

Mid-term evaluation of LO-Norway's Decent Work global programme

Final report

Friday 27 May, 2022

Martin Schmidt
Erica Molin

Views expressed in this report are those of the evaluators, and do not reflect those of LO Norway or any other party unless specifically attributed. In such cases, the interpretation of views expressed by respondents is the sole responsibility of the evaluators.

Table of contents

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
2. INTRODUCTION	5
2.1 <i>Method</i>	5
3. FINDINGS	6
3.1 <i>Relevance and coherence</i>	6
3.2 <i>Theory of change</i>	8
3.3 <i>Management</i>	10
3.4 <i>Effectiveness</i>	12
3.5 <i>Efficiency</i>	14
3.6 <i>Sustainability</i>	16
3.7 <i>Impact</i>	17
4. CONCLUSIONS	18
5. RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED	20
5.1 <i>During the remainder of the programme period 2022-2023</i>	20
5.2 <i>In the formulation of the 2024-2029 Global programme</i>	22

Annexes

- Annex 1 – Terms of Reference
- Annex 2 – People interviewed
- Annex 3 – References
- Annex 4 – Online survey results

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is a mid-term evaluation of LO Norway's Global Decent Work programme 2019-2023 conducted during March-May 2022 by a mixed-evaluation team with two members from LO Norway and two independent evaluators.

The evaluation covered the entire programme with an extensive document review, see annex 2, an on-line survey with responses from 15 countries, see annex 4, and in-depth semi-structured interviews with 23 staff of LO Norway, Norad, the Norwegian Employers Organisation (NHO), and representatives of partner organisations in Colombia, Tunisia, Zanzibar, Ghana, Hong Kong, Malaysia, and the Philippines.

Using the OECD/DAC¹ evaluation criteria as a basis for its structure, the evaluation presents findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned in response to its overall objective "To analyse progress and document results in LO's global decent work programme. The main aim is to document and contribute to new knowledge about LO's programme work and potential to have greater impact."

A few central observations are pervasive throughout the findings of the report.

(1) The 2019-2023 Global programme comes with a much developed and elaborate programme framework² compared to previous programme periods. It was prompted as a response to Norad requirements, and has had a major influence on programme management, both positive and negative.

(2) Generally, the programme is considered effective in view of its intervention logic and tough global conditions. Local ownership is sighted as the most persistent key factor for positive results, and the programme on the whole has been able to stay relevant.

(3) Global disruptions since March 2020 including the pandemic, supply side challenges in global trade, and the Ukraine war, has seriously affected the programme environment. LO Norway's management of the situation has been highly adaptive, but it does not alter the fact that global labour markets have been marked by turbulent conditions in a mainly negative sense.

(4) Overall, the global dimension of the programme is less prominent than desirable and project management is characterised by compartmentalisation, with too few horizontal associations between managers and projects.

(5) Contextualisation, i.e., alignment and acclimatisation with the partner environment, is strong. Project content and priorities are on the whole closely aligned with partner objectives. Operationally, however, the projects are at times unresponsive to the political- and internal dynamics of the partner environment, which works contrary to short-term contextual ambitions.

In summary, the following findings are noted on the DAC evaluation criteria for the Global Decent Work programme:

Relevance **Exceptionally high.** Thematic relevance as well as the added value of LO advisors and consultants in contributing practices and methods adds to the relevance of the programme.

¹ The DAC is the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, OECD. The DAC has a pivotal role in the joint policy making of the development cooperation community.

² A collective name for a series of programme foundations and working instruments that make up the definition of the programme; its results framework, the assumptions of the theory of change, the individual project rationales, the risk analyses framework, and financial reporting framework.

Coherence	High. Projects are well aligned with partner strategies and the national environment. A relative disconnect from the actions of other development actors moderates the level of coherence.
Effectiveness	High. Outcomes are achieved to a high degree despite exceptional and partly unforeseen challenges. Strong results in advocacy, defence of workers' rights, equity, and organisational strengthening.
Efficiency	Medium. Less resources than expected were used and the organisational set-up benefits efficiency. Cumbersome reporting engages resources.
Sustainability	Medium. Capacity- and organisational strengthening contributes to sustainability. The current global threat to partners challenges sustainability.
Impact	High. Impact is achieved across the programme and is partly attributed to past programmes.

Conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned are drawn and identified in the final two chapters of the evaluation. In summary, they are related below.

Conclusions

The Global programme;

- Is contributing to the strengthening of unions in union organisation and capacity, and to the positive development of labour market relations and functionality in targeted countries.
- Has a level of relevance to its partners and its overall purposes that is extraordinarily high.
- Has been seriously affected by a number of global trends spilling over into the context of union work.
- Has some difficulties in adapting to the more comprehensive programme framework.
- Generally, operates more as a series of individual projects than as a global whole.
- Experiences concerns about the sustainability of the projects and progress achieved.
- Experiences its most comprehensively sustainable results in the area of organisational strengthening.

Recommendations

Before programme end;

1. During 2022 or 2023, revisit the overall situation analysis underpinning the Global programme in view of the programme period 2024-2029.
2. During the remaining period of the 2019-2023 programme and to the extent possible, aim to bolster LO Norway physical presence in all partner countries.
3. During the remaining period of the 2019-2023 programme, make a point of revisiting each project from a strategic perspective.
4. During 2022 or 2023, revisit the Global programme framework in view of the programme period 2024-2029 with aims to a) reduce complexity and b) improve its usefulness for planning, partnership dialogue, and strategic priorities.

In the formulation of the next programme 2024-2029;

1. Strengthen the "global" aspect of the Global Decent Work programme by stimulating the exchange between projects and staff.
2. Re-visit the role of LO Norway and its partners as change agents based on the conclusions of a new overarching situation-analysis.
3. Strengthen the Global programme framework for 2024-2029 with increasing emphasis on local political- and internal dynamics as a means to improve the efficiency and timeliness of operations.

2. INTRODUCTION

Recent global developments, including the Covid-19 pandemic, climate changes and increased geopolitical tensions, have been dramatic. Their effects present exceptional challenges to achieving the sustainable development goals. There have been situations on national and regional levels in the past that could be compared to this shift e.g., devastating natural disasters or violent conflict. One can learn about e.g., coordination, cooperation, and operational strengths and weaknesses from these experiences. However, the global turn presently under way will demand outstanding and innovative responses.

It is in this context that LO Norway's Global Decent Work Programme 2019-2023 (the Global Programme) operates, and that this mid-term evaluation was commissioned. Beyond Intent has performed the evaluation in close dialogue with the mixed team representatives at LO Norway and has maintained recurrent contacts with the evaluation steering group. The ambition of the evaluators at Beyond Intent was a participatory and adaptive approach. This ambition was accomplished through the openness and curiosity that guided the interactions with LO Norway as well as the partners. The team was also appreciative of the active response to the on-line survey submitted to partners.

The mid-term evaluation has been steered with a clear learning objective and the second chapter includes a description of the method used. Although it examines findings thus far, presented in chapter 3, these are particularly relevant in contemplating how to incorporate the experiences throughout the programme period and beyond. The global circumstances naturally also affect the global programmes and all national projects. Members, activities, national policies, and priorities were all impacted. Hence, we have found it relevant to specifically analyse how the programme adapted to changing circumstances and how the internal processes and structures played out. Chapter four outlines the evaluators conclusions and the last chapter includes recommendations for the last year of the current programme period as well as the way forward 2024-2029. The magnitude of global developments is expected to affect the programme moving forward.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank LO Norway, partners, and other actors who devoted time and effort to support our work. We were met with consideration and open communication for which we are very grateful. A special thanks goes to the LO representatives of the mixed team Jane Vogt Evensen and Nadia Shabana, and head of section Nina Mjøberg, who provided immense support throughout the process.

2.1 Method

This evaluation was conducted as a mixed-team evaluation. Jane Vogt Evensen and Nadia Shabana of LO Norway joined two evaluators from Beyond Intent AB (Sweden) Erica Molin and Martin Schmidt (team lead) in an evaluation lasting through March-May 2022. The evaluation has been conducted and written by the latter two whilst taking advice, input to drafts and substantive discussions with the former.

A desk-study was done in March and an Inception report was delivered 18 March, detailing the focus and timeline of the subsequent study. In late March- early April, an on-line survey directed at 63 primary programme stakeholders was conducted (Annex 4 details the 25 responses, which is a response rate of 40%). Semi-structured interviews were simultaneously carried out with 23 programme managers from LO Norway, Norad, the Confederation of Norwegian Employers (NHO), and the projects in Malaysia, the Philippines Sentro ng mga Nagkakaisa at Progresibong Manggagawa

(SENTRO), Asosasyon ng mga Makabayang Manggagawang Pilipino Overseas (AMMPO) & Progressive Labor Union in Hong Kong (PLU)), Colombia (Central Unitaria de Trabajadores de Colombia (CUT) & Unión Sindical Obrera de la Industria del Petróleo (USO)), Tunisia (Union Générale Tunisienne du Travail (UGTT)), Ghana (Trade Union Congress Ghana (TUC)) and Zanzibar (Zanzibar Trade Union Congress (ZATUC)). A full list of people interviewed is attached to this report in annex 2.

The overall aim of the study is “to analyse progress and document results in LO's global decent work programme”. The ToR goes on to say: “The main aim is to document and contribute to new knowledge about LO's programme work and potential to have greater impact. To do so, the evaluation will provide analysis of the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, coherence and impact of the global decent work programme”.

From a methodological perspective, this has meant the evaluation team has relied heavily on the OECD/DAC criteria. In shortened form, they say that an evaluation should;

- establish the contextual **relevance** for partners and beneficiaries of the cooperation;
- determine the **coherence** of a programme in relation to context and in particular the development context of the environment in which the programme is implemented, and the compatibility of the cooperation with other actors and interventions;
- identify to what extent partners perceive the cooperation has achieved anticipated results (outcomes) contributing to purpose (**effectiveness**);
- assess the **efficiency** and purposefulness of the contribution approach, utilisation of strategies and methods in the partners’ implementation to determine the intended and unintended effects of the cooperation;
- assess the **sustainability** and plausible resilience of long-term changes achieved through the cooperation;
- assess programme **impact** both in terms of direct programme effects and changes, and of wider and lasting effects to beneficiaries and society at large.

Based on the criteria, the evaluation has structured its findings in section 3.

Because of the learning purposes of the mid-term evaluation, particular emphasis was placed on the closing sections conclusions (4) and recommendations and lessons learned (5).

3. FINDINGS

This chapter is organised along the DAC criteria starting with relevance and coherence. It also makes a point of discussing the LO Theory of Change (ToC) and management approach to the Global programme. They are central ingredients to understanding findings about effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact that concludes the findings section.

3.1 Relevance and coherence

The following section combines findings regarding the relevance and coherence of the Global Decent Work programme 2019-to date. Overall, it finds the relevance of the programme to be exceptionally high, paired with a high level of coherence with partner’s and national agendas. Yet there are some doubts about the programme’s coherence with local development cooperation

agendas. The section also discusses the related term contextualisation. Mainly what elements of the Decent Work programme that supports or works against the contextualisation of individual projects.

Thematically, the relevance of the Global programme to the partners should be set at a particularly high level. There are core values and agendas shared between the partners that summarises in four major joint working areas; 1) union organisation, 2) collective bargaining, 3) political/legal advocacy, and 4) improved representation by women and youth.

In addition to a shared political sensitivity to the work of unions and their relationship with government, employers, and wider society, this makes for a strong overlap between the national strategic objectives of the partners, and the competencies and programme content of LO Norway. Partners across the board attest to the correspondence. This aspect also adds to, but is not the entire picture, of the coherence of the Global programme with national contexts.

Further adding to the relevance of the programme is the added value provided by LO Norway to its thematic areas. To a high degree³, when LO Norway engages with partners in particular areas they add advanced practices, an international comparative perspective and methodologies that strongly support the partner organisations. In particular, the training element of operations contributes to individual learning that actively promotes organisational capacities. The partners describe how the transition of individual learning spills over into institutional strengthening; also, on a sustained level. It has been described that when originally trained staff have left the organisation, learning and new practices have stayed behind.

Adding even further to both relevance and the coherence of LO Norway country projects, is the generally high level of contextualisation. The peer relationship between LO Norway and its counterparts probably adds substantially to this observation. The partners work on a collegial and shared-interest basis that allows free and unmasked dialogue on local circumstances. Also, partners attest to a participatory approach to developing the project agenda.

The one aspect that pours doubt into the level of coherence of LO programming is the relative disconnect of national LO projects with the actions of other development partners and actors. By this is meant that both project documentation and partners are less prone to put the LO project into a larger national development aid context. Particularly when LO is one among many partners, such as in Tunisia (UGTT) and Colombia (CUT), some aspects of the actions of others are unknown. In programme documentation, reference is made to LO ambitions to work with donor coordination. On the whole, these efforts are described as difficult and more concerned with information sharing than on active allocation of roles and responsibilities.

Generally, LO Norway has been a persistent partner for up to two decades or more. Persistence adds a long-term grinding element to understanding the partner contextually and in terms of needs. The 2019-2023 programme largely builds on this sequence, which adds to the thematic relevance. It also adds thematic coherence as a fit to strengthening unions in the context of national labour market developments.

³ From the extensive desk-study of project reporting, followed-up through semi-structured interviews, the external evaluators are here making an estimation based on the sample of projects under specific review. In these projects, about three out of four activities examined pointed to the partners feeling that LO advisors and/or consultants contributed practices, methodologies or comparative perspectives that strongly supported the partner and its organisation. In about one out of four activities, by contrast, it was felt they were slightly less supportive. In such cases, interventions were either not properly anchored with local partners in advance or failed to assess correctly the enabling environment required for achieving desired changes in practices or behaviour.

Operationally, there are some aspects of the global programme 2019-2023 that are less relevant to national contexts. One is the struggle of LO Norway to bring the new, more thorough and comprehensive, programme framework⁴ into harmony with local partner agendas and objectives. This aspect will be further discussed in the management section (3.3). Here, it suffices to say that there is feedback from the partners that the framework – all aspects and components – is seldom used to supply the partner with information relevant to programme planning and decision-making. The framework is instead felt to be used almost singularly as a control function. This has both pros and cons. But as a means of creating programme relevance and coherence to partner planning and decision making, the application of the framework comes off short according to partners. This is not to say that the framework is divorced from its planning purpose. Its use has been confirmed by LO Norway staff and also occasionally a partner, although the control perspective dominates the view of the framework.

Another aspect that challenges the long-term relevance of the programme has to do with contextualisation⁵. Generally, LO Norway has a strong history of understanding its partners and their challenges. In the programme period 2019-2023, however, concerns are noted that some partners spend too little time dwelling on the internal dynamics of the partner environment. For instance, with the partners clout with key actors in government and with employers and employer organisations. One example-situation is when Zanzibar elections in 2021 removed all ZATUC government partners from office. Such events have a strong potential influence on project decision-making and effectiveness and illustrates that different courses of action can produce different results.

Concluding findings about contextualisation, two elements point in different directions. On the one hand programme content, assumptions and orientation are regarded by the partners as highly contextualised. Adding to this is often a long history of cooperation and a sense of mutual trust and familiarity. On the other hand, there are operational aspects where the partners have identified a lack of focus on local and internal dynamics. Some note such aspects are discovered too late or are absent from the project dialogue.

The evaluators note two things. First, operational concerns mostly coincide with recent events – including the pandemic, the war in Ukraine and labour market disruptions due to global supply side crunches – and may thus have to do with lower levels of project interaction and increasing external influence. Secondly, the partners report that the focus of the project dialogue is often technically oriented, with too little time spent on the overall picture. If this is the case, contextualisation is weakened operationally by a technical rather than strategic focus on the circumstantial factors that may or may not favour the projects.

3.2 Theory of change

In this section the evaluation makes a particular point of examining the partners view of the programme Theory of Change (ToC) because of its central importance to a common understanding of how change comes about in the programme. Broadly, it finds the ToC appropriate in its central assumptions and carefully developed, yet with a slight drawback in a relative omission for the political- and internal dynamics requirements of successful programming.

⁴ This term, the “programme framework”, is used to refer to the guiding principles of the Global programme. A closer definition of what the evaluators mean is laid out in the management section below.

⁵ In short, this means the alignment, sensitivity and acclimatisation of an operation with the partner environment.

The ToC of the Global programme is built on many layers. As a whole, it will be referred to as the ToC of the Global programme. But in fact, it is made up of a series of assumptions in each area of cooperation including organisation, collective bargaining, inclusion etc. In each area of cooperation, LO Norway has not only made a global assessment, but it has contextualised that assessment in each partner context.

At its core, however, is a point of departure in a social dialogue between main stakeholders of labour markets worldwide; governments, unions, and employers. To enable and foster that dialogue, LO Norway strengthens the capacity of unions to work with advocacy, organisational development and the promotion of equity and inclusion⁶. Along these lines of development, LO Norway and the partners identify what to accomplish in each context.

Overall, the logic of the ToC is strong. It is also demonstrably rational in that both LO and partners can explain and describe the pathways to change and how they have unfolded in reality. This is not to say that everything is working according to plan. It is instead to confirm that given the right circumstances, and ability to work on opportunity in each context, the ToC is a solid theoretical foundation.

If there are weaknesses to the ToC as a theoretical foundation, it would be its relative disregard for the political dynamics of each context. Related is some neglect of the importance of the internal dynamics of each partner to be supportive of the change paths. There may be reason behind these omissions. But according to several stakeholders, opening up this conversation in the partnership allows for further opportunities. Both in identifying prospects on the wider labour market arena of tripartite relationships, and in working towards legal and social reform.

One example that is recorded in several cases, is related to the expectation of growing membership numbers. Increasing membership is also intermediate outcome 1 of the elaborate results framework. When reporting back on numbers, it is not always clearly in the interest of the partner to keep transparent records. Nor are numbers necessarily correlated with political influence. Several examples given by partners of their successful influence have occurred despite falling numbers.⁷ Another example encountered widely, is that union staff one way or the other trained for project purposes acquire skills that make them attractive on the labour market. Over long periods of cooperation, staff trained has eventually left the unions, mostly for politics or public office. This has had important both positive and negative implications for results achievement in the projects.

Hence, according to several stakeholders, the logic of political- and internal dynamics has proved to be influencing the level of success recorded in the projects⁸. On this account, it should probably be reflected more clearly in the ToC.

Finally, while the strengths of the ToC should not be disregarded, nor should they be taken for granted. Viewing the ToC as flexible and responsive to local developments would be favourable. And the way that global pressures have challenged the behaviour of key actors of labour markets since the inception of the Global programme in 2019 is a point in kind. The present strategic period of 2019-2023 has already seen unprecedented movements in global context. In all projects selected for in-depth interviews, Ghana, Zanzibar, Tunisia, Colombia, Hong Kong, Malaysia, and the Philippines, partners are weary these currents are affecting programme assumptions in one way or the other.

⁶ Principally of women and youth but also migrant workers and marginalised groups.

⁷ All agree that in the long run, larger membership numbers are helpful to the influence of the unions. In the shorter term, however, it is likely that influence equally rests on other factors such as connections, negotiation techniques, and advocacy tactics favouring alliances with important branches of government and the rest of society.

⁸ Examples are given from Zanzibar (section 3.1) and Colombia (section 3.4).

Partners agree that the effort to spend time on crafting and maintaining an analytical view of how change comes about should be lauded and upheld. It has promoted results achievement and brought partners closer to an understanding of what priorities are warranted to advance their organisations.

3.3 Management

This section will deal with the role of LO Norway’s management approach in fostering programme objectives. Some core elements shall be discussed. Mainly, the evaluation finds that the management approach employed across the 2019-2023 programme has become overly concerned with a reporting/control aspect, and relatively less concerned with a planning aspect. Also, the management approach shows signs of fragmentation.

Both LO Norway and partners describe the management approach of the 2019-2023 programme as a decisive change compared to earlier programmes. The current one has taken a more thorough view on its theoretical foundation, mainly its results and reporting frameworks, and to what this means for the management of the programme. It is noted this is in response to signals from Norad about a tightening of programme management requirements. In turn, these signals came in response to previous programme periods characterised by what has been labelled a “less than stringent” management approach.

In the following, we will refer to the “programme framework” as a collective name for a series of programme foundations and working instruments that make up the definition of the programme. These include its results framework, the assumptions of the theory of change, the individual project rationales, the risk analyses framework, and financial reporting framework.

From a management perspective, it now becomes relevant to ask how LO Norway has brought this programme framework to bear on operations?

A first observation shared by LO, partners, and the evaluators alike, is that the framework is very thorough. In fact, it is so large and complex that many find it difficult to work with. In the evaluators view, this has brought about two main characteristics.

1. One is that it has been hard to convert the programme framework to an operational strategic basis for individual project management. In the view of most respondents and LO staff, it is so elaborate that it is difficult to approach from the partners’ planning perspective. This had led to a tendency towards a technical focus, sometimes to the detriment of an overall view of programme options.

According to most partners, the pandemic and relative absence of LO Norway advisors on the ground has probably also contributed to the technical focus. These aspects combined has led to a slowdown in operations and in some individual cases, led to realisations about opportunities for dialogue and other external measures coming too late.

2. Secondly, the programme framework has become overly concerned with its control aspect. In practical terms, according to most stakeholders, this has meant a lot of time is spent in search of information to fill out reporting requirements. Both of project results and financial disclosure, and of both partners’ and LO staff.

But spending time on reporting is still a manageable task. The true problem is with the one-sidedness of its application. Primarily, a programme framework of this nature is normally

meant to serve both planning and control purposes, and in that order. For the partners, this brings us back to the first point (1) above.

For LO Norway running the Global programme, the situation brings to light several aspects of programme management.

It is clear that the stricter, more comprehensive programme framework of 2019-2023 has brought about a more comprehensive operation. Although cumbersome to work with, LO staff take great knowledge and learning from the programme framework. The elaborate and complex results framework, moving into detail on the individual projects, brings about insights on how the cooperation environment works and reacts to operations. A similar effect is identified with some partners, but not all.

On this “project” level, the framework works at least to a degree as it was intended; to supply LO and partner managers with key information about the circumstances of the project environment; results, what works, what does not etc. How these insights contribute to project decisions is, however, sometimes obscure.

Taking a step back to consider the global character of the programme, it is noted that the motivations and rationale for its global aspect is less developed in the programme document. That is, spelling out in greater detail how and why running a global programme benefits the individual projects. For instance, with comparative and learning perspectives, or benefiting from exchange of specialised competences. But when speaking to partners and LO advisors and consultants, this rationale is all the clearer. Mainly, stakeholders point to the comparative perspective on global operations where LO has and will play a significant role. Both as knowledge brokers, connectors, and as a learning organisation bringing that mindset to its partners, the global character of the programme holds considerable promise.

A brilliant example of the comparative strength of the global programme is when a project evaluation in Ethiopia 2019-2020 included a partner from Ghana in the evaluation team. A related example is in the performance of three participatory gender audits. They have been consistently viewed, by partners in different contexts, as a reflexion of international best practices and a global societal tendency towards inclusion and empowerment of women and youth.

Managerially, however, there are indications that LO Norway to a high degree works contrary to this perspective. Whatever the reason – be it the cumbersome reporting requirements, the troubles of the partners under tightening conditions, a growing and more complex programme – the projects are run more in isolation than what would have been desirable. In management jargon, this is often referred to as compartmentalisation.

In a compartmentalised environment, managers tend to work isolated from one another. There are few interrelationships and operations rarely benefit from comparative experiences. The competing perspective is to work more horizontally.

Risk assessments

This sub-section concludes findings on the application of the risk assessments in the management of the programme. The central finding is that they function as input to a clear understanding of the conditions of successful operational planning, but also that they make an omission of internal dynamics similar to that of the ToC (section 3.2).

There is a risk assessment accompanying all project frameworks. Assessments also accompany separate programme initiatives such as the Gender Equality and Digital Monitoring project, as well as a global risk assessment.

As with the results frameworks, the risk assessments present a large apparatus. On the whole, however, it is viewed as intuitive and helpful by partners. On the subject of managing risk in the projects, some interesting observations have been made.

From speaking to partners about what leads to durable results on both organisational and structural level, in case after case they emphasise local ownership.

By this is meant that the internal dynamics of an organisation – its power centre, relationships, resources etc. - must work in favour of operations if they are to be successful. From the in-depth conversations this evaluation has had with five partner projects, the evidence is a mixed bag which has to do with how risk is managed.

In some cases – including dialogue with employers in Zanzibar, gender development in Ghana etc. – it is clear that LO and the national union in partnership has acted on an understanding of these internal dynamics and made them to work in favour of project objectives. Also, there are cases where project components/operations have been carried out without an equally clear understanding. For instance, in work related to membership databases the fact that unions are not always happy to disclose their numbers may work contrary to project objectives⁹. Another example is when work on the gender components have been initiated without full local involvement or discussions about timing¹⁰.

In close connection with this observation, it is noted that the risk assessments of the Global programme, with the notable exception of the assessment for the Gender Equality and Digital Monitoring project, takes little note of the risks associated with national power- and union internal dynamics.

3.4 Effectiveness

While there were substantial obstacles for implementing the programme and the overall situation for the trade unions globally is bleak, evaluation findings suggest that the programme has been effective. The goals of the programme are likely to be achieved or almost achieved within the period. Objectives have generally been achieved in terms of advocacy, defence of workers' rights, equity, and organisational strengthening but also in organising more workers. The sections below describe what contributes to the achievements and potential that is yet to be fulfilled.

The consequences of the Covid-19 pandemic on labour market, societies, and human rights dramatically impact the possibilities to achieve the objectives of the interventions and thereby the effectiveness of the programme. In several of the countries of interventions, governments have implemented policies that make e.g., collective bargaining and unionization more difficult. Many workers have lost their employment and members' events have been cancelled. Women have been particularly affected by the pandemic with increased responsibility for children and increased risks of being victims of domestic violence. In the following paragraphs, the evaluation's findings on the Global programme's effectiveness in these circumstances are presented.

⁹ In relation, internal tensions between different actors within unions have been noted by many partners.

¹⁰ See example regarding the Participatory Gender Audits (PGA) in paragraph 7 under 3.4 Effectiveness.

Generally, the interventions have been adapted to the situation at hand. The increased challenges mentioned have to a high degree been mitigated through a flexible and creative approach in organising digital trainings etc. The programme structure has demonstrated resilience, enabling objectives to be met to a higher degree than would have been possible otherwise. A success factor of the programme are the regional consultants that provide an accessible resource and maintain the close link with advisors in headquarters. Rapid response and efficient communication with country programmes in monthly meetings, group chats etc from LO is appreciated from partners to accommodate programme activities to contextual developments. Partners have raised in interviews that a strength of LO Norway is that it “believes in them” and listens to partners’ problems and challenges. LO’s international connections and standing bring confidence.

Regarding advocacy, the fora for lobbying have been limited and altered due to pandemic restrictions. However, the long-term alliances that have been built to analyse proposals and share information have been successful in influencing policy. Targets on number of collective agreements and participation of women in negotiation teams were reached. Partners describe that the input they provide to political policy development is considered relevant by decision makers. The evaluation team attributes this to capacity strengthening and organisational development.

Several examples from projects of where the organisational capacity strengthening leads to policy gains have been brought forward during the evaluation. One example is from USO in Colombia. USO developed its legal department to not only provide support to members directly on union issues, but also to broadly share information to members and lobby for legal change politically.

Other objectives achieved due to capacity and organisational set-up relate to protection of workers’ rights. Apart from legal assistance in complaints in e.g., Colombia, the programme has achieved legal improvements for workers in Cambodia as well as increased negotiation platforms in e.g., Hong Kong.

Despite challenges mentioned, the effectiveness of interventions to promote gender equality and inclusion are generally perceived to be high. The evaluation team has identified increased gender and youth representation in the programme countries, e.g., through increases in membership base and leadership positions. Improvements were also achieved through legal representation in sexual harassment cases. The programme has also achieved increased policies in improving gender equality. Sensitisation and the Participatory Gender Audits (PGA) are identified to be strong tools to achieve this change. The PGA is perceived by the partners to contribute to awareness creation and a wider understanding of both organisational and societal challenges. The PGA has been appreciated as it included an ownership of the process for the participants. However, the process would have gained from including the partners at an even earlier stage in deciding in what country and project the audits should be performed.

During interviews, the issue of internal factionalism within partner organisations were raised as obstacles for achieving further goals. Recall the observations about internal dynamics in sections 3.1-3.3.

While the programme’s overall achievements to recruit members are met, there have been challenges regarding migrant workers because of the pandemic. Main challenges are that members lost their employments, left the country of work, and that members recruitment events were cancelled. In these cases, goals were not achieved.

Physical presence by LO to partners has decreased or been cancelled due to travel restrictions, thereby decreasing possibilities to share experience and competence. This is unfortunate as the lack of

capacity of employers and government within the social dialogue has been stressed. This challenge could have been addressed to some extent through international exchange. Interactions, dialogue, and training with peers from LO Norway and possibly also employers' representatives can support capacity strengthening.

The cooperation has increased partner capacity in organisational issues and financial management e.g., to collect dues. The increased capacity on an organisational as well as individual level has increased the union's competitiveness. This has resulted in increased access to funds from additional solidarity partners. Persons who strengthened their capacity in the trainings have also in several cases received competitive offers, in terms of e.g., political influence or financial compensation, from other organisations and left the partner organisations. This can be a positive development individually as well as for partners who can develop important networks outside the organisation. At the same time, it is a loss of capacity internally for the partner organisation.

Overall, initiatives to continue capacity building have been successful in strengthening the partner organisations and its representatives. A clear indication is that the national project teams continued their work and adapted interventions to a changed context. Moving trainings on-line is one example that has brought several lessons learnt. On-line trainings allow more people to take part which is positive. However, it is more difficult to conduct certain interventions on-line such as member recruitment (in particular youth), project design, reflections, open discussions, and consolidation of teams. Project representatives stress the importance of physical presence of LO representatives to get to know each other and have opportunities to discuss sensitive issues.

LO's Global programme is, as the name implies, a global programme including, country specific, thematic, and regional projects. The added value of the Global programme derives from LO Norway and the organisation's intrinsic strengths as peer, funder etc. The value also stems from the links between partners and the partnership model the programme attaches to the cooperation. Throughout the evaluation it has been clear that while the partnership model is important in terms of effectiveness, the "hinge" between the partnership model, results framework, and the specific context is key. In each partnership it is necessary to adjust the model and implementation for the context. In this process, partners believe it is key to ensure relevant capacity to provide for the adjustments. Contextualisation has bearing on all areas of the programme.

3.5 Efficiency

The mid-term evaluation finds that the Global programme is generally considered efficient. In the paragraphs below, strengths and challenges to efficiency are pointed out.

The evaluation team finds the decision to reduce administrative costs by focusing on fewer partners to be rational and cost effective. As mentioned above, the hinge between the programme framework and the projects is a challenge that would likely be increased with more project partners and countries.

Respondents and reports show that human resources in terms of regional consultants is a sensible solution. The regional consultants have a proximity to partners that benefit the decision-making process and avoid delays. The partnership model shortens the decision-making process and favours efficiency in operations with regional consultants providing effective support, as well as facilitating communication and coordination. It was also stressed that the specific competencies of the regional consultants are taken advantage of in the projects. They complete trainings and participatory gender audits avoiding consultants' costs. While this could create interesting synergies and be cost-effective,

the evaluation team raises a question of the terms of reference of the regional consultants and the resources in time that they have at their disposal. A flexibility in the roles has been described in interviews where the consultants can be relieved of or temporarily downgrade other responsibilities to find time for the trainings and audits. This flexibility can accommodate the dilemma.

A central challenge identified relating to reporting is time constraints during the reporting period. This situation risks creating frustration for regional consultants as well as advisors. A possibility suggested to meet this challenge is to schedule a reporting period without annual leave and travels, during which period issues relating to reporting are prioritised and all relevant staff are available for input.

One issue raised in relation to efficiency in reporting is the organisational set-up in terms of the development and design of the reporting framework. It includes an identification of what partners should be looking for, checklists and requirements. This process is managed by LO Norway in Oslo and involves some regional consultants. This could be a prudent choice that increases cost-efficiency as not all actors need to be involved in all processes. However, it has been suggested that increased transparency regarding staff involvement in different processes would benefit overall efficiency. A review of the terms of references for regional consultants and advisors could increase understanding of the different roles and ensure that the focus of the role aligns with the contextual needs. This could in turn ensure that human resources are better employed.

Due to the increased number of on-line trainings, costs for physical meetings were decreased and by the end of the period there were unused funds. Some resources planned for venues and travels were instead allocated to computers, software, and replenishment of internet subscriptions. The evaluation team compared digital and physical meetings during interviews and within the team. The financial costs for digital trainings and meetings can be reduced with less travel and time spent. In some cases, the same focus could be maintained and fulfilled. This was mentioned for check-off meetings and trainings that involve less interaction. In other meetings, the objectives of meetings were more challenging to fulfil in digital meetings, and physical meetings will be necessary as a complement, such as formation of groups and discussions of sensitive issues. In these contexts, the financial costs will not necessarily be reduced as more meetings or delays in implementation may be called for. The evaluation team found that there was high awareness within the programme of the issue, and it would benefit planning and ensure that costs are well spent if the programme document these insights.

Interviewees consider it to be cost-efficient to work with structural challenges that can benefit many workers. One example that was raised in interviews is the legislation for increased parental benefits that was introduced in the Philippines. In this advocacy campaign, the unions collaborated with civil society organisations as they have identified common interests. The staff partners' in e.g., Hong Kong often aim to create synergies through combining different interventions such as trainings with fundraising. The programme also cooperates with other actors in advocacy to create greater change together. But the coordination is also cost-effective as it inspires others, e.g., other civil society organisations, to do more. Another example from Hong Kong, is where committees have been formed that lobby their issues of focus, dividing responsibilities and increasing effects.

In terms of financial control, LO headquarters has supported with capacity building for financial and other staff providing opportunity for cross-country exchange. LO headquarters also support through on-going clarifications or coaching within programmes. The contacts improve competence and structural capacity, and partners are more prone to reach out to LO if they have established a previous contact.

The Global programme has drawn lessons from corruption cases within the programme. One lesson is the importance to share an understanding of what corruption is. Another is how fraud can be

discovered. Initially there was resistance to developing policies on anti-corruption. However, as the policies were implemented, they are perceived as an advantage for partners.

As mentioned above the understanding of the programme framework is key in adequately adjusting it to the local context. Guidance from LO Norway consultants and advisors can contribute to ensuring that the focus remains on the programme outcomes in combination with local priorities. The evaluation provides a mixed picture in terms of the understanding of the reporting frameworks. While there are testimonies of a common view of what should be captured, focusing on the longer-term outcomes rather than details, there is at the same time a frustration regarding detailed reporting requirements.

Reporting has been a recurring issue during this evaluation for several reasons.

1. It is experienced to be challenging because of the relevance of indicators and the administrative burden. Interviewees stress that extensive resources are devoted to chasing member numbers from unions and that sections such as developments in the country of implementation should not need to be reported as often as is the case currently. An exception is of course if uncommon and important developments in the context relevant for the programme that should be reported as soon as is convenient.
2. There can also be technical obstacles for reporting such as the absence of databases of members and other relevant tools to follow up progress. A review and update of membership databases could be included in the programme.
3. A third aspect can be political, for different reasons information is not shared transparently within organisations due to formal or informal power structures or internal politics.

Technical and political obstacles to adequate reporting does not necessarily imply a problem with the reporting structures but rather that the challenge high-lights other issues within the programme or organisation. It should be noted that the mid-term evaluation coincides with the project reporting period, which could contribute to the focus on the issue.

3.6 Sustainability

The evaluation team identifies some substantial achievements in terms of sustainability, primarily in achievements of capacity strengthening. However, increasing concerns about sustainability are raised because of the consequences of the pandemic and challenges to the union movement globally. This section highlights concerns to- and factors improving sustainability.

Across the programme and through in-depth interviews conducted in five projects, concerns are expressed about the sustainability of operations. Responses from the on-line survey in particular stresses challenges to sustainability of operations, seeking increased support from LO Norway to develop sustainability plans. This work is partly underway e.g., in Malawi. The respondents particularly raise concerns of the increasingly difficult situation in the aftermath of the pandemic and that they are heavily dependent on LO Norway to sustain the work. However, some respondents also note that the focus would remain and that some aspects have been mainstreamed into the organisations.

The evaluation team finds the organisational sustainability generally strong in increasing capacity and structures. One example is from USO in Colombia, while the set-up of a legal department positively influences the project's impact. Another example from Colombia, this time from CUT is the increased competitiveness of the organisation. After the organisation implemented an anti-corruption policy, CUT increased its potential to apply for funding from additional donors.

An intrinsic sustainability challenge within the migrant programme is that members and leaders are trained but to a high degree leave their countries of work. Hence, it is important to collaborate with local organisations that are less mobile, something that is also underway. The unions are keeping in touch with leaders and members that have been trained and subsequently leave the country. One positive example is a member who had taken part in training but later moved to Singapore where she continued to conduct trainings.

To a large extent, concerns regarding sustainability have been prompted by the pandemic situation. In a moulding incremental fashion, the phase starting in early 2020 until now has presented challenges to working conditions, with some sectors hit more seriously than others, and the labour market climate as a whole has hardened.

3.7 Impact

The evaluators have identified programme impact as trade unions have contributed to improved workers' social protection and working conditions. The section also suggests obstacles to - and traits that positively influence the programme impact.

A success factor for impact within the programme is **empowerment**. The capacity building has made a great difference for the participants in the programme according to interviewees. The participants are empowered, and more workers have the capacity to defend their rights and negotiate. This contributes to positively impacting social protection of workers and decent working conditions.

Improved social benefits of workers have been achieved e.g., in the maternity benefits in the Philippines and income security for retrenched workers in Tunisia. Partners have also negotiated security measures and benefits specifically relating to Covid-19. The programme has additionally achieved to increase the minimum wage in seven out of fourteen programme countries¹¹.

Evidence suggest that the Global programme has had lasting impact from its organisational capacity building efforts. This seem particularly true in work with smaller organisations such as ZATUC and USO and where LO Norway is among the major partners.

Another strength of the programme has been **collaboration**. One example is from Malaysia. Through continued lobbying, in March 2022, the Malaysian employment act was amended, and amongst other things, the wording domestic servants was replaced with domestic employees. To achieve this, AMMPO teamed up with different organisations. The importance to build coalitions with other NGO's and trade unions has been raised in several interviews.

The set-up of a legal department in USO in Colombia is an example of where the programme meets impact indicators of increasing compliance in workers' rights. Another example would be the training of domestic migrant workers in AMMPO Malaysia and PLUDW Hongkong on case reporting and the subsequent filing of cases and claims for abuse or exploited domestic workers in both Malaysia and Hongkong, where large sums of penalties were exacted from the abusive employers. Similarly, CUT in Colombia had already in 2019 handled more than 1000 legal cases of violations of workers' rights. Other examples are found in e.g., Zimbabwe. There have been many cases globally relating to the pandemic. The strategic litigation mechanism utilised provides for potential direct improvements as well as long-term impact.

¹¹ The source for this information is the upcoming programme Annual Report for 2021, which is forthcoming.

Improved policies for migrant workers have been achieved in the countries of operations, indicating impact achievement. One example from Hong Kong is that the Employment Agency Administration agreed to be open on Sundays to accept complaints from migrant workers on their day off. The programme has also been instrumental in the establishment of an international organisation to organise migrant workers from the Philippines and possibly other countries.

In an interview and in line with the findings of the external evaluators, it was noted that there lies potential in increased focus on factors that are outside the control of partners, but still affect impact. The programme can contribute to creating the impact it seeks, but other actors are also instrumental to its achievement for example through shaping legislation. Hence, there is an opportunity for positively strengthened impact through increased inclusion of relevant actors in programme activities. This could, for example, mean that key actors outside the project increasingly benefit from interventions such as capacity building. It could also lead to increased cooperation with regional actors such as SADC or South Africa in the case of Zimbabwe. Working in this way could strengthen programme focus on global phenomena.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions drawn in the following are limited to the overall traits of the programme in relation to the main evaluation criteria relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. They are also prioritised in a way that motivates the focus of the final chapter on recommendations and lessons learned.

(1)

In the assessment of the evaluators, **the Global programme is contributing to the strengthening of unions in union organisation and capacity.** In so doing it is also contributing **to the positive development of labour market relations and functionality in targeted countries.** It is also indirectly strengthening the relative contribution of governments and employers' organisations to the pluralistic mechanics of the labour market as a whole.

The tensions in the tripartite cooperation between government-unions-employers are also one of democratic governance in the core sense that it promotes a balancing of powers. This reality is present in LO Norway programming and lends it strength.

(2)

The Global programme has a level of relevance to its partners and its overall purposes that is extraordinarily high. The way the Global programme 2019-2023 was put together stems from a long history of experiences. Union-to-union work also falls into a category of shared agendas and motivations that is in fact not so common in development cooperation, even between like-minded organisations, mainly due to cultural and normative differences of perspective. It is nevertheless remarkable in a comparative perspective to conclude that programme coverage, over the mosaic that are the priorities and objectives of partners on five continents, is contextualised and to the point.

In particular, the Global programme is presenting the partners with tools to secure access and influence in political labour market decision-making. The partners have developed partnerships as well as legal and thematic competences that make them heard/influential in political and legislative processes. One should take great pride in this recognition.

(3)

Since the beginning of the pandemic approximately from March 2020, **the Global programme has been seriously affected by a number of global trends spilling over into the context of union work.** Since February 2022, the invasion of Ukraine has only aggravated the number and strengths of shifting conditions.

For the project, primary consequences have included;

- a) A **sharp increase in unemployment** in both formal and informal sectors, with difficulties to retain members as a main consequence.
- b) **Restrictions to movement and social gathering** have limited capacity building, recruitment events as well as severely limiting LO presence in-country and in the practical work. This poses challenges to the partnership model of the Global programme.
- c) **Legislative measures limiting the right** to assembly, freedom of speech and access to collective bargaining mechanisms have challenged union activity. Additional restrictions from employers have added to the challenges.
- d) **Disruptions in supply chains and increasingly tense geopolitical relations** leading to regionalised deviations from global trends.

It is true that in the years 2020-2021, results achievement has not as a whole met expectations set before the programme started. Considering the adversity of global events – including the pandemic and geo-economical supply side challenges – it would in all likelihood still be **safe to say the programme is overperforming.**

Drawing on these conclusions, however, one should probably consider revisiting the global programme situation analysis because of the rapid and sharp turn of global trends.

(4)

The Global programme 2019-2023 has difficulties in adapting to the more comprehensive programme framework. This state of affairs has had several consequences, both positive and negative. On the positive side, the framework has presented meaning and robust understanding of what is the programme and its objectives. With partner organisations, increased awareness and to a degree, empowerment of programme content and options is probably the right way to describe the effect.

On the negative side the framework has induced an approach that is technical in nature. This means the partners are so focused on the activity at hand that they sometimes fail to put their actions into an overall context. Secondly, the practice of using the framework has one-sidedly emphasised its control aspects. Exaggerated amounts of time are spent on reporting and looking for numbers which decreases efficiency in operations. The numbers are subsequently seldom used for the second key objective of a programme framework; supplying information relevant to planning. On balance, the framework can be managed differently to become an increasing asset of the Global programme by stimulating a better equilibrium between the planning and control aspects of the framework.

(5)

LO Norway tends to operate its Global programme more as a series of individual projects than as a global whole. The Global programme reports on progress, and updates from all countries included, provides an interesting picture of the overall trends for the global labour union movement. However, in terms of learning between the partners involved and sharing experiences and methods there is less focus. One reason could be that the management of the Global programme has become more

compartmentalised. The programme stands to lose both in relevance and efficiency if this trend is not addressed.

While projects rest on the four pillars they have in common, they have also developed distinctive focus areas under these pillars. Examples include strategic litigation or the formation of a transnational migrant union. Partners benefit from **sharing these experiences** for inspiration, learning and as input to strategic planning. Such exchange can also contribute to consolidating achievements and empowering programme staff. From a management perspective, greater interactivity is also a means to handle and make beneficial the different profiles, experiences, and skills of LO Norway programme staff.

Looking at the roles LO Norway plays towards its partners, it is particularly **as a learning organisation, as a knowledge broker** of international comparative experience, and **as a connector** that the programme could benefit greatly from operating more collectively and interactively.

(6)

Concerns have been raised to the sustainability of the projects and progress achieved. The evaluators interpret this worry to reflect challenges in project countries. Respondents to the survey as well as interviewees request LO Norway to increase their support in formulating sustainability plans.

(7)

It is concluded that the most comprehensively sustainable results are found in the area of organisational strengthening. The fact is that results as they appear today are a consequence also of cooperation before the 2019-2023 period. Measures to strengthen organisations – in creating routines, policies, organisational principles, registers etc. etc. – have largely remained part of organisational life.

By contrast over time, results in areas of training, such as collective bargaining skills, insights into legal frameworks, advocacy towards certain groups and so on has been more **vulnerable to staff movements**. But there are also important examples contrary to this overall pattern. Instances of lasting impact on alliances built, legal frameworks, and lasting behavioural changes towards the inclusion of women and youth, including the Participatory Gender Audits, have been recorded throughout the Global programme.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS AND LESSONS LEARNED

5.1 During the remainder of the programme period 2022-2023



(5.1.1) During 2023, revisit the overarching situation analysis underpinning the Global programme in view of the programme period 2024-2029.

At mid-term, the Global Decent Work programme 2019-2023 finds itself in the midst of a profound global turnaround. Patterns of globalisation are being challenged towards more regionalised development paths. These changes in geopolitical and geo-economic outlook are affecting labour markets world-wide, and will probably also prompt more regionalised responses. Additionally, the Covid-19 pandemic has negatively influenced the possibilities of achieving the Sustainable Development Goals and transformed labour market practices globally. Under these circumstances,

revisiting the overall situation analysis and what it means for project priorities and pathways of change is warranted.



(5.1.2) During the remaining period of the 2019-2023 programme and to the extent possible, aim to bolster LO Norway physical presence in all partner countries.

From a cost-efficiency perspective, this may seem an unfit suggestion. However, the rationale is that the extraordinary situation of the pandemic has underplayed LO Norway's contributions as a partner and practical driver of individual operations considerably. From our sample projects, it seems clear this has been to the detriment of project outcomes in the first half of the programme period.

As indicated in this report, the presence of LO Norway staff in the project setting plays an important role. The Global Decent Work programme as a whole takes **more strengths from its collaborative- than from its financial element**. An overall determination of the right balance between in-country presence and distance cooperation is difficult at this time (because the sample frame is so distorted from expectation), and the report settles for the recommendation to increase physical presence and to take this opportunity to examine the strategic outlook of each project in line with point 5.1.3 below.



(5.1.3) During the remaining period of the 2019-2023 programme, make a point of revisiting each project from a strategic perspective.

First, it is recognised by the evaluators that in various degree, this is already happening. The point with reiterating the obvious is the belief that partners will thrive from lessening the emphasis on reporting and control, and in reviving the projects – particularly in view of increasingly gruesome international geopolitical and geoeconomic prospects, but also of locally hardening political and labour market prospects – from the point of view of their own strategic concerns and struggles.

Revisiting efforts may be including questions such as; where are we now, what options are available to us, in what areas and under what conditions can we hope to be particularly successful? Also, what experiences would be relevant to share with other partners and what information from partners would benefit our work?

Finally, including a historical perspective on strategic direction would probably serve partners well. In some cases, cooperation has been ongoing for over two decades and bringing past experiences into a renewed contextual analysis is likely to strengthen it.



(5.1.4) During 2023, revisit the Global programme framework¹² in view of the programme period 2024-2029 with aims to a) reduce complexity and b) improve its usefulness for planning, partnership dialogue, and strategic priorities.

The primary motivation for this recommendation is to emphasise the “other” purpose of the framework besides control, i.e., its planning purpose.

Several options are possible. It may entail a modification of each project strategic outlook, i.e., the adaptation of the Global programme framework to something less cumbersome and more operational and executive in each project context. Such frames are usually short, succinct, condensed and to the point of decision-making. Contrarily, it may entail reducing the complexity of the overall framework – of course without compromising Norad requirements – and make a greater point of emphasising the

¹² A collective name for a series of programme foundations and working instruments that make up the definition of the programme; its results framework, the assumptions of the theory of change, the individual project rationales, the risk analyses framework, and financial reporting framework.

inherent flexibility of the framework. Or something in-between. In either case, a review of the application of the entire framework is warranted.

The concrete recommendation here is to engage LO staff in an exercise, supported by outside neutral advisors, to assess what would be necessary to rebalance the management approach towards the planning objective.

5.2 In the formulation of the 2024-2029 Global programme



(5.2.1) Strengthen the “global” aspect of the Global Decent Work programme by stimulating the exchange between projects and staff.

The primary means to do this in practice, is to reorganise the cooperative element of LO Norway advisors and consultants to a more horizontal and mutually supportive relationship. In our view, such action would simultaneously promote the interactivity of the country projects, strengthen the strategic aspect of project programming, and finally address the reported compartmentalisation of project management. LO Norway is hence advised to apply the classical managerial remedy of working more horizontally. This means that leadership, advisors and consultants work more as a team than as isolated workshops.

One way to achieve such coherence is to introduce strategic planning sessions.¹³ In such a session, the project responsible presents a case to a panel of peers. The presenter explains against which analysis this or that action, or strategic direction in the cooperation, should be taken. The panel then acts as a sounding board whose primary purpose is to strengthen and develop the analysis of the presenter with their own experiences. Potential to strengthen LO Norway as a partner in this way includes its capacities as a knowledge broker of international comparative perspectives and examples, as a connector between the local and other partner organisations and actors, and finally as a learning organisation.

More broadly, however, working more horizontally means to make more of the capacities of LO Norway staff, advisors and consultants as a collective.

Discussing strategic choice jointly would be a means to strengthen the capacity of the individual project managers with the insights of colleagues from different backgrounds and experiences. This is likely to improve contextualisation when/if it has limits, but foremost it would contribute to make better use of the global aspect of the programme by providing comparative examples and solutions from other countries and unions. In this regard, including the partners as beneficiaries in the exchange is likely to further develop their capacities.

Ideally, measures to strengthen internal cooperation would go hand-in-hand with efforts to manage the programme framework differently, i.e., increasingly emphasising its planning purposes.



(5.2.2) Re-visit the role of LO Norway and its partners as change agents based on the conclusions of the overarching situation-analysis (see 5.1.1).

The interests of members of the unions in the transition to greener low carbon economies, technologic advancement, and societal development will need to be protected. Platforms for advocacy and

¹³ The evaluators are conscious that to some degree such sessions already form part of programme management, for example as part of the internal project evaluations, but wishes to make a point of their further institutionalization.

possible alliances should be reviewed. In addition to analysing the context, the organisations' need to assess their roles in the context to define how the unions can secure a voice in the decision-making processes of 2024 and beyond.



(5.2.3) Strengthen the Global programme framework for 2024-2029 with increasing emphasis on local political- and internal dynamics as a means to improve the efficiency and timeliness of operations.

As discussed in this report, the level of contextualisation of operations is high. What can be done to sharpen this aspect even further is to look closer at local political- and internal dynamics to take advantage of existing opportunities to further the agenda of the partners based on their own motivations. In particular, when such motivations cater to central players in the tripartite relation government-unions-employers to strengthen the functioning of the labour market and the programmes' contribution to societal development as a whole.