minister for Trade and Development Cooperation, further fuelled the interest to initiate cooperation on labour market issues to improve conditions for increased commercial ties between Denmark and Colombia.

The overall strategy has been to bring social partners together and create space for exchange of experiences and consultations. The project works on enterprise levels with a focus on soft skills development of the youth, mediation and conflict resolution. This is done through training seminars of social partners, ANDI, CTC and CGT, where union representatives will be trained in mediation techniques, conflict resolution and labour laws in order to prepare them to enter in a structured dialogue with employers and enterprise managers. Likewise, enterprises will receive parallel trainings that will prepare them to enter into consultations with union representatives. Local capacity building of social partners is essential in order to bring both parties closer to each other. Moreover, training of 15 skilled trainers will replicate training on a large scale to e.g. youngsters, so they become self-motivated, confident decision makers, and become contributors to creating environments of democratic involvement, negotiation and consensus building. Subsequently, social partners will have developed training materials for business owners and labour union representatives focussing on best practices on social dialogue on work places.

On policy level, the aim has been to formulate realistic policy proposals of mutual interests for both employers and workers to support a more stable labour market characterised by decent jobs and sustainable businesses. Social partners focus on the Permanent Commission for Consultation under the Ministry of Labour. In formulating policy proposals and providing inputs to the Ministry of Labour, local experiences of social dialogue are documented and used as best practices.

East Africa:

The incentives behind this action used the momentum after 12 of the most representative and independent employers' and trade unions in East Africa joined forces in 2013 for the first time in history. After having approached DTDA and DI, the East African partners decided to synchronise their lobby and advocacy work to remove barriers of free movement. In East Africa, the project operates on regional, national and enterprise level.

Overall, the main strategy has been to bring social partners together and create fora and space for joint consultations, coordination and exchange of experiences to strengthen and coordinate advocacy and lobby of governments on national policy and socio-economic development issues. On a regional level, the strategy has been to establish social dialogue fora and a round table for social partners i.e. regional apexes EAEO and EATUC and national workers and employers' confederations from the six countries. Through these fora, the partners collaborate and develop joint positions to qualify and influence tripartite social dialogue with national governments, as well as the EAC institutions, and other regional stakeholders.

The strategy has been to rethink the traditional and (often) adversarial labour relations between workers and employers' organisations by building capacity within national and sectoral social partners jointly to deepen their cooperation in the labour market and to understand the strategic value of collective bargaining, skills development, dispute prevention etc. To illustrate, the aim has been for partners to produce bipartite agreements in form of MoUs, codes of good conduct, joint training materials, collection of evidence-based labour market data etc. Likewise, lobby and advocacy has been a strategic priority backed up by conducting public national/local sensitisation meetings and campaigns on decent work and employment. The strategy has been to meet key government stakeholders, government line ministries and national media while at the same time disseminate relevant materials to constituents at workplaces.

Organisational setup

Monitoring and coordination with national partners have been institutionalised into sub-regional steering committee and national annual/quarterly meetings with DI and DTDA. Both projects were initially planned for three years, from ultimo 2015 to ultimo 2018, but the Columbia project was prolonged with six months ultimo June 2019. Another no-cost extension has been submitted for ultimo 2019 to assure appropriate time for monitoring and termination of prolonged activities.

The EAC project was extended to ultimo 2019 caused by unforeseen delays in project implementation. The coming external evaluation examines and analyses progress, main achievements and lessons learned from two different project designs with similar ‘social dialogue’ strategies applied in two different geographic areas and political contexts.

- Colombia: DTDA, DI and three social partners: ANDI, CTC and CGT. Strategic partners: The Colombian Ministry of Labour.
- East Africa: DTDA, DI and social partners: national employer organisations, national trade union centres and two regional apex organisations East African Employers organisation (EAEO) and East African Trade Union Confederation (EATUC).

Objectives of the action:

Colombia:

Development Objective:

Contribute to a more stable and well-functioning labour market in Colombia paving the way for inclusive growth, decent jobs and sustainable enterprises.

Immediate Objective 1:

Policy level: Strengthen the engagement and institutional set-up of social partners in bi- and tripartite labour market dialogue.

Immediate Objective 2:

Enterprise level: Strengthen social dialogue competencies at enterprise level with a focus on soft skills development of the youth, labour rights, mediation and conflict resolution.

EAC:

Development Objective:

Social dialogue in the EAC region has been improved with more focus on decent work, consensus and constructive agreements and effective dispute handling.

Immediate Objective 1:

Strengthened institutional capacity of social partners in East Africa to advocate and raise awareness about free movement of labour and productivity.

Immediate Objective 2:

Bi-partite social dialogue mechanisms have been strengthened to improve decent working conditions and productivity in private industries.

Objectives of the external evaluation

The evaluation must reflect DAC criteria.

- e. Project relevance and impact
 - i. Identify and assess key lessons learned by social partners and to which extent objectives and strategies of these projects adequately address bi- and tripartite social dialogue priorities of key partner/beneficiaries;
 - ii. To what extent has the projects strengthened bi-and tripartite social dialogue mechanisms? To which extent have partners been motivated to re-think labour relations into more cooperation, consensus and compromise-seeking consultations and negotiations?).
- f. Effectiveness of different approaches to social dialogue:
 - i. Assess best practices, prospects and consequences of using inputs from Danish/international external resource persons (either single vs. bipartite missions);
 - ii. Assess comparative advantages and limitations of different approaches e.g. on how to bring social partners together in otherwise adversarial environments and to which extent training and skills development have promoted consensus-and compromise seeking consultations, negotiations and dispute handling to reach immediate objectives?
- g. Efficiency:
 - i. Assess whether costs of technical assistance and activities are reasonable to benefits.
- h. Sustainability
 - i. Assess local ownership of projects and involvement as experienced by social partners.
 - ii. Assess to what extent lessons learned and social dialogue competencies gained are likely to be used in future by partners and DTDA/DI.
 - iii. Assess to what extent joint actions, mediation and collaboration between social partners have brought about a better labour relations climate to apply a more robust stance in conciliating and reducing industrial unrest and labour disputes;
 - iv. Assess to what extent project actions have been institutionalised into national policies, collective/local agreement structures, codes of good conduct, MoU's, guidelines etc.

Scope of Work

The evaluation should include, but not be limited to the following:

- Review whether the strategic approaches to further collective bargaining and social dialogue with employers has been relevant and successful at organisational levels?
- Assess main lessons learned from the sub-regional and national interventions on how to make social partners aware of the benefits of improved and consensus-seeking social dialogue as well as providing best practices on how to bring social partners together most effectively to

- conduct consensus-seeking negotiations, collective bargaining, bi/tripartite consultations, dispute handling/prevention, joint coordination, policy development, and
- Provide concrete findings and recommendations as input and guidance for the future work of the Danish consortium in other like-minded partner countries.

Methodology

The evaluation will utilise a combination of different methodologies apart from perusal of documents, interviews etc. The evaluation covers East Africa (2 focus countries) and Columbia. The below matrix indicates partners that have been identified for the field work with the aim of reflecting trends and indications rather than only quantitative data:

Region:	Regional (East Africa)	Uganda	Zanzibar	Columbia
East Africa	EATUC EAEO	NOTU FUE	ZATUC ZANEMA	
Columbia				ANDI, CTC and CGT

a) Desk study

Prior to the mission, the consultant will be familiarised with the projects from the outset through a desk study research including all relevant documents in collaboration with DTDA, DI, local partners and sub-regional offices in Colombia and East Africa. The consultant will receive reports on progress and achievements including updated data on the baseline survey from local partners. DTDA, DI and social partners in Colombia and East Africa will make all documents available to the consultant upon signing of contract.

In East Africa, EAEO/EATUC is obliged to collect reports on progress and achievements including updated data on the baseline survey from its national member organisations and submit them to DTDA/DI prior to field visits. In Columbia, DTDA staff will collect similar reports from national partners.

b) Field studies

The methodology behind the external evaluation mainly rests on a field study with semi-structured interviews of selected stakeholders such as trade-union leaders, CEOs, union and employer/enterprise representatives (managers/owners), workers in the labour market, government officials and trainers. Moreover, partner interviews will also be part of the field study. In East Africa, this will take place at a regional stakeholders' conference in East Africa, and in Colombia during meetings with partners and selected participating companies. If necessary, a follow-up via Skype or additional meetings during visits in selected countries. In East Africa, 2 country-field visits will be conducted by the external evaluator in connection with the regional conference.

Overall, the consultant is expected to interview at least three types of respondents:

- Sub-regional secretariats (EATUC/EAEO) representing national workers and employers' organisations;
- Relevant employer and worker representatives at national, regional and workplace levels (executives, negotiators, trainers and local union/enterprise representatives, and
- stakeholders and government authorities (sub-regional, national and if possible provincial).

The evaluation assignment will start with (telephone/skype) meetings between the consultant and DTDA/DI to discuss ToR and fieldwork programme. At the end of the desk study, a mission preparation note will be drafted.

c) De-briefing and follow up

The external evaluator will produce a debriefing note and hold meetings with ANDI, CTC, CGT in Columbia and selected national partners in East Africa as well as DTDA/DI. Immediately after field visits, preliminary findings will be presented to DTDA/DI. This will serve the dual purpose of verification of information in the debriefing note and provide key partners with an opportunity to comment on the de-briefing by the consultant.

Finally, a draft evaluation report will be produced to DTDA and DI, who will comment on the report and lastly, the final evaluation report will be submitted to the DTDA and DI.

The evaluation consultant

Frans van Gerwen, independent consultant.

Time Schedule

To be finalised upon assignment of consultant and confirmation from partners.

Task	When (tentative)
Signing of contract, documents made available to consultant	Mid Aug. 2019
Start-up (skype) meeting between DTDA/DI and consultant to discuss methodology and tentative program for the field work	5/6 Sept. 2019
Desk study	Sept. 2019
Submission of mission preparation note	Prior missions
Field work in Colombia and debriefing meetings	7-10 October 2019
Field work in East Africa and debriefing meetings + Meeting partners at a regional stakeholders' conference in Arusha, Tanzania.	21 Oct - 1 Nov. 2019 (28 – 30 Oct. 2019)
Submission of draft evaluation report to DTDA/DI	10. November 2019
Comments to consultant from DTDA/DI	22. November 2019
Final evaluation report submitted to DTDA and DI in DK	15 December 2019

This work involves approximately 23 days of work by external evaluator.

Outputs

1. Mission preparation note to be presented to DTDA and DI prior to field mission, outlining issues to be addressed during the evaluation as well as a detailed description of methodology and work plan;
2. Debriefing note to be presented to key partners. The debriefing note will outline major findings and recommendations. The debriefing notes will give the opportunity for ANDI, CTC, CGT, EAEO and EATUC to provide their comments prior to the writing of the draft report, and
3. An evaluation report, presenting the findings and conclusions of the evaluation. The report should answer the questions outlined in the ToR, but the consultant should be free to include any additional issues that he/she may find relevant (max. 20 pages).

A draft evaluation report will be finalised and submitted to DTDA and DI for comments no later than ten days upon completion of the mission. Once DTDA and partner organisations have provided feedback on the report (within 12 days, i.e. 22 November 2019), the consultant will finalise and submit the final report to the DTDA no later than 15 December 2019.

List of documents

The following documents will be available for the consultant for the desk research:

- Project documents, implementation plans and budgets;
- Progress reports from sub-regional and national partners;
- Baseline surveys;
- DTDA Labour Market Profiles;
- Relevant narrative reports from partners;
- Policy documents, Social dialogue documents, training materials, brochures etc. developed;
- Any other relevant materials, publications, press clippings etc.

ANNEX 2: LIST OF PEOPLE CONSULTED

DTDA

Mads Bugge Madsen	Director and Colombia Social Dialogue coordination
Kent Jensen	Programme officer, East Africa Social Dialogue coordination and evaluation process coordination
Anne Aamand Sørensen	Social Dialogue project officer
Kristian Lybaek	Head of Sub-regional Office, Arusha DTDA (out-going)

DI

Katrine Ruby Bodiker	Consultant and Colombia Social Dialogue coordination
Jesper Friis	DI officer and East Africa Social Dialogue coordination (in field)
Anders Fugmann	DI Chief Economist and TA East Africa Social Dialogue

Other stakeholders and Union/Federation level Technical Assistance providers

Jorgen Holst	FTF Chief Economist (retired), TA Social Dialogue East Africa and former Arusha Office East Africa LO-FTF coordinator
Thomas Sjøby	Danish Metal Workers and TA East Africa Social Dialogue
Diana Botero	Consultant in Colombia Social Dialogue Project

Colombia

Oscar Walter González, Dagoberto Lasso	Unionist from Ingenio Pichichí (Sintrapichichí) and Colombina (Sintracolombina)	CTC, Valle del Cauca
Alberto Guzmán,	President of Valle del Cauca Subdirective	CGT, Valle del Cauca
Ramiro Mariño Fidalgo Jorge Mario Ríos, Isabel Cristina Díaz, Luis Felipe Ramírez. Analinda Carvajal	Grupo Riopaila-Castilla Representatives, Ingenio Mayagüez Representatives Ingenio Sancarlos Representative	Members ANDI, Valle del Cauca
Maria Camila Agudelo Salazar	Lawyer	ANDI
Rosa Elena Flerez González	General Secretary	CTC
Luis Miguel Morantes Alfonso	President	CTC
Mirtha Rodriguez V.	Director Project Dept.	CTC
Miryam Luz Triana	General Secretary	CGT
Ana Catalina Herrera	CGT Representative for the project	CGT

Francisco Maltés	Department of Social Sectors (Project Dept. at the time of project initiation)	CUT
Joint meeting	representatives	CTC, CGT and ANDI

Zanzibar

Khamis Mohammed	Secretary General	ZATUC
Salahi S. Salahi	Executive Director	ZANEMA
Fatma. L Ally (and staff)	Labour Commissioner	Ministry of Labour, Employment, Elders, Women and Children
Salim Salim	Project Coordinator	ZATUC
Kurwa A. Uledi	Duty Manager	SERENA
Member of ADR committee	Reception	SERENA

Uganda

Group Meeting (briefing)	Representatives of FUE and NOTU	NOTU and FUE
Peter Werikhe	Secretary General	NOTU
Yazidi Baligasima	Coordinator SD project	NOTU
Group Meeting	Technical committees on ADR and minimum wage	NOTU
Jacqueline Banya Acayo	National Programme Officer	ILO, Uganda
Maweije Muddu David	National Coordinator	ILO, Uganda
Apollo Onzoma	Principal Labour Officer	Ministry of Gender, Labour & Social Development
Geoffrey Kabi	Employment Relations Officer	FUE
Julian Nyachwo	Employment Relations Consultant	FUE
Shaffi Manafa	Head Marketing Membership Development and communications	FUE
Group Meeting	Technical committees ADR and minimum wage	FUE
No name	Shop steward	Africana Hotel
No name	Staff of HR Department	Africana Hotel
No name	Shop steward	SERENA Hotel
Mauku R. Moses	Director of Planning & Operations	Uganda Hotels, Food, Tourism, Supermarkets & Allied Workers' Union (HTS-Union)

Arusha conference and regional level

Melance Hakizimana	Vice-President	COSYBU
--------------------	----------------	--------

Valentine Cimpaye	Conseillère	COSYBU
Selemani Bernard	Conseiller principal	EAB
Callixte Nkurunziza	Coordinator	EAB
Biraboneye Africaine	Vice president	CESTRAR
Christine Mutoni	SD project coordinator	CESTRAR
Leon Pierre Rusanganwa	Health programme coordinator	FSP
John Gatsinzi	Coordinator	FSP
Stephen Opiro	Head of Advocacy, Communication & partnerships	FKE
Damaris Muhika	Project Coordinator	COTU
Saidi Shaban Wamba	General Secretary, interim	TUCTA
Meja Kassim Kapalata	Consultant	TUCTA
Suzane Charles Ndomba	Head of Legal Services	ATE
Caroline Khamati Mugalla	Executive Secretary	EATUC
Stephano Mwaiko	Programme officer	EATUC
Salahi Salahi	Executive Director	ZANEMA
Khamis Abdallah Sururu	Director	ZANEMA
Khamis Mohammed	General Secretary	ZATUC
Salim Ali Salim	Coordinator	ZATUC
Yazidi Baligasima	Coordinator	NOTU
Geoffrey Kabi	Employment Relations Officer	FUE
Shaffi Manafa	Head Marketing Membership Development and communications (FUE)	EAEO
Dan Okanya	Coordinator	EAEO
Søren Bjerregaard Jepsen	Head (in-coming)	Sub-regional Office, Arusha DTDA
Lisungu M. Mapunda	Programme Officer	Sub-regional Office, Arusha DTDA
Lucas Leyton	Programme Officer	Sub-regional Office, Arusha DTDA
Alain Christopher Ndayishmiye	Programme Officer	Sub-regional Office, Arusha DTDA
Kent Jensen	Programme officer	HQ, DTDA
Johan Bogh	Representative	HQ, DI
Diana Rutechura	Representative	EAC Secretariat
Mary Makoffu	Director of Social Sectors	EAC Secretariat
Eutropia Ngodi	Consultant	FNV

ANNEX 3: LIST OF DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

- AEB & COSYBU. 2017 MoU between AEB and COSYBU for jointy cooperation for common interest and implementation of mandates
- AEB & COSYBU. 2017. Guide de Formation de Base sur le Dialogue Social dans les Enterprises, les administrations et les Milieux de Travail Informel
- AEB & COSYBU. Several Dates. Project and Activity reports 2016-2019
- AEB. No date. Baseline Study on Social Dialogue within the East African Community, AEB baseline data
- ATE & TUCTA. 2017. Background paper on the Current Situation of Vocational Training in Tanzania
- ATE & TUCTA. No date. Brief Progress Report on the implementation of the ATE-TUCTA Social Dialogue Project.
- ATE & TUCTA. No date. Technical Collective Bargaining Agreement Framework
- ATE & TUCTA. No date. ToR study institutional arrangement (Governance Structure) VET System in Tanzania
- ATE. No date. Baseline Study on Social Dialogue within the East African Community, ATE baseline data
- Bashiraahishize P. no date. Study on BURUNDI-RWANDA and Democratic Republic of Congo Social Security Portability Arrangement. Zero Draft Report submitted to the East African Trade Union Confederation (EATUC) and the East African Employers' Organisation (EAEO).
- CESTRAR. No date. Baseline Study on Social Dialogue within the East African Community, CESTRAR baseline data
- COSYBU. No date. Baseline Study on Social Dialogue within the East African Community, COSYBU baseline data
- DI & DTDA, 2017. Visit report – monitoring and experience exchange workshop. Bogotá 18 – 22 September 2017
- Di & DTDA, 2018. No-cost extension of project on social dialogue in East Africa (UM file no. GRV 2015-44933/900342)
- DI & DTDA. 2015. Budget Social Dialogue for Growth and Decent Jobs in Colombia
- DI & DTDA. 2015. Budget Social Dialogue in East Africa
- DI & DTDA. 2015. Indicator Matrix (outcome and output level) Social Dialogue for Growth and Decent Jobs in Colombia
- DI & DTDA. 2015. Project implementation plan and activities for Social Dialogue for Growth and Decent Jobs in Colombia
- DI & DTDA. 2015. Results Framework, LFA and Outline of Indicators of Social Dialogue in East Africa project
- DI & DTDA. 2015. Social Dialogue East Africa. Project Document 2015-2018
- DI & DTDA. 2015. Social Dialogue for Growth and Decent Jobs in Colombia. DANIDA project application
- DI & DTDA. 2015. Social dialogue in East Africa. DANIDA project application

- DI & DTDA. 2016. Report Denmark June 27-30, 2016 (visit Colombian partners to Denmark)
- DI & DTDA. 2017. Status report Social Dialogue in Colombia 2016
- DI & DTDA. 2017. Status report Social Dialogue in East Africa 2016
- DI & DTDA. 2018. Request for no cost extension Social Dialogue in East Africa
- DI & DTDA. 2018. Revised Budget Social Dialogue in East Africa
- DI & DTDA. 2018. Status report Social Dialogue in Colombia 2017
- DI & DTDA. 2018. Status report Social Dialogue in East Africa 2017
- DI & DTDA. 2019. Completion report Social Dialogue in Colombia 2016-2019
- DI & DTDA. 2019. EAC CMS report final August 2018
- DI & DTDA. 2019. report on NOTU & FUE Training on Alternative Conflict Resolution (ADR)
- DI & DTDA. 2019. Status report Social Dialogue in Colombia 2018
- DI & DTDA. 2019. Status report Social Dialogue in East Africa 2018
- DI & DTDA. 2019. Terms of Reference External evaluation Social-dialogue in Colombia and East Africa, October/November 2019
- DI & DTDA. No data. Training Manual on Collective Bargaining (Rwanda)
- DTDA, 2018. Labour Market Profile 2018, Burundi. DTDA, Copenhagen
- DTDA, 2018. Labour Market Profile 2018, Colombia. DTDA, Copenhagen
- DTDA, 2018. Labour Market Profile 2018, Rwanda. DTDA, Copenhagen
- DTDA, 2018. Labour Market Profile 2018, Tanzania and Zanzibar. DTDA, Copenhagen
- DTDA, 2019. Labour Market Profile 2019, Kenya. DTDA, Copenhagen
- DTDA, 2019. Labour Market Profile 2019, Uganda. DTDA, Copenhagen
- DTDA. 2017. The Danish Trade Union Development Agency's Development Policy Platform 2017
- DTDA. 2019. compilation The Danish Trade Union Development Agency's (DTDA) Policy and Strategy papers. (version 2019)
- DTDA. No date. Competency profiles of experts deployed in Social Dialogue Projects
- EAEO & EATUC. 2016. AEO-EATUC Joint Position Paper on Portability of Social Security Benefits in EAC. Final version
- EAEO & EATUC. No date. Baseline Study on Social Dialogue within the East African Community. Template to be filled in by Social Partners
- EAEO & EATUC. No date. Baseline Study on Social Dialogue within the East African Community. Section A: Baseline information about national social partners
- EAEO, EATUC, DI & DTDA and all national SD partners. 2016. MoU between all Social Dialogue in East Africa partners
- EAEO, EATUC, DI & DTDA. 2017. Progress Report 2015-2017, Social Dialogue in East Africa.
- EAEO, EATUC, DI & DTDA. 2018. Progress Report 2015-2017, Social Dialogue in East Africa.
- EAEO, EATUC, DI & DTDA. 2019. Progress Report 2015-2017, Social Dialogue in East Africa.
- EAEO, EATUC. 2018. Regional Froum Social Dialogue 2018.
- EAEO, EATUC. 2019. Social Dialogue in East Africa Regional Progress report 2016-2019
- ETA & TUCTA. Several Dates. Project and Activity reports 2016-2019

- FKE & COTU. 2019. Guidelines on settling employment disputes arising from labour relations through Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) mechanisms. COTU and FKE
- FKE & COTU. no date. Brief Alternative Dispute Resolution Mechanism Activity
- FKE & COTU. no date. Brief TVET Activity
- FKE & COTU. No date. Guidelines on settling employment disputes arising from labour relations through Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) mechanisms
- FKE & COTU. Several Dates. Project and Activity reports 2016-2019
- FUE & NOTU, 2019. Draft Alternative Dispute Resolution Guidelines for the settlement of employment and labour disputes/complaints. FUE and NOTU
- FUE & NOTU. 2015. MoU between FUE and NOTU
- FUE & NOTU. 2016. National Activity - FUE & NOTU Social Dialogue Second Joint Activity Minimum Wage Setting and Systems of Setting Minimum Wage, 26th October 2016
- FUE & NOTU. 2018. Joint Position Paper on Minimum Wages in Uganda (FUE and NOTU)
- FUE & NOTU. Several Dates. Project and Activity reports 2016-2019
- FUE & NOTU. 2019. Summary report on Social Dialogue Activities between NOTU and FUE, year 2016-2019
- FUE. No date. Baseline Study on Social Dialogue within the East African Community, FUE baseline data
- Ministry of labour Uganda. 2018. Minutes of the Minimum Wage technical Committee meeting on the position paper of FUE and NOTU (28 May 2018)
- NOTU. No date. Baseline Study on Social Dialogue within the East African Community, NOTU baseline data
- Proyecto Diálogo Social Colombia, 2019. Las subcomisiones departamentales de concertación laboral. ANDI
- Proyecto Diálogo Social Colombia, No date. Guía para observar buenas prácticas en la negociación colectiva entre sindicatos y empresas
- PSF & CESTRAR. 2016. Code of Conduct for social dialogue and CBA in Rwanda
- PSF & CESTRAR. 2017. MoU on Social Dialogue and Collective Bargaining between PSF and CESTRAR
- PSF & CESTRAR. 2019. Social Dialogue Project. Activity progress report 2019
- PSF & CESTRAR. 2019. Social Dialogue Project. Activity progress report 2019
- PSF & CESTRAR. Several Dates. Project and Activity reports 2016-2019
- PSF. No date. Baseline Study on Social Dialogue within the East African Community, PSF baseline data
- Puerto Romero M. & Alberto Gomez L. 2016. Project Evaluation Central Unitaria de Trabajadores de Colombia - CUT
- Sanchez A. & Rubiano Bello M. 2017. Baseline Study for Social Dialogue Project in Colombia
- TUCTA. No date. Baseline Study on Social Dialogue within the East African Community, TUCTA baseline data
- ZANEMA & ZATUC. 2016. A Background paper on the current situation for Vocational Training in Zanzibar. Joint National Activity 2016

- ZANEMA & ZATUC. 2018. MoU between ZATUC and ZANEMA on Establishment of Dispute Settlement Committees at Workplace
- ZANEMA & ZATUC. 2019. A consolidated narrative report Social Dialogue Project in East Africa, Zanzibar. A Joint Project of ZATUC & ZANEMA, DI & DTDA. 2015-2019
- ZANEMA & ZATUC. Several Dates. Project and Activity reports 2016-2019
- ZANEMA. No date. Baseline Study on Social Dialogue within the East African Community, ZANEMA baseline data
- ZATUC. No date. Baseline Study on Social Dialogue within the East African Community, ZATUC baseline data

ANNEX 4: EVALUATION MATRIX

Main evaluation criteria & questions	Sub-questions and indicators	Sources of Verification	Methods
A. Project relevance and impact			
i. Identify and assess key lessons learned by social partners and to which extent objectives and strategies of these projects adequately address bi- and tripartite social dialogue priorities of key partner/beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extent to which agendas for bi- and tri-partite dialogue (sectoral, national, regional) cover the priorities of the specific social partners - Extent to which social partners realise objectives & priorities through social dialogue - Extent to which social partners recognise specific contribution of DTDA/DI projects/Danish experience in social dialogue in realising their objectives/priorities through social dialogue - Amount and kind of positive and negative experiences identified by social partners in social dialogue promoted through the projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional, national and local trade union partners - Employers' associations and members - DTDA/DI management and staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk Study - Semi-structured KII's - Country visits - Sense-making Workshops - Optional assessment survey
ii. To what extent have projects strengthened bi-and tripartite social dialogue mechanisms? To which extent have partners been motivated to re-think labour relations into more cooperation, consensus and compromise-seeking consultations & negotiations?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assessment and appreciation of changes in social dialogue mechanism (bi- and tri-partite) at sector, national and regional level - The extent to which the different social partners recognise and value the contribution of the projects to improvement of social dialogue mechanisms - Self-appreciation of attitude and behaviour of the social partners in social dialogue and labour relations at enterprise level - Appreciation of attitude and behaviour of other social partners in social dialogue and labour relations at enterprise level - Assessment of external partners on changes in social dialogue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional, national and local trade union partners - Employers' associations and members - DTDA/DI management and staff - External stakeholders 	
B. Effectiveness of different approaches to social dialogue			
i. Assess best practices, prospects and consequences of using inputs from Danish/ international external resource persons (either single vs. bipartite missions);	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Examples of successful use of Danish social dialogue experience and expertise (workers and/or employers) - Critical success factors in social dialogue identified by social partners and external partners - Appreciation of the different forms of training and technical assistance provided by DTDA/DI by the different social partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional, national and local trade union partners - Employers' associations & members - DTDA/DI management and staff 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk Study - Semi-structured KII's - Country visits - Sense-making Workshops
ii. Comparative advantages & limitations different approaches (how to bring social partners together in otherwise adversarial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Awareness and use of different possible approaches to social dialogue and conflict resolutions among the different social partners - Use of knowledge, models and tools presented in training and advisory missions in practice of social dialogue at sector, national and regional level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional, national and local trade union partners - Employers' associations & members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Optional assessment survey

environments); to what extent training and skills development have promoted consensus- and compromise seeking, negotiations & dispute handling to reach immediate objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assessment of different degrees of effects and success in specific sectors, national and regional level - Development of number and kind of conflicts reported and conflict resolution processes (and outcomes of these processes) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DTDA/DI management and staff - External stakeholders 	
C. Efficiency			
i. Assess whether costs of technical assistance and activities are reasonable to benefits.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Average investment/cost of TA missions (different countries, sectors, social partners) per year compared with reported improvements in social dialogue and conflict resolutions - Value for money of the TA missions as perceived by the different social partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Budget and financial reports (project & programme level) - Staff DTDA/DI & partners, involved in reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk Study - Semi-structured KII's
D. Sustainability			
i. Local ownership of projects and involvement as experienced by social partners.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appreciation of ownership/involvement in projects by social partners - Interest of social partners to develop follow-up projects of similar nature with DTDA/DI and other development partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional, national and local trade union partners - Employers' associations & members - DTDA/DI management and staff - Regional, national and local trade union partners - Employers' associations & members - DTDA/DI management and staff - External stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desk Study - Semi-structured KII's - Country visits - Sense-making Workshops - Optional assessment survey
ii. To what extent lessons learned & social dialogue competencies gained are likely to be used in future by partners & DTDA/DI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extent to which social partners have incorporated elements of project approach/tools in own planning, programming and implementation arrangements - Lessons learned from project/competencies that have influenced practices and tools in social dialogue in Denmark 		
iii. To what extent joint actions, mediation & collaboration between social partners brought a better labour relations climate to apply a more robust stance in conciliating & reducing industrial unrest and labour disputes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assessment of labour relations climate by ILO and other development partners in the different project countries of implementation off the social dialogue projects (and recognition of a specific contribution by DTDA/DI) - (Development of) number and kind of labour conflicts reported to national ministries and the ILO and successful conflict resolutions - Assessment of political economy indicators related to industrial unrest and labour disputes 		
iv. To what extent project actions have been institutionalised into national policies, collective/local agreement structures, codes of conduct, MoU's, guidelines etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sectoral, national and regional policies that have included elements of the project approach and actions - Existence of CBA's, codes of conduct, MoUs at sector, national and regional level that included elements of the project approach and actions 		

ANNEX 5: SUMMARY OVERVIEW OUTPUTS, OUTCOMES AND IMPACT OF SD PROJECTS IN EAC AND COLOMBIA

EAC						
Aspect	Burundi	Kenya	Rwanda	Tanzania Mainland	Uganda	Zanzibar
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - background paper on major issues in labour code and how this affect members COSYBU and AEB - outline for revised labour market code of conduct. - Two workshops of AEB and COSYBU to discuss, map out and come up with recommendations on how the organizations can work together to reduce the amount of work conflicts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National dialogue workshop between employers and workers organizations. - Joint background paper on the current situation for vocational training in Kenya - background paper on the current situation related to the arbitration system in Kenya - ADR Guideline by May 2018 developed - Lobby for national skills development policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Workshop on Social Dialogue and Collective Bargaining, October 2016 - Task force to maintain cooperation between PSF and CESTRAR - MoU for long-term partnership between PSF and CESTRAR - Training manual on Social Dialogue and CBA - Booklet for awareness raising on labour law and media campaign 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Joint position paper on current situation for vocational training - Joint paper on collecting bargaining in Tanzania - standard template-framework for CBA - Workshops and training of members on TVET and CBA issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MoU on minimum wage - Joint studies on minimum wage conducted and joint position paper on minimum wage developed (4 sectors) - Bipartite meetings and workshops on ADR and proposal development - Workshops on collective bargaining (training of members) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Joint position paper and advocacy on TVET - Background paper on ADR and MoU on ADR - Awareness campaign on ADR - Training activities on social dialogue, ADR and CBA
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AEB and COSYBU working together using their existing informal bipartite consultation framework - Memorandum of Understanding (2017) - proposals of improvements of labour law developed by the social partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Draft MoU on ADR tripartite committee development and submitted to High Court - Awareness on priority of TVET and skills matching among partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Code of conduct of CESTRAR and PSF for social dialogue and collective bargaining in Rwanda - Working on structural tripartite cooperation structure to drive social dialogue process in Rwanda 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lobby on TVET moving TVET to Ministry of Labour - Format for sectoral CBA negotiation distributed and used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sectoral minimum wage joint bill development - National and Regional ADR committees established - Proposals for legal embedding ADR in process and dialogue with Govt. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 10 Pilot ADR committees established (5 still performing) - MoU on ADR establishment submitted to high court
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trust and relationship between social partners improved - proposals of improvements of labour law under revision by parliament 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cooperation and dialogue between workers and employers further consolidated - Specific project activities effects on impact not so clear - Social partners in Kenya are strong and clearly recognised in country 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recent process - Trust and relationship have increased - Sector CBA in construction sector - Not yet strong impact at national level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trust increased - Not yet strong impact at national level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cooperation and dialogue consolidated by broader MoU between FUE and NOTU - Ministry of Labour has processed bill on sectoral minimum to parliament and President - CBA processes at company level and in some sectors strong 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trust built between the social partners - Broader MoU signed between ZANEMA and ZATUC - Recognition Govt and Industrial court, clear presence and results in hotels and hospitality sector.

Limitations and Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Political and social unrest in the country - Capacity constraints of the social partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Political unrest around election processes is structural 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited experience in social dialogue in Rwanda by Govt and social partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tanzanian Government is not constructive in EAC and CMP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - President is blocking the minimum wage bill, though the process of revision still continues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Potential for rolling out is limited due to limited membership
Bottlenecks and Problems encountered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Voluminous Labour Code, which consist of over 300 articles - slow negotiation process on provisions in labour code - Language challenges in exchanging experience 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - communication challenge especially between the two parties inclusive of their affiliates. - Planning of meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PSF is not a typical employers organisation - Time was needed to build relationship and trust 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Internal instability within TUCTA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited sector presence and limited reach in informal sector and among migrant workers (in spite of significant NOTU efforts) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited membership of ZANEMA and ZATUC to mainly hotel sector

EAC	
Aspect	Overall EAC SD project level
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional conferences and regional project conferences (on SD and social security, ADR and TVET) - Baseline studies on Social Dialogue - Studies on Portability of Social Security (national and regional level) - Position paper on work permits - National and regional conferences and training events (with Danish and regional expertise, focusing on priorities chosen by national social partners) - Media coverage in the EAC partner states on regional integration (CMP-implementation) in general and more specifically on free movement of labour. - Proposals on key elements of the EAC Common Market Protocol in general and the free movement of labour in particular
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EAEO and EATUC signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to work together for a three years period from 2015 to 2018 - Position papers on a range of issues related to the social partners as for example portability of social security benefits to the EALA, TVET and ADR - Petition regarding the work permit regimes in EAC to the East African Legislative Assembly - Improved relations and collaborations and participation of social partners in the annual EAC SG Forum organized by EAC Secretariat - Bi-partite committees on social dialogue have been established, code of conduct on social dialogue and collective bargaining agreements have been signed between employers, trade unions and the Ministry of Labour. - increased understanding and focus on joint lobbying of Governments and representation in national tri-partite forums, National (EAC/CMP) Implementation Committees as well as in national delegations to EAC
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - more focus on decent work, support from both side of the social partners as well constructive agreements and effective dispute handling. - Recognition by EAC and external stakeholders from Govt. and ILO (noticeable improvement of capacities of social partners and increased quality of cooperation and social dialogue)
Limitations and Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - national Governments don't implement (equally) the EAC resolutions and recommendations; Kenya, Uganda and Rwanda are moving ahead with more speed, while Tanzania is blocking - Consultation processes are bureaucratic and generally slow. It takes considerable time to achieve tangible results
Bottlenecks and Problems encountered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The sector level projects in the SD project did not materialise - Limited time and opportunities for exchange and joint learning, paired with high costs of international meetings - Limited attention in reports on bottlenecks and problems

Colombia	
Aspect	National
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Training and exposure with partners and in Denmark and exchange between partners (300 participants in social dialogue and 1229 in dialogue and conflict resolution at the company level)) - Soft skills built in social partners and among stakeholders - Communication campaign on decent jobs and sustainable enterprises - 2 documents with joint proposals on social dialogue related themes (Handbook of good practice in collective bargaining and departmental sub-committees)
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Handbook good practices in collective bargaining disseminated and used - Departmental sub-commissions for Social Dialogue on labour - Increased participation and exchange of partners in dialogue and joint initiatives - Trust between partners build - Soft skills are getting more importance in whole Colombian systems (education and labour related) - Better employment relations between workers affiliated to Sintracerejón and representatives of enterprise Cerejón, allowing for negotiation and the subscription of a collective work agreement wherein union autonomy is respected
Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Institutionalisation and embedding of Social Dialogue is advancing and is built on older historical dialogue mechanisms and instruments (Cajas, SENA etc.) - Improved social dialogue (conflict resolution and CBA) in the mining and sugar sectors - Pact on Decent Working Conditions” by project partners, the pensioners’ confederation and Labour Ministry. CUT disagrees with the pact, weakening its impact - Growing closeness between union confederations participating in the programme and the entrepreneurs’ association (ANDI)
Limitations and Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transfer and replication of SD experiences and models (handbook) in other sectors - Good practice network on dialogue and conflict resolution at the company level has not materialised - Peace process and current Govt. Attitude on conflict resolution - Trade union fragmentation and CUT though also improvements in central de comanda de la accion sindical - Government policies and structure show a broken link between the departmental wage and labour commissions and a national structure to embed these departmental structures
Bottlenecks and Problems encountered	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited capacities of the social partners, particularly at the company level - Presence of social partners in certain sectors (e.g. flowers) and in informal economy is still limited - CUT’s departure from the project - draft bill on the implementation of reconciliation measures across all stages of the negotiation of collective bargaining agreements was cancelled, because partners could not agree on contents of this draft bill - Institutional priority given to SD project by the partners has not always been optimal - Good practice guide on dialogue was developed only towards the end of the project

ANNEX 6: FIELD VISIT PROGRAMMES

Colombia: from 7 to 10 October, 2019

Date	Location (s)	Activities
Monday 7 October	Amsterdam- Bogota-Cali	Travel Amsterdam – Cali
Tuesday 8 October	Cali	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Group meeting with key participants of CTC, CGT and ANDI in the project - Individual meetings with key staff of CTC, CGT and ANDI directly involved in the project - Representatives of unions of CTC and CGT based in Cali (max 2) - Representatives of companies, member of ANDI based in Cali (max 2) - Travel Cali - Bogota
Wednesday 9 October	Bogota	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meetings with key staff of CTC, CGT and ANDI directly involved in the project at national level (per organisation, more people can participate) - Meeting with representative of CUTH to also hear about their opinions on the project - ILO representative (if time allows) - Ministry of Labour representative (of time allows) - Debriefing meeting with the technical committee of the Social Dialogue project
Thursday 10 October	Bogota – Amsterdam	Travel Bogota – Amsterdam

In Colombia there is a possibility for 2 additional days of data collection by a national consultant (at grassroots level), coordinated by the international independent consultant from a distance.

East Africa: Wednesday 23 October – Saturday 2 November 2019

Date	Location(s)	Activities
Wednesday 23 October	Amsterdam - Zanzibar	Travel Amsterdam – Zanzibar
Thursday 25 October	Zanzibar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bilateral meetings with trade union central and employers' associations (separate) - Members of employers' Association (2) - Trade Unions (2)
Friday 25 October	Zanzibar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Government (Ministry of Labour and Other actors) - Relevant NGO's (FES and others) and UN (ILO)

		- Debriefing and sensemaking meeting with local partner(s)
Saturday 26 October	Zanzibar	No programme (development of notes), but possibility to extend programme of previous two days
Sunday 27 October	Arusha	- No programme - Travel to Arusha
Monday 28 October	Arusha	- Meeting at regional DTDA Arusha office (early morning) - Interviews with regional (EATUC, EAEO) and national partners (Burundi, Rwanda, Kenya and Tanzania) with participants in Regional Social Dialogue Conference (from early morning)
Tuesday 29 October	Arusha	- Participation in Regional Social Dialogue Conference - Interviews with leadership level representatives of regional and national partners with participants in Regional Social Dialogue Conference
Wednesday 30 October	Arusha Arusha - Kampala	- Interviews with regional (EATUC, EAEO) and national partners (Burundi, Rwanda, Kenya and Tanzania) with participants in Regional Social Dialogue Conference (until noon) - Travel to Kampala
Thursday 21 October	Kampala	- Bilateral meetings with trade union central and employers' associations (separate) - Members of employers' Association (2) - Trade Unions (2)
Friday 1 November	Kampala Kampala – Amsterdam	- Government (Ministry of Labour and Other actors) - Relevant NGO's (FES and others) and UN (ILO) - Debriefing and sensemaking meeting with local partner(s)
Saturday 2 September	Kampala – Amsterdam	- Travel Kampala – Amsterdam