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**DISCLAIMER**

The views and opinions expressed in the report are those of the evaluators and, as such, do not necessarily reflect those of the European Training Foundation. The European Training Foundation does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this report and accepts no responsibility for any consequences of their use.
1. Executive Summary

0.1. Purpose of the evaluation

The objective of this mid-term evaluation is the overall assessment of the ETF’s Innovation and Learning Projects covering the period 2006 – 2010, by providing a retrospective analysis of the qualitative and quantitative aspects of ILPs, including the identification phase, the objectives and results achieved, and the methodological aspects is requested.

Formulating useful and necessary recommendations to improve ILP projects in the next phase, which will start in 2011, is requested as well. These recommendations should be based on the lessons learnt and the assessment’s conclusions.

0.2. Methods

The main methodological principles are:

- To apply a combination of “policy” and project evaluation techniques. The first looks at the context in which operations take place to a greater extent and lesson-learning is emphasized by using qualitative approaches, participatory methods and reflections on the historical evolution of the project. The latter gives more emphasis to accountability, which implies structuring the evaluation so that its findings are independent and respected.

- To look at the full picture, of the contemporary VET reform policy and labour market policy, taking into account a plurality of objectives and their prioritization. The complexity of the issues dealt with the innovation approach, and the its interactions and synergies, often of an intangible nature.

- To use a range of tools available through the cross-sectoral character of contemporary training and labour market policy, relying mostly on narrative and qualitative techniques rather than quantitative ones and the participative approach.

0.3. Tools and approach

The proposed approach is based on models adopted by the European Commission for external cooperation programs, tailored to the specific characteristics of the ILP/ETF.

Taking into account the ILP projects’ objectives, scopes and approach, based on the Logical Framework Approach methods and on the Logical Framework as the main technical tool, the proposed main reference documents are: “Aid Delivery Methods - Project Cycle Management Guidelines, EC External Assistance Mach 2004” and Evaluation Methods for the European Union’s External Assistance /2006).

0.4. The evaluation strategy

The evaluation carried out in two main stages:

- Evaluation of each projects mainly on the basis of documentation analysis and meetings with staff in Turin;
- A holistic evaluation of the ILP project as a whole, on the basis of each project and the contribution of their activities.

The Women and Work project has been examined in depth also through a short mission in Jordan.

0.5. Evaluation criteria and indicators

The evaluation questions focus on a limited number of key points in order to allow a greater targeted data collection and in depth analysis.
They have been regrouped on the basis of seven evaluation criteria, the five basic criteria formalized by the OECD DAC (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability), plus two criteria for EC politics (European Added Value and Coherence / Complementarity).

0.5.1. Evaluation tools

- **Organization Tools** (Logical Framework for the individual ILP projects and “Impact Diagram” and Interlocked Logical Framework for the overall ILP project):
- **Collection, Analysis and Judgment Tools** The evaluation used a combination of tools, taking into consideration the nature of available data (quantitative, qualitative). The main tools which have been used are *desk analysis, interviews and case studies*.

1. **ANALYSIS AND MAIN FINDINGS**

1.1. **Relevance**

1.1.1. **Problems analysis and stakeholders participation**

In all the projects’ documentation the relationship and contribution of each project to the development of the ETF’s objectives, themes and functions are clearly stated, along with the description of the problematic framework which justifies and is at the origin of ILP projects.

The projects in the Partner Countries have adopted different organizational models, ranging from relatively stable local structures (such as the Steering Committee Established by the Government in Morocco in the Flexicurity projects), to simple on-time reports for Local Actors (such as in the Competitiveness project) or by setting up temporary working groups to support project activities (e.g. the Consultative Groups in the Women & Work project).

In all projects, the stakeholders’ active participation and interest in the proposed activities has been reported as being generally good. Even so, in some cases, the methodology, the survey’s design, and the lack of consultation have been criticized by local stakeholders, since the processes were set up and carried out without their participation and supervision; and, they were called to express their opinion only once the work had already been completed.

There is no evidence that the project proposals and their objectives have been compared to those of other stakeholders (donors and other local groups) to verify their originality.

On the basis of the visit to Amman and the meetings with project staff, we observed a significant difference between the information available in the project documentation, which mostly consists of lists of activities, and the actual accomplishments in the field, which are far richer in experiences and useful results.

1.1.2. **Degree of evaluability**

There are two main factors that limit the ILPs’ degree of evaluability ¹:

- lack of data and information;

---

¹ By evaluability we mean the conditions which allow a project to be assessed efficiently, according to the established evaluation objectives.
• generic definition of project strategy (Logical framework quality, objectives, results and indicators). This leads mostly to the use of the relevance and coherence/complementarity and European added value criteria and less to that of effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability.

The project planning documentation (PIPs and LF) doesn’t follow European formats and their structure has not been significantly updated throughout the years.

The PIPs do not contain information that could have been helpful during both the implementation and the evaluation phase (e.g. sustainability, coherence, coordination and complementarily, lesson learnt and European added value).

The reporting system (The QRs, the main sources of data, are succinct recordings of activities, with administrative and accountability purposes; there is little information on the changes produced by the project, on the problems encountered, the causes and solutions adopted, unexpected events, growth of awareness and learning progress within the ETF and among local actors, etc.

1.1.3. Quality of project design

The work methodology is always well defined and it generally appears to be coherent with the preliminary studies and surveys for analyzing the identified themes and contexts.

The Logical Framework of all projects does not correspond to the European Commission’s standards for international cooperation, and they have been updated throughout the project’s duration (e.g. HCD project) only in a few cases.

The main limits of the Logical Framework are: i) excessively high number of objectives and results; ii) generic definition of objectives, results and indicators; iii) in many cases, the proposed indicators, are not sufficiently specific and verifiable; iv) the definition of the assumptions is very variable. In some projects they are adequately described, in others they are often confused with accomplishments which lie in the sphere of the project’s activities and hence are the team’s responsibility.

1.1.4. Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions 1  Problem analysis and stakeholder participation

The project objectives and strategies, even if they are often generic, are relevant in addressing the need to update the ETF expertise and mission and to contribute to the review of local education, training and employment policies through innovative approaches.

The projects have been identified and designed by the ETF expert, supported by external specialists. This procedure is coherent with the research characteristics of the ILP projects, even if it differs from the formal procedure recommended by European models (i.e. Logical Framework Approach). However the participation of the stakeholders in the implementation phase alongside the project cycle has to address the need for ownership, the main pillars of the Turin process and of all EC development policies.

The lack of data depends mainly on the documentations’ insufficient quality and, probably, on the poor awareness of the importance of the monitoring and evaluation functions.

Recommendation 1  Problem analysis and stakeholder participation

The relations with stakeholders, should be based on a more decentralization of the responsibilities and strengthening capacities of local ownership, identifying a local focal or reference point, preferentially an already existing service or department in the education, training and labour market institutions. It would be a direct partner of projects, assuming greater responsibility for local management (selection of service provider, collaboration in findings elaboration and in organizing dissemination) as well as being the umbrella institution coordinating all stakeholders, at as present.
The findings analysis, discussion, option selection and validation and dissemination would still continue to be entrusted to working groups, made up of a higher number of representatives of institutional, social and international stakeholders.

The ILP team would still continue to be responsible for TA, supervision and monitoring.

**Conclusion 2 Quality of project design**

The project design is more activity-oriented than result-oriented, as recommended by the European and international methodologies, and it is also quite fragmented.

The consequences are i) a plurality of objectives and results; ii) the objectives and results are not clearly stated and operationally defined; iii) the resources are dispersed and couldn’t reach the critical minimum mass needed for good impacts; iv) it makes it difficult to monitor and evaluate the project.

Complex and innovative projects, such as the ILPs, can adopt a research – action approach, with a flexible initial planning to be revised and detailed as the project progress. The problem arises –is the case of quite all assessed ILPs – when, in spite of the field experience, the results, objectives, indicators, assumptions and risks remain in their vague state, alongside the project implementation.

**Recommendation 2 Quality of project design**

The project team, before the project starts, should attend a seminar on European PCM methods and techniques. It should also be supported by an internal ETF specialist / unit, at least during the identification phase and design of the project.

To revise the “Guideline notes for project proposals”, including sustainability, coherence, coordination and complementarily, lesson learnt and the European added value criteria.

To use the Logical Framework, to the extent that it is possible, according to the European model while taking into account the specific research nature of the ILPs. The LF has to be revised at least once a year.

More specifically:

**Option 1**

Projects should have one specific objective; ii) Results must be defined as goods and services produced and delivered and as contributions to achieving the specific objective; iii) assumptions should refer only to conditions which are beyond the control and responsibility of the project management (external conditions); iv) the indicators (quantitative or qualitative) have to be simple and verifiable.

**Option 2**

Projects could also be structured into more components attributing a specific objective to each (considering their size, a maximum of 2). In this case, each project/component should be considered as a sub project, and provided with consistent resources.

**1.2. Effectiveness**

A significant part of ILP results such as “New methodology for analyzing VET /LM transition”; “Consolidated HCD Reviews framework”; “New material elaborated”; “Tools to understand sustainable economic growth”, etc, have already been achieved, and a considerable amount of tools and political options is available to ETF experts and Partner Countries.

If we look at the ILPs in the light of the new proposed reformulation of the intervention logic, it can be stated that in all ILP projects the specific objective will be partly achieved because there is clear evidence that all project teams have reached a good level of knowledge and competencies in the relevant fields. The extent to which this opportunity has really been embodied (or will be) in the overall ETF system and
transformed into operational and stable expertise capability is, at present, hard to understand, because of lack of data and some unclear aspects

1.2.1. Conclusions

The effectiveness of the ILPs, that’s the extent to which the results have been achieved, can be said to be generally positive, considering that some projects are still ongoing and their relatively low degree of evaluability.

The very high levels of skills and competencies gained by the project teams are certainly a strong component of the ETF’s specific objective, “expertise quality enhancement”.

However the probability that this objective is fully achieved depends on the following key issues:

- There is no clear evidence of a learning management strategy, enabling the ETF to deal with and process, in an efficient and permanent way, the considerable amount of knowledge, experiences and competencies accumulated by the numerous ILP initiatives.
- The inner and external mobility of ETF experts. Team work ends once the project is concluded, and their members move on to other activities or leave the organization (in many projects even during the implementation). This leads to problematic and unclear issues: how will their competencies be managed by the ETF?

1.2.2. Recommendation

i) Improving the quality of data collection during the project life, giving greater weight to qualitative aspects of experience in the field and also revising the current Quarterly Reports scheme, checking the assumptions and risks evolution.

ii) The ILP initiatives should be included in a “knowledge management system” (or equivalent tool) supported also by ICT, as a complement to the project activities (cappuccino and international meetings, peer reviews, etc.) and the existing and very efficient catalog of publications, in order to share and make more available the large amount of political options, methodologies and relational models coming from the experiences of ILPs initiatives. The system could include:

- Thematic forums for each project allowing exchanges among different actors.
- Reworking of the projects results of the basis of "good practices" model, easier to be disseminated, shared and updated. the packages could be included in capacity-building activities, as distance learning and Communities of Practice
- Links to specialized websites, as results of the preliminary research phases of ILPs.

1.3. Efficiency

Preliminary activities, such as desk research and analysis of existing experiences, have been implemented as scheduled, with a few exceptions; in general, the deadlines of main steps and activities have been respected. For the most part, the planned activities have been carried out and results have been achieved, with the exception of a few cases, where they were proven unfeasible.

The project team has dealt with unexpected events in an acceptable way and in this regard, the projects have shown a good degree of flexibility.

Some delays occurred during the implementation phase in the Partner Countries; they have been caused by unexpected events and the annual project reformulation.

In some projects, the management has been burdened with the change, during the activities, of project team members (i.e. Women and Work, Flexicurity, and HCD Review) and with the delay in the availability of funds (i.e. Flexicurity).
1.3.1. Conclusions
On the whole, the management of the projects has been fairly efficient in terms of respecting the schedule, use of resources, management of unexpected events and flexibility.

Delays accumulated over the years are, in some cases, slowing down the conclusion of the projects. Some delays could be minimized through a more reliable analysis of the conditions of context, a simplification of the project design and a more careful analysis of risks and conditions for success.

The teams have carried out an impressive work load, especially considering the projects’ fragmentation, due to different contexts, variety of themes, and number of stakeholders involved.

The management has been burdened by the change, during the operation, of the project team composition and, as a consequence, the activities have not always been consistent. This is a very negative and dangerous aspect of the ILPs’ process management.

The projects’ annual reformulation is not the most suitable option when managing initiatives which instead require the certainty of resources throughout their implementation.

1.3.2. Recommendations
To ensure the stability of human resources and funds and their utmost concentration, and in particular that of the project team, limiting mobility and replacing personnel to maintain the same operational capacity.

To try to make the project duration coincide with the duration of funding, to the extent that this is possible and compatible with ETF procedures.

1.4. Impact
Although it’s too early for assessing the impact of ILP projects on Partner Countries politics, there evidences of important positions taken by institutional stakeholders to apply new methodologies and political options on VET and LM reforms.

1.4.1. Conclusion
The results which have already been achieved, the large amount of activities carried out, and the appreciation expressed by stakeholders are proxy qualitative indicators demonstrating that the results already meet the expectations.

In some cases there are concrete signs from governmental institutions that they are going to share and adopt the new methodologies and models elaborated by the ILP projects.

1.4.2. Recommendations
a) Identifying, tools and opportunities to disseminate results and information concerning the project, preferably using local channels managed by stakeholders that can ensure greater extension and continuity of delivery.

b) to put the follow up of concluded projects into the future ETF programs. This would have several advantages: to consolidate the first impacts; a more effective capacity building of local HR and institutions, based on the already acquired experience; and lesson learnt to improve the future initiatives.

1.5. Sustainability
At this stage, only a provisional assessment of the project’s sustainability is possible.
At the moment, it is difficult to evaluate sustainability in Partner Countries. It is still not clear who will take on the task for the future and ongoing updating of ILP project results, for they evolve quickly within the contexts where they were proposed, discussed and validated.

There is no information on agreements and formalized procedures, on the involvement of stakeholders in future research, and on the inclusion of ILP results in government budgets.

The HCD Review is the only exception since its specific objectives includes: “Identifying enablers in partner country systems that support HCD in the long-term, taking into account the equity dimension, for the sake of meeting sustainable development.” Even so, there is not enough information.

The institutional analysis of the local stakeholders is absent.

1.5.1. Conclusions

Sustainability has not been considered a criterion in the project design; therefore tools or opportunities to ensure the continuity of results and benefits of the ILPs in Partner countries, have not been included in the project’s plans. Nevertheless some conditions for sustainability are present in the projects, as i) good correspondence between local needs and projects objectives; ii) the consensus of local institutions; iii) good participation of stakeholders and social partners.

These could be the starting point for defining future sustainability strategy and overcome the main weaknesses: i) low level of capacity building and training of local stakeholders; ii) transience of local organizational structures, set up under ILPs just for projects activities.

1.5.2. Recommendations

Taking into account the ILPs project objectives and resources, the main focus should be on capacity building and information dissemination about the activities and results of the projects.

a) institutional and participative analysis, jointly with the main stakeholders, for an assessment of their capacity building needs, in three specific areas: i) Human resource development; ii) Organizational development; iii) Legal framework and changes requested to enable the organizations to manage the results of the projects.

b) defining a plan of activities mainly based on technical assistance and training using an integrated strategies, such as study visits in Italy, local seminars and meetings with ILP experts, thematic web forums at national and regional levels in specific websites.

1.6. Coherence and complementarity

The projects are certainly coherent with European politics and programmes in the ILP’s sectors of interest. In almost all Partner Countries, the ILP project staff collaborates with international organizations to share experiences and knowledge.

1.6.1. Recommendations

To include coherence and complementarity as criteria for project planning and implementation.

The reports should further clarify the relationship between the proposals made by the ILP projects and the national legislative framework in the related sectors.

1.7. European added value

The European added value has not been explicitly stated in the ILP guidelines and this expression “is not found in any document regarding ILP projects, suggesting that even if the projects work on the basis of European politics and experiences on each ILP theme, such a criterion has never been intentionally applied.
There is no systematic analysis of the presence of European programs in the VET and LM sectors managed by Member Countries and by EC Delegations, nor on possible coordinating or harmonizing functions carried out by them in the same areas. There is no information to establish if Partner Countries preferred the ETF/ILP proposals to other solutions offered by individual Member States, as they better respond to their needs and local politics. Likewise, there is no evidence on the comparative advantages of ILP proposals in respect to those formulated in the private sector or by other international agencies.

1.7.1. Recommendations

The first measure is to insert the European added value as a criterion for project planning and implementation. As for the sustainability, this encourages reflection on the conditions for the initiative’s continuity.

The construction of the European Added Value is developed throughout all the phases of the project’s cycle:

**Identification and preliminary activities.**

a) Preliminary activities should concentrate in a more systematic and explicit way on the experiences of European Member States and organizations, selecting existing good practices and examining failed solutions in Europe and in cooperation politics, as a lesson learnt.

b) To highlight and analyze the Member States and the EC intervention in the identified ILPs Partner Countries, in the VET and LM sectors, while considering possible existing complementarity options coordinated by the EC Delegation.

**Implementation**

C) In the elaboration of the methodological tools and of the options in support of system reforms, the comparative advantages they have as European initiatives, related to other programs should be highlighted to a greater extent.

**Dissemination**

In Partner Countries

e) The ILP proposals elaborated as good practices should be disseminated through local channels, supporting, if conditions exist, the leading role played by the EC Delegations; they should also contribute to the identification of strategic and national programs managed by EC Delegations as donors.

**In Europe**

f) The good practices resulting from the ILPs projects methodology, and if they are confirmed by follow up actions they are more relevant, allow the ETF to add value to EU community politics. It is noted that, for example, this would be an extraordinary comparative contribution to international bilateral cooperation politics conducted by Member States and the EC in the ETF’s sectors of interest.
2. INTRODUCTION

2.1. Purpose of the evaluation

Evaluations always have a double objective, to judge the past and to improve present and future activities. The objective of this mid-term evaluation is the overall assessment of the ETF’s Innovation and Learning Projects covering the period 2006 – 2010 by providing a retrospective analysis of the qualitative and quantitative aspects of the ILPs, including the identification phase, the objectives and results achieved, and the methodological aspects is requested.

Formulating useful and necessary recommendations to improve ILP projects in the next phase, which will start in 2011, is requested as well. These recommendations should be based on the lessons learnt and the assessment’s conclusions.

In regards to the evaluation effects of this mid-term evaluation on current activities, it is underlined that two of the seven considered projects are finished while the others are all in the concluding stage.

2.2. European Training Foundation

The European Training Foundation (ETF) is a specialized agency of the European Union based in Turin, Italy. The objective of the ETF is to contribute, in the context of EU external relations policies, to improving human capital development in countries eligible for assistance under the Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance (IPA), the European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument as well as other countries designated by decision of the Governing Board Regulation (EC) No 1339/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2008 establishing a European Training Foundation, article 1. ETF’s thematic mandate of vocational education and training (VET) in a lifelong learning perspective in the broader context of human capital development. In July 2009, the ETF welcomed a new Director and prepared a new Mid Term Perspective for the period 2010-13 to support the implementation of the ETF’s new Council Regulation.

2.2.1. ETF Functions

The functional dimension relates to the specific functions that the ETF undertakes to carry out its mandate. ETF planning relates to the performance of 4 main functions. These are:

F1: supporting the EU’s external assistance policies through input to Commission sector programming and project cycles;

F2: supporting partner country capacity building in human capital development to further build their capacity in policy development, policy in action and policy progress reviews;

F3: providing policy analyses through evidence-based analysis on country or cross-country policy reforms to support informed decision-making on partner country policy responses;

F4: disseminating and exchanging information and experience in the international community (agencies, regional platforms and councils, bilateral and international organisations and donors).

These functions were identified by clustering 8 functions identified in the ETF’s regulation which it may undertake to achieve its objectives.

This is derived from article 2, paragraph (a)-(h) of the ETF Regulation.
2.2.2. ETF Themes

The thematic dimension relates to the scope of the thematic activities that the ETF undertakes in support of human capital development in its work with partner countries within its territorial coverage. Thematic interventions in support of human capital development cover 3 main areas:

A. Vocational education and training system development and provision in a lifelong learning perspective.
B. Labour market needs and employability.
C. Enterprises and human capital development: Education and Business partnerships.

These thematic areas were identified by clustering 7 thematic areas identified contained in its regulation. This is derived from Article 1 sub paragraphs 3 (a)-(g).

The three thematic dimensions provide a basis for addressing the scope of human capital adopted by the Council regulation. Human capital includes not only formal vocational education, but also labour market efficiency and the use and development of skills in an enterprise context.

2.3. Innovation and Learning Program – ILP

The ILP is a specific initiative established in 2006 to support expertise development in new thematic areas and new approaches to policy development. The main reasons for the establishment of ILPs are the following:

The process of globalization and the integration of economic, political and cultural systems introduces continuous changes and competition in the patterns of training, employment and labour markets - the mission areas of ETF intervention. This requires continuous updating and improved quality of their Human Capital knowledge and know-how both in economically advanced and emerging geographic areas.

The constant updating, employment flexibility and high labour mobility requested by the international modern labour market must combine, on one hand, the capacity of government institutions to quickly adapt policies, programs, and strategies to the new demand, and on the other hand, with respect to human rights, namely decent work, employment security and equitable access.

For this task, the ETF will need to continuously develop its own human resources and staff to ensure a continuous coherence between its skills profile and the demands for external expertise.

All this requires research, new methodologies and tools that have been validated in different contexts, and models and good practices should be made (?) available to European Governments and their partner governments to assist policies and programs to be better able to adapt their Human Resources’ capacity and management to the changing climate.

The ETF annually allocates on average approximately 20% of its resources to innovation and learning.

The aim of the Innovation and Learning Project is to contribute to:

- the development of ETF expertise in line with its new mandate;
- the integration of this expertise into regular ETF operations in the countries and regions in which it works; and
- the recognition of the ETF as a centre of expertise in partner countries and among international partners.

The approach of innovation and learning projects is to i) understand and conceptualize developments in partner countries through analysis and research, and ii) apply and refine existing concepts through reality checks.
The current criteria for the selection of ILP projects have been defined in 2006 by ETF Work Programme 2006 – Innovation and Learning Projects – Call for proposals. The paper proposed some changes in the ILP project:

i) Move to projects that are corporate rather than regional;

ii) Stronger focus on projects that promote Innovation and Learning in the education and training systems that the ETF works with;

iii) Common set of criteria for the identification and selection of projects. An illustrative list of possible items was proposed in attachment.

The criteria for assessing Innovation and Learning projects, with respective weightings, were:

**Innovation** - Content and strategies that approach reforms in new a way or a new approach to an issue in partner countries (30).

**Expertise development** leads to the further development of the Commission, the ETF or Partner Countries (45).

**Priority** - A theme, programme or policy area as a priority within EU or ETF objectives (10).

**Country and regional context** - Focuses on a country or regional context that maximizes experiences likely to yield results with lessons appropriate to other contexts (15).

As one can see, “Expertise development and Innovation” covers 75% of the total score and then heavily determines the nature and quality of interventions.

The “Guidance notes for project proposals” proposes the following scheme:

- Title
- Focus on the project
- In what way is the project intended to promote innovation
- Geographical scope of the proposed project
- Links with related work
- Estimated time and budget necessary
- Products
- Support of the project to EU and ETF objectives
- Overall duration of the project
- Opinion of Colleagues
- The expected development for ETF

The evaluated projects are:

- Women and Work
- Education and training for competitiveness
- Flexicurity and the role of Lifelong Learning HCD Review
- Policy Learning in Partner Countries
- Labour Market review and Migration survey
- Transition from education to work

**2.3.1. Some characteristics of the ILP projects**

As already stated in the Inception Report, the evaluation team’s opinion is as follows:

The ILP intervention can be classified as “complex interventions” because:

---

2 Attachment 2
ILP’s innovative nature dealing with the new complex paradigm based on “building knowledge networks, learning mechanisms and social capital”, followed the deep changes that occurred in the VET reform policy approach, acting simultaneously on multiple fronts (social, economic, educational, and institutional). It has a large number of actors and stakeholders belonging to a wide range of categories involved in different operations and activities.

- It has activities in different contexts and Partner Countries. Some sectors of the interventions (i.e. Women and Work, Policy Learning, etc) have to be considered cross-cutting issues, in relation to the impact of the ILP initiatives.

- ILP projects are implemented in succession over a one year cycle.

- They are partly based on applied research, focusing on the adoption of the research methods and the formulation of a hypothesis as a solution to the problem and its validation by a field action. This aspect was underlined in many project documents. But the nature of experimental research implies that the hypothesis can fail, then it has to be rejected and a strong capacity to reorient the actions needs to be put in place. In this sense, ILP projects differ slightly from the traditional definition of a project which, on the contrary, must have a high degree of predictability (duration, activities, and objectives). On the other hand, ILP projects are included in the ETF assistance programme and mandate and they should comply with the EC project approach. This “double nature” of ILP projects is neither a contradiction nor a mistake, only a specificity that should be clearly understood and retained in order to better plan the project design, implementation and evaluation methodology.

### COMPARISON OF ILP VS TRADITIONAL PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Traditional projects</th>
<th>Innovation Learning Projects (ILPs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOOLS</strong></td>
<td>Project Logframe</td>
<td>Project LogFrame, Interlocking Logframe and Impact Diagram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IDENTIFICATION/PLANNING</strong></td>
<td>Based on specific partner country needs</td>
<td>Based on general problems on VET and LM issues. Each project is identified by ETF staff through a research approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High level of predictability and clearly identified results at planning stage</td>
<td>Results developed and detailed during progress of project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPLEMENTATION</strong></td>
<td>Yearly working plan</td>
<td>Flexible and continuous updating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Methods

3.1. Methodological implication of characteristics of ILP projects for the evaluation

An evaluation approach based on the rigid separation and sequence of cause and effect could hardly be applied to complex projects, which are made up of several interdependent relationships, where the interactions are mostly circular instead of linear.

Evaluations cannot only look at the effects of individual operations, but they have to consider the synergies and interactions with ETF objectives and functions and local training and labour market reform policies. Evaluations in this respect become *capacity building* and a *learning tool* in themselves.

Hence the main methodological principles are:

- To apply a combination of “policy” and project evaluation techniques. The first looks at the context in which operations take place to a greater extent and lesson-learning is emphasized by using qualitative approaches, participatory methods and reflections on the historical evolution of the project. Questions, such as “What and why did it happen?” and “How will it evolve?”, arise rather than the establishment of static causal relationships. The latter gives more emphasis to accountability, which implies structuring the evaluation so that its findings are independent and respected.

- To look at the *full picture*, of the contemporary VET reform policy and labour market policy, taking into account a plurality of objectives and their prioritization. The *complexity* of the issues dealt with the innovation approach, and the its interactions and synergies, often of an intangible nature.

- To use a range of tools available through the cross-sectoral character of contemporary training and labour market policy, relying mostly on narrative and qualitative techniques rather than quantitative ones and the participative approach.

3.2. Tools and approach

The proposed approach is based on models adopted by the European Commission for external cooperation programs, tailored to the specific characteristics of the ILP/ETF.

Taking into account the ILP projects’ objectives, scopes and approach, based on the Logical Framework Approach methods and on the Logical Framework as the main technical tool, the proposed main reference documents are: “Aid Delivery Methods - Project Cycle Management Guidelines, EC External Assistance March 2004” and “Evaluation Methods for the European Union’s External Assistance /2006.”

3.2.1. The main operational phases

Reconstruction of the intervention logic of the ILP overall program in order to identify the “logic chain” (objectives, results, outputs, activities), to clarify the assumptions and to analyze the interconnections among projects with local policies of recipient countries and the objectives / functions of the ETF. In this step the project objectives’ hierarchy will be clarified and, if needed, reviewed by including implicit aspects so as to make them immediately valuable.

For the single project evaluation, the existing Logical Framework will be the reference point for the evaluation.

For the overall ILP project evaluation, the traditional Log Frame could be an over-restrictive, potentially inflexible method. We propose to use the Interlocking Logical Framework and the Diagram of Expected Effects, constructed on the basis of the information gathered by the LogFrame of single projects.
A. Application of evaluation criteria by setting evaluation questions, judgment criteria and related qualitative and quantitative indicators in the intervention logic hierarchy.

B. Collection, elaboration, analysis, and judgment of data by applying evaluation tools.

C. Conclusion, recommendations and final report.

3.2.2. The evaluation strategy

The evaluation is carried out in two main stages:

- Evaluation of each project mainly on the basis of an analysis of the documentation and meetings with staff in Turin.
- A holistic evaluation of the ILP project as a whole, on the basis of each project and the contribution of their activities.

The Women and Work project has also been examined by a short mission in Jordan. Evaluation questions, evaluation criteria, judgment criteria and indicators

The evaluation questions focus on a limited number of key points in order to allow a greater targeted data collection and in-depth analysis (see annex)

They have been regrouped on the basis of seven evaluation criteria, the five basic criteria formalized by the OCSE DAC (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability), plus two criteria for EC politics (European Added Value and Coherence / Complementarity).

3.2.3. Evaluation tools

*Organizational Tools* (Logical Framework for the individual ILP projects and “Impact Diagram” and Interlocked Logical Framework for the overall ILP project): They provide a framework for the better understanding of the intervention logic and the connections among the different components of the programme.

*Collection, Analysis and Judgment Tools* The evaluation used a combination of tools, taking into consideration the nature of available data (quantitative, qualitative).

The main tools which have been used are *desk analysis, interviews and case studies.*
4. **MAIN FINDINGS**

4.1. **Innovation and Learning Project - ILP Overall assessment**

4.1.1. **Relevance**

*Problems analysis and stakeholders participation*

In all the projects’ documentation the relationship and contribution of each project to the development of the ETF’s objectives, themes and functions are clearly stated, along with the description of the problematic framework which justifies and is at the origin of ILP projects.

The project has been identified and designed by the ETF/ILP expert, on the basis of “a common criteria for identification and selection of the projects” (“ETF Work programme 2006 – Innovation and Learning projects - Call for proposals”).

The preliminary studies of the ILP projects have been carried out by ETF staff, supported by external specialists and proposed, through different procedures, to the stakeholders in Partner Countries.

Even if the selection criteria for the stakeholders’ identification (institutions and segments of civil society) are rarely clearly specified, from the hints in project documents, it can be stated that they are generally representative of the sectors of interest.

The projects in the Partner Countries have adopted different organizational models, ranging from relatively stable local structures (such as the Steering Committee Established by the Government in Morocco in the Flexicurity projects), to simple on-time reports for Local Actors (such as in the Competitiveness project) or by setting up temporary working groups to support project activities (e.g. the Consultative Groups in the Women & Work project).

This diversity is a correct application of the research method which chooses the most appropriate technique in relation to the theme and context in which the project takes place.

In all projects, the stakeholders’ active participation and interest in the proposed activities has been reported as being generally good. Even so, in some cases, the methodology, the survey’s design, and the lack of consultation have been criticized by local stakeholders, since the processes were set up and carried out without their participation and supervision; and, they were called to express their opinion only once the work had already been completed.

There is no evidence that the project proposals and their objectives have been compared to those of other stakeholders (donors and other local groups) to verify their originality.

*Degree of evaluability*

There are two main factors that limit the ILPs’ degree of evaluability: i) lack of data and information; and ii) generic definition of project strategy (Logical framework quality, objectives, results and indicators).

This leads mostly to the use of the relevance and coherence/complementarity and European added value criteria and less to that of effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability.

The projects’ documentation, which follows a standard format (attachment 2 of ETF Work programme 2006), mostly consists of the Projects Implementation Plans (PIP), Logical Frameworks (LF), Outputs Tables, and Quarterly Reports (QR), and in some projects, other working papers related to the context analysis (e.g. Guidelines for country reports, Country Reports, Perception Survey, Sectoral studies, etc). The latter are, in general, of good quality in terms of methodology and close problem examination.

---

3 By evaluability we mean the conditions which allow a project to be assessed efficiently, according to the established evaluation objectives.
The project planning documentation (PIPs and LF) doesn’t follow European formats and their structure has not been significantly updated throughout the years.

The PIPs do not contain information that could have been helpful during both the implementation and the evaluation phase (e.g. sustainability, coherence, coordination and complementarily, lesson learnt and European added value), usually recommended in all European manuals.

The reporting system (The QRs, the main sources of data, are succinct recordings of activities, with administrative and accountability purposes; there is little information on the changes produced by the project, on the problems encountered, the causes and solutions adopted, unexpected events, growth of awareness and learning progress within the ETF and among local actors, etc.

The documentation available on peer review results, focus groups, cappuccino meetings which are rigorously indicated in the QRs, is very scarce.

This not only makes it difficult to assess the interventions’ effect, but it hampers the full understanding of the complex and rich interactions and synergies established within project relationships one of the most important added values of the ILPs.

On the basis of the visit to Amman and the meetings with project staff, we observed a significant difference between the information available in the project documentation, which mostly consists of lists of activities, and the actual accomplishments in the field, which are far richer in experiences and useful results.

**Quality of project design**

The work methodology is always well defined and it generally appears to be coherent with the preliminary studies and surveys for analyzing the identified themes and contexts.

The structure of all projects is quite fragmented due to the multiplicity of objectives and results, the number of countries in which it takes place (two to four), and its annual unfolding throughout its duration (usually three years).

The Logical Framework of all projects does not correspond to the European Commission’s standards for international cooperation, and they have been updated throughout the project’s duration (e.g. HCD project) only in a few cases.

The main limits of the Logical Framework are:

**An excessively high number of objectives and results:** ILP projects usually have one general objective, 2 to 4 specific objectives and a good number of results.

**Generic definition of objectives, results and indicators:** The objectives and results are almost always defined as general intentions, which are difficult to verify and measure. The absence of a target against which to verify and measure the achievement will not facilitate the evaluation.

**Indicators:** In many cases, the proposed indicators are not sufficiently specific and verifiable.

**Assumptions:** The definition of the assumptions is very variable. In some projects they are adequately described and refer to external factors placed outside of the project’s control, which can affect its success. In other cases, they are often confused with accomplishments which lie in the sphere of the project’s activities and hence are the team’s responsibility, for instance, “Good quality expertise of local experts”, “Technical capacity and good use of resources on the part of ETF” (HCD project), and “Local experts, service provider and international expert are qualified and delivered” (precondition of the Women and Work).

---

4 The term “measurable” should not be confused with “verifiable”. The qualitative indicators are often not quantified, yet they are verifiable, for example when they are accurately described.
Conclusion 1 (Problem analysis and stakeholder participation)

The project objectives and strategies, even if they are often generic, are relevant in addressing the need to update the ETF expertise and mission and to contribute to the review of local education, training and employment policies through innovative approaches.

The lack of data depends mainly on the documentations’ insufficient quality and, probably, on the poor awareness of the importance of the monitoring and evaluation functions.

The projects have been identified and designed by the ETF expert, supported by external specialists. This procedure can be considered coherent with the research characteristics of the ILP projects, even if it differs from the formal procedure recommended by European models (i.e. Logical Framework Approach).

However the participation of the stakeholders in the implementation phase alongside the project cycle has to address the need for ownership, the main pillars of the Turin process and of all EC development policies. "The real charm is the participatory approach with evidence Which is Collected and analyzed. It is a bit like navigating on a GPS system: you need the source signal of at least three - satellites to estimate your current location, The Turin Process gathers all partners with a stake in education around a single table. Eventually Should it grow into a guided self-assessment exercise Not Unlike That of the Copenhagen process in the European Union."

The risk of reducing ownership had already been identified by the panel of experts in charge of the projects’ appraisal: "Some of the projects emphasized as desk research methodology. The panel feel that greater likely to occur if learning is in all cases. Was the research process based on action research methodology."

Recommendation 1 (Problem analysis and stakeholder participation)

The relations with stakeholders, should be based on a more decentralization of the responsibilities and strengthening capacities of local ownership, identifying a local focal or reference point, preferentially an already existing service or department in the education, training and labour market institutions.

The local focal or reference point would be a direct partner of projects, assuming greater responsibility for local management (selection of service provider, collaboration in findings elaboration and in organizing dissemination) as well as being the umbrella institution coordinating all stakeholders, as at present. The findings analysis, discussion, option selection and validation, and dissemination would still, as they are at present, be entrusted to working groups, but they would be made up of a higher number of representatives of institutional, social and international stakeholders, and coordinated by the local focal or reference point.

The ILP team would still continue to be responsible for TA, supervision and monitoring.

The advantages of this proposal are increasing the efficiency, impact and sustainability of the projects’ benefits and in reducing the management burden.

The possible disadvantage is the risk of losing control over the quality process in some of the projects’ steps.

Conclusion 2 (Quality of project design)

The project design is more activity-oriented than result-oriented, as recommended by the European and international methodologies, and it is also quite fragmented.

The consequences are i) a plurality of objectives and results; ii) the objectives and results are not clearly stated and operationally defined; iii) the resources are dispersed and couldn’t reach the critical minimum mass needed for good impacts; iv) it makes it difficult to monitor and evaluate the project.

It has to be premised that using Logical Frameworks in the typology of complex projects is not highly advisable. Logical Frameworks are a rigid tool, more than half a century old. They are related to a strongly dirigisme and schematic project culture, centred on linear cause and effect relations.
When it is applied to ILP projects it can be a factor limiting the considerable flexibility which, instead, these types of projects require and for which other planning techniques could be more useful (for example, the logical models often used today even in European Funds contexts).

In the overall ILP exercise, probably, the research nature of the projects have been under estimated. Nevertheless, once this choice has been made, it is advisable to make the best use of the good characteristics of aid to planning that the Logical Framework certainly still has, especially if applied to small scale projects.

Having only one specific objective is not a “holy rule” but a suggestion deriving from experience and technically founded on the use of the problem and objectives tree tool to establish the levels of the intervention logic (Logical Framework Approach).

The complex and innovative projects, such as the ILPs, can adopt a research – action approach, with a flexible initial planning to be revised and detailed as the project progress. The problem arises –is the case of quite all assessed ILPs– when, in spite of the field experience, the results, objectives, indicators, assumptions and risks remain in their vague state, alongside the project implementation.

The point obviously is not, per se, the formal correspondence with European manuals, (which are notoriously quite erratic and contradictory), but the consequences these deviations from the standards can have on the project’s management and the effects on its quality.

**Recommendation 2 (Quality of project design)**

1) The project team, before the project starts, should attend a seminar on European PCM methods and techniques. It should also be supported by an internal ETF specialist/unit, at least during the identification phase and design of the project.

2) To revise the “Guideline notes for project proposals”, including sustainability, coherence, coordination and complementarily, lesson learnt and the European added value criteria and the indications for to the use the Logical Framework, to the extent that it is possible, according to the European model while taking into account the specific research nature of the ILPs. The LF has to be revised at least once a year. More specifically:

**Option 1**

Projects should have one specific objective

- Results must be defined as goods and services produced and delivered and as contributions to achieving the specific objective.

- Assumptions should refer only to conditions which are beyond the control and responsibility of the project management (external conditions).

- The indicators (quantitative or qualitative) have to be simple and verifiable. The project report has to give more attention to data collection and information related to the proposed indicators.

**Option 2**

Projects could also be structured into more components attributing a specific objective to each (considering their size, a maximum of 2). In this case, each project/component should be considered as a sub project, and provided with consistent resources.

The first option is the most recommended though it differs from the current structure of ILP projects. It is more suitable for small scale projects since it facilitates the planning and management initiatives and requires less technical expertise. The second option is more complex to manage; it requires greater technical management throughout the project cycle and there is an increase in the risk of fragmentation.

---

5 They are considered erratic because of the different indications for international cooperation interventions and intervention programs within the Union (i.e. structural funds).
This condition, instead, is not fulfilled in the current ILP program, where projects are reformulated annually with variable resources (resources often vary during the year).

The possible options are:

A. Three-year planning with an annual revision and a single three-year budget. This would be the ideal solution, but compatibility with the ETF’s financial rules has to be verified.

B. Three-year planning with yearly revision and a pre-established annual budget for the three years. It is a variation of the preceding option. It is feasible only if there is a guarantee that the resources are predictable for the three years; if not, the current situation would occur.

C. Decreasing the projects’ duration to one/two years. This measure would limit the planning of resources to a shorter timeframe and they would be more predictable. To realize this hypothesis one would have to act on the typology of the projects, decreasing their complexity and increasing their efficiency. For example:
   - No more than two interested countries;
   - Decreasing to no more than 4/6 months the preliminary internal research stage;
   - A greater decentralization of management responsibilities through agreements with local partners;
   - Introduction of the follow up project typology of a one year duration.
   - Sharing several resources (for example, the same statistical analysis service for all projects.)

D. Introducing a financial revision mechanism on the basis of a mid-term evaluation on the quality of the results. The guarantee of the stability of inputs is obviously conditioned by the projects’ quality. If it is high, the resources are maintained (if possible, even increased), if it is low, the projects could be reformulated and the resources, as a consequence, reviewed. The condition is to carry out a systematic and well structured evaluation midterm along the project, on the basis of the results, as foreseen by all European projects.

4.1.2. Effectiveness

In order to better understand the ILP projects’ contribution to the ETF mission and functions and the extent to which it has to be achieved, the Interlocking Logical Framework tool will be used since it highlights the connections between the different levels of the intervention.

As a starting point, it is useful to understand and re-define the main specific objectives (S.O.) of the ILP projects. Since all of them have more than one specific objective, it is difficult to identify the interactions among the projects within the ETF program; the Logical Framework is not a flexible tool, which must also be taken into account. This is a relevant point to clarify in the evaluation.

The working hypothesis is that “ETF’s expertise improvement” is the specific objective of all ILP projects. It is plausible and rationally based for the following reasons:

   - all projects indicate this objective as one of the specific objectives, even though its formulation varies.
   - It can certainly be achieved with the projects’ resources and activities.

As shown in figure below, the LF’s realignment in each project on the basis of the common S.O. - “ETF expertise enhancement and knowledge new acquisition” can allow for a rearrangement of the overall linkages among the ILP projects and the ETF overall program.

The general objectives of the ILPs contribute in achieving the specific objective of the ETF mission, which is to contribute to the VET and LM reforms in Partner Countries.
The concept of “contribute” is appropriate as the ILP fund is only 20% of the ETF’s overall budget.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall objectives</th>
<th>ETF</th>
<th>Women and Work</th>
<th>HCD Review</th>
<th>Flexicurity</th>
<th>Policy Learning</th>
<th>Competitiveness</th>
<th>Migration</th>
<th>Transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H R Development in the Partner Countries</td>
<td>Contribute to the VET and LM reforms in the Partner Countries</td>
<td>Contribute to the VET and LM reforms in the Partner Countries</td>
<td>Contribute to the VET and LM reforms in the Partner Countries</td>
<td>Contribute to the VET and LM reforms in the Partner Countries</td>
<td>Contribute to the VET and LM reforms in the Partner Countries</td>
<td>Contribute to the VET and LM reforms in the Partner Countries</td>
<td>Contribute to the VET and LM reforms in the Partner Countries</td>
<td>Contribute to the VET and LM reforms in the Partner Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of International interest and debate on ETF/ILP themes</td>
<td>Enhanced ETF expertise and assistance (?) in ILP’s innovative areas and subjects</td>
<td>New knowledge and experience acquired by ETF/ILP staff in young female transition patterns from school to work</td>
<td>ETF able to formulate as specific as possible policy advice, bearing in mind the country’s needs.</td>
<td>Deepened ETF understanding on the applicability of a flexicurity approach in the socio-economic contexts</td>
<td>Develop ETF methodologies to implement the policy learning approach in concrete contexts as part of internal ... (?)</td>
<td>Knowledge base of ETF strengthened, in relation to education reforms that aim at enhancing competitiveness</td>
<td>To provide inputs to Policy Instruments/Measures: i) on circular and return migration; ii) on recognition of qualifications</td>
<td>To analyze the transition from education to work in three ETF partner countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific objectives</td>
<td>Contribute to the VET and LM reforms in the Partner Countries</td>
<td>Contribute to the VET and LM reforms in the Partner Countries</td>
<td>Contribute to the VET and LM reforms in the Partner Countries</td>
<td>Contribute to the VET and LM reforms in the Partner Countries</td>
<td>Contribute to the VET and LM reforms in the Partner Countries</td>
<td>Contribute to the VET and LM reforms in the Partner Countries</td>
<td>Contribute to the VET and LM reforms in the Partner Countries</td>
<td>Contribute to the VET and LM reforms in the Partner Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration of new methodology and instruments; ILPs activities</td>
<td>Elaboration of new methodology for analyzing VET/LM transition. Local stakeholders take ownership of findings and recommendations National media attention Country reports Consultative groups</td>
<td>Consolidated HCD Reviews framework and methodology Information and awareness raising among specialists and expert community Publication.</td>
<td>New methodology and material elaborated Raised awareness of key stakeholders on the potential, limitations and preconditions under which flexicurity can contribute to decent work</td>
<td>ETF’s policy learning facilitation role reviewed and documented; ETF’s visibility in international debate on policy learning ensured. A reform community established in each country</td>
<td>Tools to understand sustainable economic growth and competitiveness. Improved conceptual understanding of the factors for competitiveness in Partner Countries;</td>
<td>Better understanding of labour market issues and migration trends. Enhanced awareness and knowledge of the key stakeholders. Identification (?) of policy intervention areas R4: Increased exchange of information,</td>
<td>Dissemination of project results to ETF staff, and international and local stakeholders.</td>
<td>A methodology for a school-leaver survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Project activities</td>
<td>Project activity</td>
<td>Project activity</td>
<td>Project activity</td>
<td>Project activity</td>
<td>Project activity</td>
<td>Project activity</td>
<td>Project activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Have these objectives and results been achieved? To what extent and which ones? These questions can be answered only in part in a mid term evaluation.

For the assessment of the ILP program, some homogenous quantitative indicators can be added up to have a picture of the performances as a whole; this, though, can be done up to a certain extent.

A significant part of ILP results (goods and services provided), such as “New methodology for analyzing VET /LM transition”; “Consolidated HCD Reviews framework”; “New material elaborated”; “Tools to understand sustainable economic growth”, etc, although often formulated in vague and generic language, have already been achieved, and a considerable amount of tools and political options is available to ETF experts and Partner Countries. So far there no evidence of their wide and systematic application into the local VET and LM polices, although some political authorities have already declared the intention of adopting ILP proposals as a basis for the reforms.

If we look at the ILPs in the light of the new proposed reformulation of the intervention logic, it can be stated that in all ILP projects the specific objective will be partly achieved because there is clear evidence that all project teams have reached a good level of knowledge and competencies in the relevant fields.

Thus, the conditions have been potentially set up for the ETF to develop its functions. The extent to which this opportunity has really been embodied (or will be) in the overall ETF system and transformed into operational and stable expertise capability is, at present, hard to understand, because of lack of data and some unclear aspects.

**Conclusions**

The effectiveness of the ILPs, seen as the degree to which the results have been achieved, can be said to be generally positive, considering that some projects are still ongoing and their relatively low degree of evaluability.

The very high levels of skills and competencies gained by the project teams are certainly a strong component of the of the ETF’s specific objective, “expertise quality enhancement”.

However the probability that this objective is fully achieved depends on the following key issues:

a) There is no clear evidence of a learning management strategy, enabling the ETF to deal with and process, in an efficient and permanent way, the considerable amount of knowledge, experiences and competencies accumulated by the numerous ILP initiatives.

From the project documents, it seems that cappuccino meetings, international meetings and publications are the main tools and opportunities used to share and transfer the experience of the project within the ETF. For instance by Women and Work project:

1. The team members will further develop their expertise and it will contribute to the overall institutional knowledge development of ETF.
2. A Cappuccino meeting/s will be organised with interested ETF staff. One has been already organised in 2009.
3. A collection of relevant legislation/documents/reports/case studies/contacts will be created in relation to overall European/international policies as well as in relation to the MEDA region and to the 3 countries covered by the project.

The Knowledge management plan, in the Competitiveness project: “All technical meetings will be held open to interested staff members. At least one in-house knowledge sharing event will be arranged each year. All documents and papers will be stored in the project’s own website. Staff members will be invited to be peer reviewers in the project deliverables (journal articles).”
However some project teams were sceptical about the interest of ETF staff to share the experience of “Women and Work”: “Some lack of interest among ETF staff beyond the WOW project team might hinder a true integration of gender equality in a mainstreamed way in ETF activities” (Q4 2009). And the following was stated on the Flexicurity project: “Two cappuccinos on Flex and the Economic Crisis and Flex first results had to be cancelled because of low participation by staff. This has to be addressed in the coming year” (PIP 2010).

b) The inner and external mobility of ETF experts. Team work ends once the project is concluded, and their members move on to other activities or leave the organization.(in many projects even during the implementation). This leads to problematic and unclear issues: how will their competencies be managed by the ETF?

Recommendation

a) Improving the quality of data collection during the project life, giving greater weight to qualitative aspects of experience in the field and also revising the current Quarterly Reports scheme. The data should, in particular, concern the status of qualitative and quantitative indicators reported in the LF, the state of assumptions and risks (column IV), the difficulties encountered, and their causes and solutions.

b) The ILP initiatives should be included in a “knowledge management system” (or equivalent tool) supported also by ICT, as a complement to the project activities (cappuccino and international meetings, peer reviews, etc.) and the existing and very efficient catalog of publications, in order to share and make more available the large amount of political options, methodologies and relational models coming from the experiences of ILPs initiatives.

ETF already has relevant experience in the use of ICT in education and training, acquired in different programs, and the technical solutions may be different. Some ILP project already include ICT resources i.e. Competitiveness: “The meeting was the perfect occasion for networking and a project web-based platform has since been set up by ETF and will be used for continuing the networking. The web-based platform has been developed as an integral part of the competitiveness project pages on the ETF website, which include also project reference documentation and relevant links.” (Q2)

Some suggestions are (see also section on sustainability criteria):

- Thematic forums for each project allowing exchanges among different actors. This will allow an increase in participation and efficiency and the opportunity to update information on the projects (i.e. one of the strong requests by the Jordan stakeholders during the assessment mission).
- Reworking of the projects results of the basis of “good practices” model, easier to be disseminated, shared and updated. the packages could be included in capacity-building activities, as distance learning and Communities of Practice
- Links to specialized websites, as results of the preliminary research phases of ILPs.

4.1.3. Efficiency

Preliminary activities, such as desk research and analysis of existing experiences, have been implemented as scheduled, with a few exceptions; in general, the deadlines of main steps and activities have been respected.

For the most part, the planned activities have been carried out and results have been achieved, with the exception of a few cases, where they were proven unfeasible (for example, the data bank in the Competitiveness project).

The project team has dealt with unexpected events in an acceptable way, by taking into consideration the complexity of the themes and the weakness of local institutions and context. In this regard, the projects have shown a good degree of flexibility.
The projects with a high number of Partner Countries suffered most since the likelihood of unexpected problems increased (e.g. delays in the identification of stakeholders and umbrella institutions, delays in the tender for the providers’ selection and in setting up structures for the discussion and validation of results).

During the planning phase, some issues were described as possible risk factors in the PIP, while it would have been better to consider them as project variables, usually connected with context conditions, e.g. the lack of quantitative information; the social partners in the project’s countries are not ready to accept this new approach in the Flexicurity project). This would have allowed the project team to appropriately plan for resources.

Obviously, underestimating risks and difficulties leads to underestimating necessary human resources.

In almost all projects, the management has been burdened with the change, during the activities, of project team members (i.e. Women and Work, Flexicurity, Competitiveness and HCD Review) and with the delay in the availability of funds (i.e. Flexicurity). This is a very negative and dangerous aspect of the ILPs’ process management.

Project teams have been well structured with a clear assignment of individual tasks and responsibilities. Furthermore, for this reason, even the loss or modification of just a few units have been enough to create significant management difficulties.

The overall expenditure trend was good for most projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committed</td>
<td>Paid in the year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPETITIVENESS</td>
<td>792373</td>
<td>290017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLEXICURITY</td>
<td>1075057</td>
<td>552367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCD REVIEWS</td>
<td>513744</td>
<td>262399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN AND WORK</td>
<td>1072508</td>
<td>528546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusions**

On the whole, the management of the projects has been fairly efficient in terms of respecting the schedule, use of resources, management of unexpected events and flexibility.

Delays accumulated over the years are, in some cases, slowing down the conclusion of the projects. Some delays could be minimized through a more reliable analysis of the conditions of context, a simplification of the project design and a more careful analysis of risks and conditions for success.

A few delays occurred during the implementation phase in the Partner Countries; they have been caused by unexpected events that might have been managed more easily with a greater attention to the risk analysis, one of the weaker point of the projects efficiencies.

The teams have carried out an impressive work load, especially considering the projects’ fragmentation, due to different contexts, variety of themes, and number of stakeholders involved. This is a very negative and dangerous aspect of the ILPs’ process management.

The projects’ annual reformulation is not the most suitable option when managing initiatives which instead require the certainty of resources throughout their implementation. This reiteration has at least two consequences: it leads to confusion in the documentation which is often repetitive and overlapping, and, in some cases, it causes the delay in the availability of funds. Furthermore, it is also in contrast with the definition of a project present in European manuals.
The management has been burdened by the change, during the operation, of the project team composition and, as a consequence, the activities have not always been consistent.

**Recommendations**

To ensure the stability of human resources and funds and their utmost concentration, and in particular that of the project team, limiting mobility and replacing personnel to maintain the same operational capacity.

To try to make the project duration coincide with the duration of funding, to the extent that this is possible and compatible with ETF procedures. (see also Recommendation 2 on relevance criteria)

**4.1.4. Impact**

All ILP projects have as a general objective to “Contribute to the VET and LM reforms in the Partner Countries”, even though its formulation varies.

The projects are still underway and the data for assessing the impact of ILP projects on the politics of Partner Countries are not sufficient nor consolidated.

As already mentioned, the inflexibility of the LF makes understanding several non-sequential relations activated within the ILP projects difficult, which instead can be better highlighted through the Logical Model (Diagram of the Impacts).

The diagram shows the logical links between activities, results, objectives and the “chain of impacts”. Each component and level of the intervention logic has multiple e circular relationships and influences.

The reports refer to some important positions taken by political stakeholders about to the project results.

For instance, in Moldavia (HCD project) the final recommendations made by the ILPs were welcomed by international organizations and national stakeholders and became a priority for the country and more generally; and, in the Flexicurity project “The greatest achievement was in Kazakhstan where the Ministry of Labour introduced the notion of flexicurity in its concept for employment policy.”
In Competitiveness project (in Egypt) “The relevant authorities have decided to link the ETF report to the drafting of the Egyptian National Competitiveness Strategy. Our report will feed in the chapter on HRD, which is one of the key items in the Strategy.”

There have also been unintended effects on the future collaboration with ETF as a consequence of ILP projects requested by local institutional stakeholders. For example, the Ministry of Education in Jordan proposed a collaboration with ETF for opening a female technical school.

**Conclusion**

It is too early to assess whether the preliminary interest shown by local authorities in almost all the Countries is turning into deep and widespread changes in policy objectives, programs and regulations.

However the results which have already been achieved, the large amount of activities carried out, and the appreciation expressed by stakeholders are proxy qualitative indicators demonstrating that the results already meet the expectations. In some cases there are concrete signs from governmental institutions that they are going to share and adopt the new methodologies and models elaborated by the ILP projects.

**Recommendations**

During the ILP project planning, more attention should be given to the mechanisms allowing the best dissemination and strengthening of the proposed new models and options in the countries’ policies.

a) Identifying, tools and opportunities to disseminate results and information concerning the project, preferably using local channels managed by stakeholders that can ensure greater extension and continuity of delivery. The resources and opportunities for a more efficient dissemination should be one of the outcomes of an institutional analysis.

b) To put the follow up of concluded projects into the future ETF programs, is an option to be considered. This would have several advantages: to consolidate the first impacts; a more effective capacity building of local HR and institutions, based on the already acquired experience; and lesson learnt to improve the future initiatives.

**4.1.5. Sustainability**

At this stage, only a provisional assessment of the project’s sustainability is possible.

In the project documentation there are very little indications on how each theme will be developed and updated by further research and field experiences, in the future ETF plans.

At the moment, it is difficult to evaluate sustainability in Partner Countries. It is still not clear who will take on the task for the future and ongoing updating of ILP project results, for they evolve quickly within the contexts where they were proposed, discussed and validated.

There is no information on agreements and formalized procedures, on the involvement of stakeholders in future research, dissemination, and on the inclusion of ILP results in government budgets.

In some ILPs projects, capacity building activities were mentioned but there few data about its fulfilment. The HCD Review is one exception since its specific objectives includes: “Identifying enablers in partner country systems that support HCD in the long-term, taking into account the equity dimension, for the sake of meeting sustainable development.”. Even so, there is not enough information.

The institutional analysis of the local stakeholders is absent.

**Conclusions**
Sustainability has not been considered a criterion in the project design; therefore tools and recourses to ensure the continuity of results and benefits of the ILPs in Partner countries, have not been included in the project’s plans.

Nevertheless, as result of the intense relationships with stakeholder, some conditions for sustainability are present in the projects, as

a) good correspondence between local needs and projects objectives
b) the consensus of local institutions
c) good participation of stakeholders and social partners

These could be the starting point for defining future sustainability strategy and overcome the main weaknesses as

d) low level of capacity building of local stakeholders
f) transience of local organizational structures, set up under ILPs just for projects activities

**Recommendations**

Sustainability depends on a number of institutional, political, social, economic, technical and technological factors.

One of the first measures for ensuring sustainability is to include this criterion in the ILPs’ project design. For the project planning team, this encourages reflection on the conditions for the initiative’s continuity.

Taking into account the ILPs project objectives and resources, the main focus should be on capacity building and information dissemination about the activities and results of the projects.

Capacity building is one of the functions (F2) of ETF “supporting partner country capacity building in human capital development to further build their capacity in policy development, policy in action and policy progress reviews;”

There are two types of measures to enhance sustainability:

**Indirect:** In the reports there are a number of recommendations for other criteria such as relevance, impact, effectiveness, etc., which, all together, reinforce the sustainability. For example: the ETF learning management, decentralization of management to the countries, institutional analysis of the actors, involvement of local experts in the research methodology, etc.

**Direct:**

a) Development of an institutional and participative analysis, jointly with the main stakeholders for a capacity building assessment, in three specific areas:

- Human resource development, as individual needs in knowledge, competencies and skills, on the project topics (research methodology, data collection, processing and analyzing data, report elaboration, dissemination methods and techniques, etc.).
- Organizational development, as weakness in management structures, including processes and relationships with other organizations and stakeholders.
- Legal framework and changes requested to enable the organizations to manage the results of the projects.

b) Defining a plan of activities mainly based on technical assistance and training using an integrated strategies, such as study visits in Italy, local seminars and meetings with ILP experts, thematic web forums at national and regional levels in specific websites.
4.1.6. Coherence and complementarity

The ILP projects are well aligned with EU policies, strategies and models in the project’s themes, with an approach striving to adapt European solutions and proposals to the specific socio-economic local contexts and priorities.

In the preliminary phases, studies and surveys have mostly examined existing politics, selecting good practices and the most advanced experiences through documentation and analysis of good practices, produced by ETF, Member States and the International Community. In the subsequent phases, work hypotheses staff have been adapted to the Partner Countries’ objectives through discussions and reflections, becoming coherent with national policies and priorities.

In order to ensure knowledge sharing, coordination and complementarity some projects actively cooperate with other international organizations. For instance, Women and work with World Bank, UNESCO, UNIFEM, ILO; Flexicurity with ILO, Eurofound, DG EMPLOYMENT, Tilburg University and Karma Denmark; HCD Review with UNDP and World Bank.

As well in the Competitiveness projects the partnership is broad and well represented, such as “the World Economic Forum, International Institute for Management Development, European Commission, CEDEFOP (SkillsNet), World Bank and OECD. Furthermore “links with the businesses in Torino (such as Fiat Group) in order to broaden views to competitiveness in local enterprises”.

Conclusions

The projects are certainly coherent with European politics and programmes in the ILP’s sectors of interest. In almost all Partner Countries, the ILP project staff collaborates with international organizations to share experiences and knowledge.

Recommendations

To include coherence and complementarity as criteria for project planning and implementation.

The reports should further clarify the relationship between the proposals made by the ILP projects and the national legislative framework in the related sectors and themes to understand the degree of innovation proposed in each country and the position of local authorities and social stakeholders.

4.1.7. European added value

The European added value has not been explicitly stated in the ILP guidelines and this expression “is not found in any document regarding ILP projects, suggesting that even if the projects work on the basis of European politics and experiences on each ILP theme, such a criterion has never been intentionally applied.

There is no a systematic analysis of the presence of European programs in the VET and LM sectors managed by Member Countries and by EC Delegations, nor on possible coordinating or harmonizing functions carried out by them in the same areas.

There is no information to establish if Partner Countries preferred the ETF/ILP proposals to other solutions offered by individual Member States, as they better respond to their needs and local politics.

Likewise, there is no evidence on the comparative advantages of ILP proposals in respect to those formulated in the private sector or by other international agencies.

And, lastly, there is not enough data to affirm that the ETF is considered a leading agency in innovation compared to other stakeholders in the ILP sectors. Nonetheless, the numerous international meetings attest to the important role given to the ETF as an agency of advanced research in professional training and the labour market.

Only in the Competitiveness project is stated “There is manifest interest on the part of business communities to tackle competitiveness also on the side of human capital. They are not always equipped
to elaborate adequate policy messages to the governmental authorities; hence ETF is perceived as useful in making the bridge and facilitating dialogue between the two sides” (Q6)

Conclusions
The ILP is in an extremely favorable position to contribute to the increase of ETF’s Added Value on European political strategies on the VET and LM for two main reasons: a) its original methodology, based on the elaboration of strategic options of best European practices, re-elaborated in relation to the contexts of emerging countries and returned as validated good practices; and b) ETF’s mission as EC, and Member and Partner Countries advisor makes it able to offer proposals with a comparative advantage in respect to other solutions.

The origin of ILP proposals as deriving from selected experience of European institutions and Member states is generally understood and well accepted by the Partner Countries’ stakeholders.

Within Europe, all ILP projects have carried out activities, mostly seminars, reached agreements with specialized institutions, worked on publications etc. through which the ILP intermediate and final results have been disseminated and shared.

Nonetheless, this process, on the basis of the available documentation, does not seem to have had carried out a systematic research which looks at to understand the competitive advantages given by EC policies in terms of good political practice, new strategies and analysis of as requested by the European orientations on Add Value.

Recommendations
The first measure is to insert the European added value as a criterion for project planning and implementation. As for the sustainability, this encourages reflection on the conditions for the initiative’s continuity.

The construction of the European Added Value is developed throughout all the phases of the project’s cycle:

Identification and preliminary activities.

a) Preliminary activities should concentrate in a more systematic and explicit way on the experiences of European states and organizations, selecting existing good practices and examining failed solutions in Europe and in cooperation politics, as a lesson learnt. This obviously does not exclude collaboration with other international agencies.

b) To highlight and analyse in progress interventions on behalf of the Member States and the EC in the identified ILPs Partner Countries, in the VET and LM sectors, while considering possible existing complementarity options coordinated by the EC Delegation.

The presence of Member States intervention in VET and a coordination role played by EC Delegation could even be a criterion for the Partner Countries selection.

Implementation

c) In the elaboration of the methodological tools and of the options in support of system reforms, the comparative advantages they have as European initiatives, related to other programs (national and international), should be highlighted to a greater extent.

Dissemination

---

6 The “EU Code of Conduct on Division of labour in Development Policy” defines as follows the European Added Value: “In addition to its role as a donor, the Commission has a recognized added value, in developing strategic policies, promoting development best practices, and in facilitating coordination and harmonisation as well as in the external dimension of internal Community Policies”.

32
In Partner Countries

e) The ILP proposals elaborated as good practices should be disseminated through local channels, supporting, if conditions exist, the leading role played by the EC Delegations; they should also contribute to the identification of strategic and national programs managed by EC Delegations as donors.

g) To make explicit the project proposals’ European origin in events and dissemination channels to increase the visibility of European Commission politics.

In Europe

h) The good practices resulting from the ILPs projects methodology, and if they are confirmed by follow up actions they are more relevant, allow the ETF to add value to EU comunity politics. It is noted that, for example, this would be an extraordinary comparative contribution to international bilateral cooperation politics conducted by Member States and the EC in the ETF’s sectors of interest.

4.2. Women and work

4.2.1. Relevance

In the documentation, the themes and functions of the ETF which the project focuses on are clearly described. In particular, objectives, results and activities comply with the ETF Core Theme VET system development and provision (A) and with Labour Market needs and employability (B). It covers several ETF functions: mainly as a provision of evidence based analysis to support informed decision making in partner countries (F3), but also as a support to partner country capacity building (F2), dissemination and networking (F4). It may also provide support to the EC in terms of input to programming or follow-up of the Istanbul Process (F1).

The origin of the project is clearly described as “a follow-up and build on the ETF gender thematic group research, undertaken in 2005-06 in Jordan, Morocco and Turkey, to review gender mainstreaming policies in the fields of education, training and employment” (PIP 2010).

The problematic framework at the origin of the project is described in terms of the economic costs of gender inequality and focuses on female transition from school to work, “which results in many women being discouraged and dropping from the labour force.”

The criteria for identifying the sub-sectors of tourism and ICT have been clearly stated:

1. Good potential for employment, in particular female employment;
2. VET systems’ contribution crucial for provision of skilled labour force to ensure growth;
3. Presence of active private/multinational investors, having set recruitment policies and sensitive to equal opportunity policies.

They correspond to the countries’ priorities for economic development.

The project identification and basic design were carried out by ILP staff and then proposed to the three Countries’ stakeholders (Q3 2008). The meetings held in Jordan during the evaluation mission confirm the relevance of the project in relation to women's employment problems. Yet, there was also a clear dissatisfaction about the lack of involvement during the identification and implementation phases, which was is considered as a lack of ownership.

This is also stated in the project: reporting: “After three years (Q1 2010), following the criticism of the draft regarding the Country Reports made by the local stakeholders forming the Consultive Groups (in Egypt and Jordan), the members of the project had to admit the risks caused by the lack of communication with the local representatives.”
The meeting in Turin saw the participation of 24 women representatives of the CG of the three Countries involved in the project. During the Amman focus group meeting, it emerged that they found sharing their experiences with the other countries involved in the study and learning about the ETF mission an excellent experience.

There was a lack of coordination between the local service provider and the activity of the consultative group, which was also due to the delay in establishing the CG. In fact, the CG was set up when the research methodology had already defined.

In Egypt, criticism mostly revolved around the methodology, the design of the survey and the lack of consultation with stakeholders from the start of the project, and the “atomization” and separation of roles between the design of the survey, the implementation and the analysis.

In Tunisia, the report was appreciated for the contents but criticized for lacking in preparatory consultation, ownership and methodology.

The composition of the CG and the umbrella-institutions in the three Countries have been formally represented by the major stakeholders in relation to the projects’ themes.

**Quality of project design**

The structure of the Logical Framework does not comply with European manuals and it seems to be used as more of a summary table of project activities and intentions rather than as a tool for planning, management and evaluation.

In particular:

The **general objective** is clearly formulated and highlights a change which the project can contribute to significantly, but it lacks indicators.

The formulation of the project’s **specific objectives** evolved during the project. One objective with multiple formulations in the PIP 2008 was that “to increase the knowledge and awareness of obstacles and opportunities for women’s employment in two (ITC and tourism) potential growth sectors of the economy of the selected countries and to provide recommendations and advice to both the national authorities as well as the European Commission for strengthening women’s role in the labour market”.

In 2009, two S.O.s were formulated. The first was an **internal S.O.**: “ETF expertise enhanced by new knowledge and experience in the field of gender equality in E&T and employment, exploitable for EC requests and policy advice for the Partner Countries”; and the second was an **external S.O.**: “ETF expertise enhanced by new knowledge and experience (ILPs’ general objective) in the field of gender equality in E&T and employment, exploitable for EC requests and policy advice for the Partner Countries”.

The wording of the S.O. is ambiguous and generic. It is ambiguous because it combines the enhancement of knowledge (cognitive objective) with interest (which is a commitment for action); and it is generic because it doesn’t define the target against which it can be verified.

The **assumptions** are the external conditions and factors for success which are beyond the project management’s control. In some cases, they are confused with regular tasks and accomplishments which, instead, are the project team’s responsibility and should not be insert in the Logical Framework (i.e. the preconditions: “Local experts, service provider and international expert are qualified and deliver”; “Working Group members represent relevant national stakeholders” etc.)

Furthermore, it is difficult to understand the external conditions alongside the intervention logic since it lacks a level (three instead of four, presumably that of the results.)
The project receives the support of national stakeholders.
There is scope in the EC strategy for future intervention in the countries to take into consideration the findings of the ETF project.
Relax is monitoring Istanbul and thematic meeting on education and employment takes place.

The researchers have access to data, information and companies.
The focus group target people are reached and able to attend the focus groups.
Working Group members represent relevant national stakeholders.
Working Group members fully support and promote the project.
The national media is accessible.

Conclusions

The problems which arose during the project were well analyzed during the preliminary activities. In general, the objectives and project strategies comply with the need to update ETF expertise and to propose political options to the partner Countries to review gender mainstreaming policies in the fields of education, training and employment.

The interest and participation of local institutions and stakeholders in three Consultative Group meetings held during the project’s implementation have been judged as good, lively and very productive.

This has been confirmed by the Focus group during the evaluation mission in Amman.

Recommendation

The project methodology should give much more attention to ownership, by decentralizing a part of the management’s responsibilities and involving local stakeholders in the preliminary research phase.

A better use of the Logical Framework in line with European guidelines is strongly recommended.

More specifically: i) define one specific objective; ii) results must be defined as goods and services produced and delivered; iii) assumptions should refer only to conditions which are beyond the control and responsibility of the project management (external conditions); and iv) indicators (quantitative or qualitative) have to be simple and verifiable.

The project report should give more attention to the collection of data and information related to the proposed indicators.

4.2.2. Impact

The project is still underway and there is no evidence yet on if and how the objective and results have contributed to promote gender equality policies in education, training and employment in Jordan, Egypt and Tunisia; furthermore, no indicators are available.

A proposal which emerged from the Amman meeting was of a future collaboration with the Ministry of Education. A meeting has already taken place between a project team member and the Secretariat of the Ministry.

The institutional analysis of the local stakeholders and representatives is, in general, absent. This limits the assessment of their capacity to disseminate the results of the experiences within their own organizations. There are no yet data on dissemination activities.
Conclusion

Even though it is too early to assess if the interests of stakeholders will turn into deep and wide widespread in policy objectives, programs and regulations, the future collaboration proposed by the Ministry of Education is a positive sign.

From the meetings and discussions with the Focus Group, the possibility that the dissemination of studies, analysis and recommendations - which is quite common and is carried out by several national and international organizations - can have a significant impact on the country’s gender policies was received with skepticism. The same opinion was voiced on the possibility of influencing the demand of female employment in the private sector, at least according to the expectations described in the project.

The delay in the delivery of the country report and the lack of information are creating a climate of distrust and loss of interest.

Recommendations

Concluding and giving the final versions of the country reports and presenting the research findings and political options, as they emerged during the last Consultative Group, is urgent.

To give more attention to dissemination and strengthening of the proposed new models and options in the countries’ policies, by identifying, tools and opportunities to disseminate results and information concerning the project, preferably using local channels managed by stakeholders that can ensure greater extension and continuity of delivery.

4.2.3. Effectiveness

While there is a lot of data related to performance, the information on the extent to which the objective has been achieved - the changes that occurred in partner countries and the degree of ETF expertise enhancement - is quite scarce.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>SOURCE OF VERIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Increased knowledge of and interest in women’s employment opportunities and benefits in JO, MO and TU</td>
<td>ETF project contribution/influence to national policies (or EC programming)</td>
<td>National policy documents (EC programming documents)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ETF expertise enhanced by new knowledge and experience (ILPs’ general objective) in the field of gender equality in E&amp;T and employment, exploitable for EC requests and policy advice for the Partner Countries</td>
<td>An article by the ETF on the subject is published in an academic magazine 2011 ETF Work Programme includes activities related to gender mainstreaming or a replicated specific gender project</td>
<td>X academic magazine ETF Work Programme 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SO 1 There is not enough information at the moment on the proposed indicator, “ETF project contribution/influence to national policies (or EC programming)”, which seems more appropriate for the General Objective.

According to the QR, and as confirmed by the results of the meeting in Amman with the local CG stakeholders, the participation of stakeholders in the intense activity throughout the project has increased their knowledge of women’s employment opportunities. They said, “we learned a lot and we will use the new experience in our jobs, it was capacity building for us.”

SO 2 The two indicators proposed for the second specific objective’s evaluation can be measured only at the end of the project (ETF Work Programme 2011).

As result of the participation in the project, the management team has acquired a high level of knowledge and expertise on gender employment, which is a potential opportunity for ETF expertise enhancing”.
However, at the end of 2009, the project team was sceptical about the interest of the ETF’s general staff to share the experience of “Women and Work”. “Some lack of interest among ETF staff beyond the WOW project team might hinder a true integration of gender equality in a mainstreamed way in ETF activities” (Q4 2009).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESULTS</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>SOURCE OF VERIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1: Policy advice for enhancing women’s employment in the private sector in EG, JO and TU</td>
<td>3 Country Reports (EG, JO, TU) include findings and recommendations based on research on ICT and tourism sectors, and validated by the project’s national Consultative Groups</td>
<td>Three country reports Proceedings of national validation and/or dissemination events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2: Consultative Group members take ownership of the study’s findings and recommendations</td>
<td>Consultative Group members contribute to the findings and recommendations of the study The majority of the Consultative Group members remain the same in the 3 countries throughout the project</td>
<td>Emails and CG meetings proceedings LoP of CG meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3: National media attention to the subject enhanced</td>
<td>At least 2 articles per country in the national media on the project At least one article/country on the EU Delegation Website on the project</td>
<td>National media EC Delegations’ Websites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4: High quality regional ETF synthesis report</td>
<td>Editorial Board approves the regional report Cappuccino meeting organized at the ETF on the regional reports attracts at least 15 ETF staff members The regional report is covered by at least one article in an internationally recognized newspaper</td>
<td>Editorial Board meetings minutes Cappuccino meeting LoP International press</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**R1** Can be assessed only at the end of the project when the Country Report will be finalised and validated by the national Consultative Groups.

**R2** According to the proposed indicators, it can be confirmed that the result has been fully achieved. In particular, during three meetings, the CG contributed to a better understanding of the findings and recommendations, and the majority of the Consultative Group members remained more or less the same in the 3 countries throughout the project (on average, 20 participants).

Furthermore, the components of the CG are representative of the political and civil society related to women and gender issues in the VET and labour market areas. This guaranteed a good constructive discussion and the relevance of results (i.e. among the participants, in Jordan, there were representatives of the Ministry of Labour, Ministry of Education, Jordanian National Commission for Women, Ministry of ICT, Ministry of Tourism, Ministry of Higher Education, Ministry of Planning and Development, Federation of Labour Unions, Jordan Hotel Association, Department of Women’s Studies, Unifem, USAID Siyaha, ILO etc).

**R3** On the basis of the proposed indicators, it can be said that the result has been partially achieved. However, it is underlined that two articles published per country in three years can hardly be considered an “enhancement” of media attention, unless the issue of gender was initially absolutely absent. This is an example of how the absence of baseline data limits the evaluation with which the degree of success is later measured.

**R4** There isn’t any information on the number of participants at the Cappuccino meeting and of its quality; the regional reports have not yet been concluded.

**Conclusions**

So far, the project’s main positive effects have been the increase in knowledge of the ETF/ILP staff and of the representative of stakeholders involved in the consultative groups.
The evaluability of effectiveness is reduced by at least two major causes: i) the generic formulation of objectives, results and indicators; and ii) the insufficient data related to the changes produced by the project, due to the report’s administrative approach.

An example can be found in the Q4 on Tunisia: “The implementation of the company survey and the focus groups faced some difficulties due to the reluctance of the companies to meet with the service provider, lack of interest by young girls to attend focus group meetings without compensation and the holiday period. However, the service provider, very committed and reliable, completed the work.”

There is no further explanation on the causes of the difficulties and on how they were dealt with. Needless to say it is important as lesson learnt to understand if and how the difficulties are related to gender equality, which is the project’s objective. Why were the companies reluctant? What solutions and strategies have been adopted? Have the provider company’s actions been supported by local stakeholders?

**Recommendations**

At least two operations are recommended to improve the evaluation of effectiveness:

1. A more detailed definition of the objectives that should include the targets or describe the final scenario against which to make the evaluation.

2. Use of valuable indicators for the collection of data and relevant information.

It is also suggested to give more attention to significant data collection both in relation to the proposed indicators and, more generally, to the changes that the project has introduced (or is introducing) even if unexpected and not described by the objectives and results of the project.

### 4.2.4. Efficiency

Preliminary activity started in 2007. It included a literature review and preliminary stocktaking in the field. At the end of 2009, the projects had reached the following stages:

**Egypt**: The descriptive background report was published on the ETF website in August and it was translated into Arabic in December 2009. The second consultative group meeting took place in Cairo on 13 December 2009. The meeting is mentioned in Q4 2009 for the good and active participation, the presence of Delegations and of course of the Undersecretary for Employment from the Ministry of Manpower, the umbrella organisation for the project at national level.

**Tunisia**: The descriptive background report was elaborated further after the ETF peer review exercise, but it was decided to work on it in parallel with the finalization of the draft country national report Q1 2010. The Consultative Group met the second time in November. The participation of the members has been active with the presence of delegations.

**Jordan**: The descriptive background report for Jordan was published on the ETF website in November 2009. The second consultative group meeting took place on 23 November 2009, with the aim to show the research findings from the employers’ survey and focus group discussions with young women. About 20 people attended the meeting.

In Jordan SP conducted 13 meetings with focus groups. The areas covered in Jordan were Irbid (north), Madaba and Amman (center), and Petra (South). The survey sample of companies had to be changed because the threshold of the size of the set, at least 25 employees, turned out to be a slightly unrealistic for Jordan (the same issue occurred in Egypt and Tunisia).

The criteria for identifying the sample of interviewed has been criticized by the CG because was too small and the sample was not representative of the Jordanian community; furthermore, there were differences between the age groups of the study samples in the different countries involved in the study (Egypt and Tunisia).

In 2010 the main activities were the production of reports, their revision by the EFT and the
presentation of the draft to the Consultative Groups for analysis and recommendations. Participation was lively, critical and very constructive in all the Countries.

Since 2008, the more complex project activities have been delayed, such as the establishment of the Consultative Groups because of the high number of stakeholders taking part and the necessity to find a reference institution (Q1 2008). The establishment of the CG in Tunisia asked for a mission (23-27 Feb 2009) and negotiated a “chef de file”, which resulted in the postponement of all related activities. A similar incident occurred in Egypt caused by the lack of an umbrella organization (Q1 2009).

Other delays have been recorded in the tender for the local providers’ selection. (“The Jordan restricted tender evaluation was unsuccessful and will be re-launched mid-January 2009.”)

The Q4 2008 report made negative judgments: “Relations with all 3 local experts for Egypt, Jordan & Tunisia proved to be difficult”, and “National experts’ underperformance has led to further delays and workload for project team members.”

Compared to the available information (the last available QR is Q1 2010), the project is now late in respect to the main results, that’s Jordan Country Report and the Cross Country Report.

During the meeting with the CG members in Amman, the concern that the study will be out of date was expressed, since a number of steps have been taken by different ministries during that period (2008-2011) to address gender issues. For instance, on the website of the Economic and Social Council, a government institution, the policy paper “Female labour force participation in Jordan” is available; it looks at the same topics as the Women and Work project, and has an analysis of and recommendations on women’s employment policies.

Decreasing the team to three units (the statistics expert was later reintegrated) has contributed to the delays and has negatively influenced the project’s quality. “Turnover in ETF staff responsible for statistics could be a risk factor both in terms of quality and time, due to discontinuity between staff that helped to create methodology instruments & staff that will analyse the data after field work” (Q2 2009).

Conclusions
The data show the good flexibility of the project and the capacity of the team to cope with and manage unexpected situations.

In particular, during the design phase the risk of a possible chain effect caused by negative events has been underestimated.

For example, the delay in establishing the CG, which was perhaps predictable given the high number of entities) represented, resulted in a reduction of ownership in the survey and findings analysis and led to rescheduling the activities.

The project was designed to be entirely managed by ETF staff, with an estimated 37 missions in three years (10 in 2008, 14 in 2009, and 13 in 2010) (PIP 2008).

The reduction in the number of experts in the project team - a very challenging and rare event in a management system - has been one of the main causes of the delays.

In fact, the project strategies (objectives, results, activities) are set-up according to the resources (internal coherence). Any change which takes place affects the quality of the whole.

Recommendation
To ensure the stability of the project team, limiting the mobility to maintain the internal consistency of the initial project.

From a managerial point of view, some of the difficulties could be predicted through two approaches: i) a more thorough analysis of risks and conditions of success; and ii) a revision of the project design.
based on decentralization and improvement of the research-action method.

4.2.5. Sustainability

Since the project is still in progress, only predictions on sustainability are possible.

The high mobility of staff (within the ETF and externally) could put at risk the development of a stable process of a learning organization, which would mainly deal with publications.

It should be noted, however, that in Q4 of 2008 capacity building activities are briefly mentioned but they are not referred to in any other document.

“Preliminary discussions have taken place with national institutions about the establishment of a working group which should follow up the implementation of the project. Necessary capacity building actions will be organised for the members of the working groups during 2009.” The visit to Turin was the only activity of some importance.

It should be noted that capacity building support to partner countries is one of the functions of the ETF (F2). There is no information on the inclusion of ILP results in government budgets and means and procedures which could allow the continuity of benefits.

Conclusions

Sustainability has not been considered a criterion in the project design; therefore tools and recourses to ensure the continuity of results and benefits of the ILPs in Partner countries, have not been included in the project’s plans.

As result of the intense relationships with stakeholder, some conditions for sustainability are present in the projects, as

a) good correspondence between local needs and projects objectives
b) the consensus of local institutions
c) good participation of stakeholders and social partners at the Consultative Groups

These could be the starting point for defining future sustainability strategy and overcome the main weaknesses as

d) low level of capacity building of local stakeholders
f) transience of local organizational structures, set up under ILPs just for projects activities

Sustainability depends on a number of institutional, political, social, economic, technical and technological factors. For this reason, the measures suggested for the other criteria, such as relevance, effectiveness and impact, will contribute to the improvement of sustainability.

Recommendations

To enhance the capacity building component of the intervention. For example:

- The capacity building actions should be included in a general project agreement with the local partner, in order to: integrate the actions with ongoing training activities (i.e. in the lifelong approach); to identify strategies and topics more relevance in relation to objective and subjective needs; to qualify permanently the local training offers.

- To train local human resources on the skills related to the whole process of Country Program production (research methodology, data collection, processing and analyzing data, report elaboration, dissemination methods and techniques, etc.), through different and integrated strategies, such as study visits in Italy, local seminars and meetings with ILP experts, thematic web forums at national and regional levels in specific websites and giving priorities to the local teaching resources.
4.2.6. Coherence and complementarity

European gender equality policies and priorities have been clearly considered in the project (e.g. Euro-Mediterranean Partnership Declaration, Euro-Mediterranean Employment and Labour Ministers Conference, etc.) along with ETF’s commitment to the gender approach (Mid Term Perspective 2007 – 2013).

Also, the project is fully in line with the priorities of the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which is co-funding the project, in the field of international assistance in the MEDA region.

Furthermore, the preliminary work and the project design show a good coherence with the partners’ countries gender policies on training and employment.

In order to ensure knowledge sharing and coordination, the project actively collaborated with other international organizations working on gender, such as the World Bank, UNESCO, UNIFEM, ILO, etc. (UNIFEM took part in all CG meetings).

During the meeting with the European Union Delegation in Amman, the synergies between the ETF and EC programmes in the Countries were highlighted.

Due to Euro Mediterranean relations, 35 million Euros were promised to support ETVET in Jordan. After the ETF report in 2006, the EU decided to support 2 sectors: ICT and Tourism in Jordan with a specific focus on women and the labour market.

4.2.7. European added value

This criterion was not included in the ILP Guidelines so it was not specifically addressed by the team in the project design and implementation. The meeting held in Amman confirmed this.

There is no clear information to establish if the stakeholders in Partner Countries preferred the ETF/ILP proposals to other solutions offered by individual Member States, as they better respond to their needs and local politics.

Likewise, there is no evidence on the comparative advantages of ILP proposals in respect to those formulated in the private sector or by other international agencies.

Furthermore, there are not enough data to affirm that the ETF is considered a leading agency in innovation compared to other stakeholders in the ILP sectors.

Even so, the interest shown by the Ministry of Education in Jordan for ETF expertise is a good sign.

Conclusions

The European added value is not been explicitly stated in the ILP Guidelines. Nevertheless, the European origin of the ILP proposals is clearly understood and accepted by the Partner Countries’ stakeholders, but there is no clear evidence that it is perceived as a “European added value” - that it is a specific elaboration and product of European culture and experience, different from that of each Member State.

Recommendations

To insert the European added value as a criterion in the project planning and implementation phases and to compare the originality of the ILPs’ innovative approach and the interest shown by local stakeholders with other proposals made by Member States and the International Donors Community.

Project documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>WOW Q2 2010 Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIP WOW 2008</td>
<td>WOW Q4 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIP WOW 2010</td>
<td>WOW Q4 2009 Outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOW Outputs 2010</td>
<td>WOW Q1 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4.3. Flexicurity and the role of Lifelong Learning

4.3.1. Relevance

Problem analysis and stakeholders participation

The themes and functions of the ETF which the project addresses are clearly stated in the documentation. In particular, it covers “the ETF core theme B “Labour market needs and employability”; ETF function 2 “Support to partner country capacity building”; 3 “Provision of evidence-based analysis”; and 4 “Facilitation of exchange of information and experience.”

The problematic framework which justifies and is at the origin of the flexicurity project is well outlined: “The question (flexibility and security in the labour market) arises whether and how the concept of flexicurity can be applied to labour market policies in countries with low job creation, large informal and/or unstructured labour market, weak labour market institutions/services, tight public budgets, low unionisation rates and weak social partners in their efforts to achieve decent work for all” (PIP 2009).

The selection criteria of the Countries are described, even if very succinctly, and are in line with the project’s objectives: “Kazakhstan, Turkey and Ukraine selected for presenting some degree of economic and labour market dynamism while having different labour market structures and geopolitical location”.

The project, in line with the other ILPs, was identified and designed by ETF staff who were assisted by a group of experts, without the participation of local stakeholders who were involved at a later stage.

The low involvement of local stakeholders in the initial stages of the project was a concern among the project staff: “In order to increase the relevance of the project to the countries participating in it and enhance ETF staff knowledge on the topic outside the FLEX core team, the input of CMs (AVO, MBA/MVG, MPR and TKU) has been sought (and thankfully achieved) since the initial phase of the project and will be continuously sought during the whole project implementation”.

Quality of the project design

The structure of the logical frame does not follow the guidelines in the European manuals. It is more of a summary of the project components and it has not been updated throughout the project’s duration.

The general objective is described as more an activity (“Assist countries in their efforts to promote decent work”), while one of the two proposed indicators seems to mostly have the characteristics of a general objective (“The concept of flexicurity is introduced in the design of LM and education policies in some of the ETF partner countries”).

The project has 4 specific objectives and 4 results (which are distinct from the outputs and are looked at separately in “Annex 2: Outputs”). Some objectives and results are described generically and this does not allow for an understanding of the internal coherence with the available resources.

Only one part of the proposed indicators have the characteristics required to measure performance. Some results are re-used as indicators for specific objectives (New methodology for analysing labour
markets from flexicurity perspective; “Recommendations for the 4 countries for future policy actions”). “Thematic papers” are the main indicators for both specific objectives and results.

Some sources of verification are the same as the indicators (e.g. “Four thematic papers on (a) methodology to analyse labour markets from a flexicurity perspective; (b) flexicurity, transitional labour markets and decent work

**Assumptions**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project receives the support of national stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is scope in EC strategy for future intervention in the countries to take into consideration the findings of the ETF project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relex is monitoring Istanbul and thematic meeting on education and employment takes place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The researchers have access to data, information and companies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The focus group target people are reached and able to attend the focus groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Group members represent relevant national stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Group members fully support and promote the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The national media is accessible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRECONDITIONS**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local experts, service provider and international expert are qualified and deliver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The assumptions are incomplete (they should be four, one for each intervention logic level); some are internal requirements of the project, which are the responsibility of the executive body (ETF) and, as such, they are not external conditions.

For example, the preconditions and the conditions to achieve the specific objectives are respectively: “Local experts, service provider and international expert are qualified and deliver” and “Working Group members represent relevant national stakeholders”. Both are the responsibility of ETF staff which has to guarantee the quality of the experts and the institutional representation through negotiations and agreements with the government and social partner.

**Conclusions**

The project is relevant in addressing the need to update ETF expertise and mission and, on the basis of European experience, to enhance both flexibility and security in labour market policies in Countries with low job creation, large informal and/or unstructured labour markets and a weak institutional system.

The interest and participation of local institutions and stakeholders has been judged good and very productive.

The project structure is quite fragmented since it has 4 specific objectives and 4 results and works in four countries; this requires a good analysis of the assumptions and risks and the certainty and stability of resources. In some cases, these conditions have not been respected.

**Recommendations**

A better use of the Logical Framework according to European guidelines.

More specifically: i) define one specific objective; ii) results must be defined as goods and services produced and delivered; iii) assumptions should refer only to conditions which are beyond the control and responsibility of the project management (external conditions); and iv) indicators (quantitative or qualitative) have to be simple and verifiable.

The project report should give more attention to data collection and information related to the proposed indicators.
4.3.2. Impact

Since the project is currently underway, only a potential impact can be discussed.

Information on the long term effect of the project on the quality of ETF expertise is still scarce and can only be assessed at the conclusive stage of the project. In this respect, the increasing awareness of national stakeholders on flexicurity since it can lead to long term changes is a relevant data. “Generally the project has attracted the attention of the Ministries in the 3 countries where activities were more intense (work on Ukraine has been delayed due to lack of staffing resources addressed only in the last months of 2009). The greatest achievement was in Kazakhstan where the Ministry of Labour introduced the notion of flexicurity in its concept for employment policy” (Q4 2009).

In Morocco “The Minister of Labour was very supportive on the project continuation and expressed a special interest to focus the project on active labour market measures and their effectiveness using also research prepared by the ministry itself” (Q5 2010).

Conclusions

It is too early to assess if the increased awareness on flexicurity proposals is turning into deep and widespread changes in policy objectives, programs and regulations.

The good participation in the project activities and the interest shown in the first effects of the project in the three countries, mainly in Morocco and in Kazakhstan, could lead policies makers to share and adopt new methodologies and models elaborated by the ILP projects.

4.3.3. Effectiveness

Not all the information is available (for example, “Agendas and minutes of the round tables organized in 4 countries; List of participants; Round table minutes, etc.).

SO1 Most of the papers and publications (proposed indicators for SO) have been produced. However it is questionable whether a few papers on flexicurity and two cappuccino meetings, in the time span of three years, can effectively measure the “Deepened ETF’s understanding on the applicability of a flexicurity approach... “.

In addition, the tools for managing internal information and ETF staffs’ level of interest do not seem to guarantee the best opportunities. “However, a third (unforeseen) risk appeared during the project implementation. This risk links to the project capacity to disseminate knowledge in the ETF staff. Two cappuccinos on Flex and the Economic Crisis and Flex first results had to be cancelled because of low participation by staff. This has to be addressed in the coming year” (PIP 2010).
**SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE(S)**
Deepened ETF’s understanding on the applicability of a flexicurity approach in the socio-economic contexts of its partner countries giving particular emphasis on the role of LLL

| ETF methodology for analyzing labour market from a flexicurity perspective (by Q3 2009); |
| ETF thematic paper on how LLL promotes flexicure labour markets (by Q3 2009); |
| ETF thematic paper on transitions during the life course & flexicurity with links to ILO decent work agenda (by Q4 2009); |
| ETF thematic paper on flexicurity and social security (by Q4 2009); |
| ETF publication on flexicurity in transition and developing countries including 4 thematic papers (by Q4 2010) |
| 2 cappuccino events (by Q4 2009 & Q4 2010); |

| Four thematic papers on (a) methodology to analyse labour markets from a flexicurity perspective (b) flexicurity, transitional labour markets and decent work (c) the role of LLL in flexicurity policies (d) flexicurity and social policy either on ETF Website or in an a specialised reviews |
| ETF publication (ETF Website) |
| Agenda of ETF cappuccino events |

| Contribution to the international debate on flexicurity and its link to decent work for all in developing and transition countries - focusing in particular on the role of LLL |
| ETF presentation in 2-3 international conferences (by Q4 2010) |
| Nb of press articles referring to ETF ILP on Flexicurity |
| Round tables on flexicurity in the 4 |

| ETF contributions to international events (meetings agendas, presentations, mission report database) |
| National & International Press |
| Four thematic papers on (a) methodology to analyse labour markets from a flexicurity perspective (b) flexicurity, transitional labour markets and decent work (c) the role of LLL in flexicurity policies (d) flexicurity and social policy either on ETF Website or in an a specialised reviews |

| Raised awareness of key stakeholders in selected ETF partner countries on the potential, limitations and preconditions under which flexicurity can contribute to decent work and competitiveness |
| countries participating in the project (active participation from Kazakhstan, Turkey, Turkey and Ukraine) (by Q3 2010) |
| Number of participants in each round tables (20 participants in each country) (by Q4 2010) |

| Published country studies of the 4 countries participating in the project (Kazakhstan, Turkey, Turkey and Ukraine) |
| Agendas and minutes of the round tables organized in 4 countries |
| List of participants |

| The flexicurity debate is transformed into a set of concrete policy actions that help policy makers in the ETF partner countries to design future labour market and training reforms |
| 1. Provision of recommendations to the 4 countries for future policy actions during the round tables and in the publication (by Q4 2010) |
| 2. Number of articles on ETF flexicurity project (by Q4 2010) |

| 1. ETF publication |
| 2. Round Table minutes |
| 3. National & International press |

It is very important to underline that in terms of skills improvement, the project staff acquired a good knowledge on flexicurity issues, as a consequence of intense project activity.
SO 2 The objective is going to be achieved through the project team’s participation in a series of initiatives, among them the peer learning seminar organised by DG Employment on flexicurity and the seminar on economic crisis in Brussels: “Employment Week” (24-25 June) in Brussels and “Implementing flexicurity in times of crisis” in Prague (Q4).

SO 3 The number participants at the round tables was good. It confirmed the interest in the initiative and that the local stakeholders have clearly understood the objective of ILP initiatives. No further information is available on the quality of these meetings to assess the “Raised awareness of key stakeholders”. From the reports, it emerges that “Generally the project has attracted the attention of the Ministries in the 3 countries where activities were more intense” (Q4).

SO 4 At the moment, there is not enough data to measure this objective.

Results

| RESULTS | Thematic papers on (a) methodology to analyse labour markets from a flexicurity perspective (b) flexicurity, transitional labour markets and decent work (c) the role of LLL in flexicurity policies (d) flexicurity and social security | (Internal) survey results documents for Turkey and Kazakhstan ETF publication Published country study Kazakhstan Published country study Turkey Published country study Turkey Published country study Ukraine |
| 1. ETF publication on different aspects of the applicability of flexicurity in transition developing countries; |  |
| 2. New methodology for analysing labour markets from flexicurity perspective |  |
| 3. Analysis of the labour market in the 4 transition countries participating in the project from the flexicurity perspective |  |
| 4. Recommendations for the 4 countries for future policy actions discussed with the stakeholders and disseminated. |  |

The results cannot be easily assessed due to insufficient indicators.

R1 The project is producing the expected number of publications (the same as in SO1).

R2 New methodology for analyzing labour markets from the flexicurity perspective is certainly one of the most expected results, but the relative indicators are not clear.

R3 The country studies, proposed as result indicators, have been finalised.

As proxy indicators one can assume that the procedures adopted could guarantee a good quality of the product: “In April 2010 a meeting took place in Turin with participation of 4 European experts and national experts involved in the project with the aim to: I) receive comments for the enhancement of the quality of the reports; II) generate a discussion on (a) what flexicurity may mean in the context of developing and transition countries; (b) how can flexicurity be enhanced taking into account the institutional realities of the countries concerned; and (c) what the role of lifelong learning is in promoting flexicurity in the context of those countries”.

R4 This result can be assessed at the end of the project.

Conclusions

The level of achievement of the specific objective and results is generally satisfactory, on the basis and limits of the available indicators and the very generic formulation of the objectives.

There is some evidence that “Raised awareness of key stakeholders in selected ETF partner countries on the potential, limitations and preconditions under which flexicurity can contribute to decent work and competitiveness” is going to be achieved.
The results related to methodology and publications have already been achieved even if some indicators do not have all the required characteristics.

Among the results it is important to underline the improvement of knowledge and skills of the project team and the local stakeholders representatives involved in the project.

**Recommendations**

In order to improve the evaluation of effectiveness, at least two operations are recommended:

- A more detailed definition of the objectives that should include targets or describe the final scenario against which to make the evaluation.
- Use of valuable indicators for the collection of data and relevant information.
- It is also suggested to give greater attention to data collection both in relation to the indicators and to the changes that the project has introduced (or is introducing), even if they are unexpected and not described by the objectives and results of the project.

**4.3.4. Efficiency**

Preliminary activities during the first phase have generally been implemented as scheduled, such as desk research and the analysis for a better understanding of the flexicurity concept by ETF staff (July – Dec 2008); an expert meeting was organised in December 2008.

During the first months of 2009, in the three Countries (Kazakhstan, Turkey and Morocco) the guidelines to analyse LM for flexicurity were developed and the contracts for local experts to produce the report on “Labour market functioning and Institutions” (Q1 2009) were finalized. At the end of 2009, the projects had reached the following stages:

**Ukraine:** The local expert provided a gap analysis of the Black Sea Labour Market Review – the Ukraine report is in line with the guidelines of the flexicurity report.

**Turkey:** The 1st draft of the working paper on the assessment of Turkish labour market from a flexicurity perspective was submitted to ETF.

Key project progress in 2010 (Q5).

**Kazakhstan:** National seminar on the discussion of a Kazakhstan (?) concept of employment in cooperation with the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection took place (?). A meeting with the local expert took place on 5 February to discuss the 1st draft of the report on “Labour Market Flexibility and Security in Kazakhstan”.

**Turkey:** Meeting with the Minister of Employment and VET took place in order to provide an overview of ETF activities in general and on the flexicurity project in particular.

**Ukraine:** ETF mission (LFE) to Ukraine on 23-24 March to meet trade unions, employers, and employment services to discuss the proposed activities in the field of industrial restructuring with corporate (social) responsibility.

The delays on the implementation of the project in Ukraine, due to the elections, and on the delivery of the qualitative survey in Turkey, caused by the appointment of a new Secretary General of the Ministry of labour, are examples of normal unexpected events which should be included in the risk category.

The lack of human recourses caused the delay in the start of the activity in Ukraine: “**Given the lack of human resources in the project, the bulk of the work on Ukraine is postponed to Q3 and Q4 followed by LFE**” (Q2 2009); the lack of resources also delayed the start of the survey in Kazakhstan, “**Given the budget restrictions and in case of no additional availability of funds (26 000 Euro) the survey in Kazakhstan will be postponed to 2010.**”
Risk Analysis

Due to the innovative approach, the complexity of the theme and the weakness of local institutions, the problems highlighted as risks (the lack of quantitative information; the social partners in the countries of the project are not ready to accept this new approach) should be considered as regular project characteristics rather than as possible external risks.

Such a position would allow the project team to appropriately plan for resources during the programming phase rather than coming up with ad-hoc solutions when unexpected events occur (which is what took place). The lack of planning causes managerial difficulties “but efforts have been made in order to minimize their impact on the final results.”

Conclusions

The data show the good flexibility of the project management and the good capacity of the team to cope with and manage unexpected situations.

The project had a few delays especially in Ukraine, as a result of unexpected factors, and in Kazakhstan, because of the delay in the delivery of funds due to the annual structure of the project.

As happened in other ILPs, the reduction in the number of experts in the project team - a very challenging and rare event in a management system - has been one of main causes of the delays. In fact, the project strategies (objectives, results, activities) are set according to the resources (internal coherence).

Any change which takes place affects the quality of the whole.

Recommendations

To ensure the stability of the project team, limiting the mobility to maintain the internal consistency of the initial project.

Some of the difficulties could be predicted through two measures: i) a more thorough analysis of risks and conditions of success; and ii) a revision of the project design based on decentralization and improvement of the research-action method.

4.3.5. Coherence and complementarity

The project is in line with the EU commitment to promote “decent work throughout the world as part of its efforts to strengthen the social dimension of globalisation, both in the EU and outside”, and “The flexicurity approach to the design of labour market policy has been developed within the European Union as a response to the increasing volatility of labour markets resulting from technological change and globalization” (PIP 2009).

In regards to complementarity, the project has developed solid collaborations and exchanges with organizations such as the ILO, Eurofound, DG EMPLOYMENT and other European Research Centres specialised in the field of flexicurity (Tilburg University and Karma Denmark). It also seeks to cooperate with European Social partners so as to learn from their experiences on the implementation of flexicurity in EU Member States.

Conclusions

The project objectives are strongly coherent with European politics and programmes in the flexicurity area, and collaborated with the international community sharing their experiences at very high levels. Nevertheless, there is not enough information on the collaboration with other international agencies based in partner countries.

Recommendations

To include coherence and complementarity as criteria for project planning and implementation.
The reports should clarify to a greater extent the relationships between the proposals made by the flexicurity project and the legislative framework to gain a better understanding of the level of innovation and the position of local authorities and stakeholders.

4.3.6. Sustainability

Since the project is currently underway, only the assessment of the probability of sustainability is possible. The tools and opportunities which should allow for a permanent transfer of new knowledge within the ETF are scarcely highlighted in the projects. More specifically, it is not clear how the ETF will continue the activities of ongoing research to update the areas of interest and of dissemination.

A good opportunity to make ILP’s effects more sustainable could be the Community of Professional Practice (PPC), which was recently launched within the ETF.

However, the mobility of personnel within the ETF and that leaving the organization constitutes a weakness factor in terms of effectiveness and sustainability.

At the moment, though, it is difficult to evaluate sustainability in Partner Countries. The issue to address is how to move from the temporary structures of Working Groups to a more systematic and continuous updating of the ILP projects results, since they evolve quickly within the contexts where they were proposed, discussed and validated.

There is no information on the inclusion of ILP results in government budgets and means and procedures which could allow the continuity of benefits.

One can assume that the new knowledge gained and the raised awareness of stakeholders could affect political decisions. In this respect, there are interesting opportunities in Kazakhstan and Morocco.

Conclusions

Sustainability has not been included in the ILP Guidelines; therefore tools or opportunities have not been planned to ensure the continuity of the results and benefits in ETF action and in Partner Countries.

By analyzing the data strong and weak points appear:

strong points
a) good correspondence between local needs and projects objectives
b) the consensus of local institutions
c) good participation of stakeholders and social partners

weak point

f) transience of local organizational structures, set up under ILPs just for projects activities

Recommendations

Taking into account the ILPs project objectives and resources, the main focus should be on capacity building and information dissemination about the activities and results of the projects.

a) development of an institutional and participative analysis, jointly with the main stakeholders for a capacity building assessment, in three specific areas:
   ▪ Human resource development, as individual needs in knowledge, competencies and skills, on the project topics (research methodology, data collection, processing and analyzing data, report elaboration, dissemination methods and techniques, etc.).
Organizational development, as weakness in management structures, including processes and relationships with other organizations and stakeholders.

Legal framework and changes requested to enable the organizations to manage the results of the projects.

b) defining a plan of activities mainly based on technical assistance and training using an integrated strategies, such as study visits in Italy, local seminars and meetings with ILP experts, thematic web forums at national and regional levels in specific websites.

4.3.7. European added value

This criterion was not included in the ILP Guidelines. The European origin of the ILP proposals is clearly understood and accepted by the Partner countries’ stakeholders, interested to share the strong EU’s economic and social flexicurity model, which tries to combine competitiveness and social cohesion.

Even so, there is no clear evidence that it is perceived as a “European added value” – that it is a specific elaboration and product of European culture and experience, different from that of each Member State.

Conclusions

The European added value is not explicitly stated in the ILP guidelines.

In fact, the expression “European added value” is not found in the document on the flexicurity project. This suggests that even if the projects work on the basis of European politics and on the experiences of each ILP theme, such a criterion has never been intentionally applied.

Recommendations

To insert the European added value as a criterion for project planning and implementation and to compare the originality of the ILPs’ innovative approach and the interest shown by local stakeholders with other proposals made by Member States and the International Donors Community.

Project documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PIP FLEX 2009-final draft after incorporation of reviewers and OKA comments</td>
<td>Q3 flex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIP FLEX ANNEX 1 Logframe</td>
<td>Q4 project progress report ILP-FLEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIP FLEX ANNEX 2 OUTPUTS</td>
<td>Q6 project progress report ILP-FLEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIP FLEX 2010 FINAL 12-02-10 to PMEU</td>
<td>4. CPIP ANNEX 2 OUTPUTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIP FLEX ANNEX 1 Logframe OKA</td>
<td>ILP FLEX missions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting</th>
<th>Countries Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1 project progress report</td>
<td>Concept note on flexicurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2 project progress report ILP-FLEX</td>
<td>ETF Guidelines for country studies-final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 flex</td>
<td>ETF Guidelines for country studies-final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5 project progress report ILP-FLEX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.4. HCD review

4.4.1. Relevance

Problems analysis and stakeholders participation

The themes and functions of the ETF are clearly stated in the documentation: “This project is designed to contribute to the development of vocational and training system development and provision in a
lifelong learning perspective (Core Theme A). It will do so mostly by providing evidence-based analysis on policy reforms, to inform decision-making on partner country policy response” (PIP 2010).

The problematic framework which initiated the project is well described:

- Expertise is the main asset of ETF, but it needs continuous improvements in order to meet needs and demands of the stakeholders;

- VET and LM remain at the heart of ETF’s work, nonetheless the recast regulation has reformulated the mandate in terms of human capital development (HCD) and added the “lifelong” dimension;

- there might be demands to work in other geographical areas in future. In these situations, ETF shall be ready to add value through an analytical framework that takes existing reports into account, but elaborates on the policy challenges ahead that are specific, or unique to that given country (PIP 2010)

The project innovation strategy is well delineated and coherent with the problems’ analysis. It includes three aspects of innovation - approach, focus and methodology - and different dimensions of “demand” i.e. the aspirations of households and individuals, the Governments’ strategies; the expectations of the actors in the labour market, etc.

The focus is on equity, how access to HCD is fair and open, and on the analysis of barriers to access learning and employment opportunities, etc.

The methodology is based on the link between education analysis and labour market analysis, by bringing together the five areas of strength for ETF, namely education, school to work transition, labour market, adult learning, and migration.

The project was identified following the ILP model: the theme is first identified and studied by the ETF and then proposed for discussion with stakeholders to further explore and specify its scope (Q1).

Quality of design

The structure of the Logical Frame does not follow official European manuals. It seems to be used as more of summary table of project elements, updated annually, rather than as a support tool to plan, manage and evaluate the project. As a result, the information in the LF has limited evaluative value.

The general objective and the related indicators are correctly formulated because they highlight a change which the project can contribute to significantly. The project has three specific objectives. They are all described as general principles for example “specific as possible policy advice, bearing in mind the country needs”, or as activities: “Identifying enablers in partner country systems that support HCD in the long-term”.

The results for 2009 and 2010 presented in the project are different, leading to a total of 10 results, which is an excessive value compared to the size of the project. Furthermore, some results have not been formulated in a measurable way. For example, “Refined understanding of relationship HCD and equity reflected in research outline, task description, guidelines quantitative analysis, tools for qualitative analysis, template for databases” is certainly a criterion for the project’s quality, but the formulation is quite convoluted and it can hardly be measurable.

The majority of the proposed indicators are not clearly valuable Some indicators and results are similar (i.e. Country reviews); others are the results of the project (“HCD Review methodology refined, guidelines and tools elaborated and commented upon); and others still are stated as targets rather than as variables (Two national workshops take place; Four technical meetings on policy options).

Assumptions

Lack of ownership on the part of the countries, to be mitigated through continuity of dialogue;
Repeating what done by others, to be mitigated by identification of issues not explored and of real added value;
Assumption: time, technical capacity and good use of resources on the part of ETF
Involving competent experts;
Availability and reliability of data;
Accessibility of rural districts for regional surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRECONDITIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical support available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission budget available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership on the part of stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETF expertise and time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good quality expertise of local experts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The assumptions are incomplete; those referring to the results are missing

Most of the assumptions are correctly defined. Some are the project’s internal requirements and fall under the responsibility of the project’s executive body (ETF) and, as such, they are not external conditions, i.e. “good quality expertise of local experts”, Technical capacity and good use of resources on the part of ETF.”

Conclusions
The project is relevant in addressing the need to update ETF’s expertise capacity on analysis and in understanding the new scenarios of human capital development in specific contexts with an integrated and original approach. The intention is also to equip the institutions of two Partner Countries, Moldavia and Tajikistan, with conceptual and methodological tools to address this issue. The interest and participation of local institutions and stakeholders has been judged as good, lively and very productive.

The structure of the project is quite fragmented because it has 3 specific objectives and a redundant number of 10 results (in two years); furthermore, it takes place in three countries, which requires a good analysis of the assumptions and risks and the certainty and stability of resources.

Recommendations
A better use of the Logical Framework according to European guidelines.

More specifically: i) define one specific objective; ii) results must be defined as goods and services produced and delivered; iii) assumptions should only refer to conditions which are beyond the control and responsibility of the project management (external conditions); iv) indicators (quantitative or qualitative) have to be simple and verifiable.

The project report should give greater attention to data collection and information related to the proposed indicators.

4.4.2. Impact
For now it is only possible to discuss a potential impact concerning the achievement of the general objective: “to build partner countries’ capacity to analyse and interpret trends and challenges.”

In particular, there is not enough information on the following proposed indicator: “ETF will have produced and shared with the EC and Partner Countries an innovative instrument to appraise “where” a country is in terms of its human capital.”

The high level of participation in the nation’s workshop for presentation of project findings and the welcoming received by international organizations and national stakeholders, in Moldavia, are important signs for further development and policy makers engagement commitment: “The national workshop for presentation of the project findings in the Republic of Moldavia was held in Chisinau on 10 June, attracting 35 participants. The Deputy Education Minister Loretta Handrabura (in Moldavia) announced that public-private partnerships have been declared a priority for education” (Q6 2010).
Conclusions
Even though it is too early to assess if the interest in the HCD review project and the very good participation in the activities will produce significant policies changes.
Nevertheless, it is already possible to observe some positive trends, mainly in Moldavia.

Recommendation
To put attention to dissemination and strengthening of the proposed new models and options in the countries’ policies, by identifying, tools and opportunities to disseminate results and information concerning the project, preferably using local channels managed by stakeholders that can ensure greater extension and continuity of delivery.

4.4.3. Effectiveness
In line with all the ILPs, the main objective of the project, even if it is not clearly stated in the Logical Framework, seems to be the enhancement of ETF expertise:

“The challenge of this ILP was to equip ETF with an instrument to appraise, or make a diagnosis as to “where” a country is in terms of its human capital development and where it can go next - taking into consideration each country’s specific policy history, socio-cultural background, economic features, and long-term development goals” (PIP 2010).”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Objective(s)</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Source of verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Innovating the approach to country reports bringing education, training and employment closer together, learn a newer methodology accordingly, and test it in two countries;  
  • Formulating as specific as possible policy advice, bearing in mind the country needs. To this end analyses, findings and recommendations shall be close to each country’s specific economic situation and development goals;  
  • Identifying enablers in partner country systems that support HCD in the long-term, taking into account the equity dimension, for sake of meeting sustainable development. | Two HCD Reviews on Rep of Moldova and Tajikistan  
Policy dialogue conducted with authorities, based on report conclusions and on policy options to address equity for HCD  
Feedback on ETF methodology for analysis and on reports’ conclusions, from partner countries and EC  
Participation of policy makers and specialists in the dissemination workshops and in the technical meetings | Actual paper work  
Peers’ comments and opinion  
Feedback by countries’ stakeholders  
Publication |

By examining the specific objectives on the basis of the proposed indicators, the following considerations can be made:

SO1 The two HCD Reviews on the Republic of Moldova and Tajikistan have been elaborated.
Throughout the project, the political dialogue with the authorities on project themes, and, in particular, on policy options to address equity for HCD has been positive and constant.

There is not enough information on two indicators: “Feedback on ETF methodology for analysis and on reports’ conclusions, from partner countries and EC”, and “Participation of policy makers and specialists in the dissemination workshops and in the technical meetings”.

SO2 This objective can be properly verified at the end of the project. However, there is some positive signals as the recommendations as conclusions of the presentation workshop in Tajikistan: “Quality: Improve management and coordination of education; improve teachers’ position; improve school facilities in rural areas; develop school assessment. Access: Expanding access to education for excluded
social groups: women, poor, villagers living in remote mountain regions. **Choice:** Empower individual choice in VET, HE and self-employment; develop standards of professional training; develop partnership public and private institutions and social partnership**” (Q6 2010).

**SO 3** There is not enough information on “Enablers identification in partner country systems that support HCD in the long-term”

The projects’ objectives have been clearly understood and properly managed by the stakeholders.

**Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EXPECTED RESULTS 2009</strong></th>
<th><strong>2009</strong></th>
<th><strong>2009</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Test the framework with methodology developed in 2008, through two pilot reviews in Rep of Moldova and Tajikistan respectively;</td>
<td>HCD Review methodology refined, guidelines and tools elaborated and commented upon</td>
<td>Reports available at ETF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Refined understanding of relationship HCD and equity reflected in research outline, task description, guidelines quantitative analysis, tools for qualitative analysis, template for databases;</td>
<td>Country reports’ delivered</td>
<td>HCD Review framework and tools available on paper Mission reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Conclusions on HCD and Equity</td>
<td>Draft policy options received and commented upon by ETF</td>
<td>Procurements implemented Q1-4 report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Draft outline of policy options or scenarios;</td>
<td>Identification of variables as suitable for equity index and problematisation of equity index</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Test feasibility of a equity index.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EXPECTED RESULTS 2010</strong></th>
<th><strong>2010</strong></th>
<th><strong>2010</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Consolidated HCD Reviews framework and methodology</td>
<td>Finalised versions of two country reports, on the Rep of Moldova and Tajikistan</td>
<td>Country reports actually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Submit and discuss the policy options submitted and discussed with policy makers in rep of Moldova and Tajikistan</td>
<td>Consolidated conclusions as regards the relationship between HCD and equity i.e. finalised methodology for analysis ETF Policy advice missions</td>
<td>Team work and knowledge sharing at ETF Mission reports Q1-4 reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Awareness raised among policy makers as to relevant factors for equitable development of HCD, and engagement generated</td>
<td>ETF Policy advice missions</td>
<td>Editorial Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Information and awareness raising among specialists and expert community</td>
<td>Two national workshops take place Four technical meetings on policy options Technical presentations in EC and EU seminars/events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) Publication.</td>
<td>ETF publication at least submitted to the Editorial Board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected results in 2009

The LF proposes 4 indicators, two of which can be assessed: HCD Review methodology refined, guidelines and tools elaborated and commented upon, and Country reports’ delivered.

The methodology “comprising (a) a model task description for conducting HCD Reviews, (b) streamlined guidelines for quantitative analysis, and (c) tools for the qualitative analysis” was elaborated through research and a systematic revision undertaken with the stakeholders and experts of the two Partner Countries. The material produced, which was part of the documentation handed over to the evaluation team, seems to be of good quality.

“Two HCD Reviews in Tajikistan and Moldova” have been elaborated on the basis of the results of surveys that cover three aspects: i) initial education, its quality, access and returns; ii) adult learning (informal and non-formal), its quality, modalities, access and returns; and iii) appreciation of the HC and equity in the country at present and future perspectives.”
The reports will be the basis for work and reflection to identify policy options that the Governments may pursue to improve the equity in the development of HC.

However, there is no evidence on the other two indicators: “Draft policy options received and commented upon by ETF”, and “Identification of variables as suitable for equity index and problematisation of equity index”. They are formulated in generic terms and are difficult to evaluate. In any case, information on dissemination activities within the ETF is scarce.

Expected results in 2010

Some results have most certainly been achieved, such as the “Consolidated HCD Reviews framework and methodology.”; Reviews framework and methodology; “Submit and discuss the policy options submitted and discussed with policy makers in rep of Moldova and Tajikistan”; Publications.

There is no clear evidence on other results, such as the “Awareness raised among policy makers as to relevant factors for equitable development of HCD, and engagement generated”, and “Information and awareness raising among specialists and expert community”.

Proxy indicators can be used, which are very positive, as the interest shown by local institutions in two Countries, the number of people in attendance at presentation events (35 in Moldova), the quality of the recommendations, and the meetings with the international community in Moldova.

In the examined reports there is not enough information on the nature of the stakeholders. In Tajikistan the key stakeholders are the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection.

Conclusions

From a qualitative point of view, the level of achievement of the results is generally satisfactory.

In particular, the results related to the methodology, models and reviews seem already achieved, even if, at times, the indicators do not have all the required characteristics of evaluability.

Among the most important and strategic results, it is important to highlight the improvement of knowledge and skills of the project team and local people involved in the project.

It is still too early to assess the specific objectives as defined in the project documents, even if there is some evidences that strategic advice based on policy dialogue, one of the project’s main objectives, is going to be achieved.

Recommendations

In order to improve the evaluation of effectiveness, at least two operations are recommended:

- A more detailed definition of the objectives that should include the targets or describe the final scenario against which to make the evaluation.
- Use of valuable indicators for the collection of data and relevant information.

It is also suggested to give further attention to data collection both in relation to the indicators and to the changes that the project has introduced (or it is introducing), even if unexpected and not described by the project’s objectives and results.

4.4.4. Efficiency

Since the geographic area of the project was limited to two Countries, the managerial complexity and risks of not being successful decreased.

The preliminary activities have, in general, been carried out according to the plan, among them: i) Overview of what was done by ETF in the past on reporting and analytical approaches, identifying some weak analytical points; ii) Understanding of how the changes in ETF environment are affecting
the way in which ETF conducts diagnoses at country level; iii) The selection of countries where piloting the HCD Reviews in 2009 led to choose Moldova and Tajikistan;

The main activities in 2009 have been undertaken according to the scheduled plan with the exception of a few delays which occurred in the procurement of expertise in Moldova and Tajikistan: i) A research model was drafted for both Republic of Moldova and Tajikistan, based on identification of key policy issues; ii) Consultation with local stakeholders (national ministries’ officials, on the suitability of the analysis and chosen focus, and consultation with the EC services.); and iii) Guidelines for the quantitative analysis and tools for qualitative analysis.

The main activities in 2010 have been as follows: in May, the Country Reports for the two Countries were finalized and the political options identified “after having been presented to the institutions of reference (Deputy Ministers of Labour and of Social Protection and to the Ministry of Economy in Moldova )”. Work has begun on the film in the two Countries.

In general, from an examination of the achievements’ list (Q4) and of the quality of the activities undertaken and the material produced, one can infer that the project ran quite in 2009. The established activities were carried out, namely arranging tools and the research methodology while inserting the innovative elements which characterize the project (i.e. Lifelong dimension of HC; disaggregated analysis of HC, by rural-urban, but also gender and to some extent income and ethnicity; tri-dimensionality of equity: access, choice, quality, etc).

The changes in staff were among the difficulties encountered during the project which also caused the delays: “The project team was affected by changes till end of Q1 (i.e. NPO left the project); the statistician (in addition to JJO) was an important source of expertise but not will not join till May at the earliest. Moldova and Tajikistan: Procurement of expertise needed to implement the activity in the country postponed to Q2” (Q1).

Furthermore (Q4 2009) “Less FTE are allocated to the project in 2010. At the same time, country teams are given a new priority (the Turin Process, and the Business and Education) which may impact on team members’ availability, especially during Q1-Q2 2010”.

The risks are defined correctly even in relation to the project’s innovative nature and the contexts’ characteristics: the risk of a lack of ownership was balanced by a constant flow of information and consultations with stakeholders; the “duplication of the project themes and actions” was alleviated by “the existing panoply of reports, assessments, and stocktaking exercises”.

“The level of budget consumption is according to plan. The rate of commitment is in line with the fact that the dissemination strategy (edited publication, film, contribution to conference) requires: final editing of country reports upon finalisation (following the Q2 peer review); procurement of external expertise for film based on conclusions reached in Q2; contribution to corporate event based on decisions about event format taken in Q2-Q3” (Q6 2010).

**Conclusions**

The data show the good flexibility of the project and the capacity of the team to cope with and manage unexpected situations.

The project experience a few delays especially in Ukraine, due to unexpected events, and in Kazakhstan, because of the delay in the delivery of funds due to the project’s structures.

The data collection demonstrates good flexibility and the capacity of the team to cope with and manage unexpected situations.

The reduction in the number of experts in the project team - a very challenging and rare event in a management system- has been one of main causes of the delays. In fact, the project strategies (objectives, results, activities) are established according to the resources (internal coherence). Any change which takes place affects the quality of the whole.
The annual re-financing of activities introduces an element of uncertainty in the allocation of funds and on the continuation of activities.

**Recommendations**
To ensure the stability of the project team, limiting the mobility to maintain the internal consistency of the initial project.

**4.4.5. Sustainability**
At this stage, it is only possible to carry out a provisional assessment of the project’s sustainability.

There is no information on the future involvement of stakeholders in procedures able to give continuity to the results and benefits of the project in the Partner Countries.

The project planned a specific action for supporting the HCD in the long term, described in specific objective N 3 (“Identifying enablers in partner country systems that support HCD in the long-term, taking into account the equity dimension, for sake of meeting sustainable development”), but information is still poor.

It is not clear how the ETF will continue an activity of ongoing research to update the areas of interest and of dissemination.

However it should be noted that the mobility of personnel within ETF and that leaving the organization may constitute a risk factor for sustainability.

**Conclusions**
Sustainability has not been considered a criterion in the project design; therefore tools and recourses to ensure the continuity of results and benefits of the ILPs in Partner countries, have not been included in the project’s plans.

Nevertheless, as result of the intense relationships with stakeholder, some conditions for sustainability are present in the projects, as

a) good correspondence between local needs and projects objectives
b) the consensus of local institutions
c) good participation of stakeholders and social partners

These could be the starting point for defining future sustainability strategy and overcome the main weaknesses as
d) low level of capacity building of local stakeholders
f) transience of local organizational structures, set up under ILPs just for projects activities

**Recommendations**
The first measure to ensure sustainability is to include this criterion in the project design, in order to plan the resources for sustainability.

Taking into account the ILPs project objectives and resources, the main focus should be on capacity building and information dissemination about the activities and results of the projects.

a) development of an institutional and participative analysis, jointly with the main stakeholders for a capacity building assessment, in three specific areas:
   - Human resource development, as individual needs in knowledge, competencies and skills, on the project topics (research methodology, data collection, processing and analyzing data, report elaboration, dissemination methods and techniques, etc.),
• Organizational development, as weakness in management structures, including processes and relationships with other organizations and stakeholders.

• Legal framework and changes requested to enable the organizations to manage the results of the projects.

b) defining a plan of activities mainly based on technical assistance and training using an integrated strategies, such as study visits in Italy, local seminars and meetings with ILP experts, thematic web forums at national and regional levels in specific websites

4.4.6. Coherence and Complementarity

In the planning documents (PIPs) there is no explicit references to European policies, programs or strategies and to collaboration with centres or agencies that occurred during the project’s implementation, tough the Human Capital definition is referred to in EU documents as the EU’s Integrated Guidelines for Growth and Jobs as part of the Lisbon Strategy.

In Moldova, there has been, from the preliminary stages, a collaboration with UNDP on the quality of education.

Furthermore, in Moldavia, “Bilateral meetings with Minister of Economy Lazar, with UNDP resident representative, the World Bank, and the team leader of the EC high-level policy advice confirmed that human capital development is a priority for the country”.

The 2009 Report (Q4) underlines a “potential connection with the research to be launched by the Crell (t) on social inclusion, and with the EU Conference Crell is organizing for April 2010 in Malta”. There is, however, no further information.

Conclusions
Sustainability was not a criterion included in the ILP Guidelines.

Considering the nature of the topic and the methodological approach, the lack of reference to European policies may depend on the insufficient data in the documentation.

Recommendations
To include a clearer reference to European policies and strategies in the project background and more details on the collaboration and exchanges with Member States and International Agencies.

4.4.7. European added value

The sustainability and coherence criteria were not included in the ILP Guidelines.

However, the PIP clearly mentions the intention to develop a specific and original “ETF product”, distinct from other organizations.

“Moreover the HCD Reviews have the ambition to: i) become a product that distinguishes ETF from other organisations. VET remains at the centre, with its broad links to post-secondary, higher and continuing education and training, and to employment; ii) help responding to evolving requests of the EC”

Conclusions
The European added value has not been explicitly stated in the ILP guidelines. Nevertheless, the research activity carried out by the project makes reference to the European experience, which was originally re-elaborated and adapted to each context.
**Recommendations**

To insert the European added value as a criterion for project planning and implementation and to compare the originality of the ILPs’ and the interest shown by the local stakeholders to other proposals made by Member States and International Donors Community.

**Project documentation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNING</th>
<th>COUNTRY PAPERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCD review PIP ANNEX 1 LFM final</td>
<td>02 HCD review in Tajikistan - EDITED-15-04-10 final rev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRD Reviews ILP 08 23</td>
<td>Human Capital Development Moldavia final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIP HCD review draft 2 after peer review</td>
<td>Policy Options_Moldavia completed version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIP HCD Reviews 2010 ANNEX 2 OUTPUTS</td>
<td>Agenda 31-05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCD Reviews ANNEX 1 LFM 2010</td>
<td>ETF presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIP ANNEX 2 OUTPUTS HCD-Reviews Q4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIP HCD Reviews 2010</td>
<td>HCR-Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCD Reviews framework update March09</td>
<td>Questionnaire for enterprises 04-08-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORTING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILP-HCD Q4 2009</td>
<td>Questionnaire for initial training - individuals 05-08-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4 progress report 2008</td>
<td>recommendations_HC_seminar_July10-ETF_final210710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIP ANNEX 2 OUTPUTS HCD-Reviews</td>
<td>TAJ policy options 290310MWA accepted changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6 ILP-HCD WP10-40-09 final</td>
<td>Guidelines for statistical annex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.5. Education and training for competitiveness**

**4.5.1. Relevance**

*Problem analysis and stakeholder participation*

The ETF themes and functions which the project focuses on are clearly indicated: “It ensures that the ETF is supporting the European Commission by providing a focal point for international debate and a reference point for the analysis and use of experience in HCD in partner countries” (PIP 2008), and “This particular ILP is designed to support quality and relevance of VET systems and provision, with particular reference to improved innovative pedagogies and introduction of key competencies (Priority Theme A)” (PIP 2010).

The problematic framework at the origin of the project is described as follows: “Enhancing economic competitiveness of a nation or a region has rarely been transformed into operational strategies or reform programs for education systems or its practitioners. A competitive knowledge economy also requires advanced secondary and tertiary education provision that is able to boost labour productivity, research and innovation” (PIP 2008/09/10).

The project is structured around four main areas of activities which are related to objectives and results:

- Analyse the connection between education and training policies, and economic growth and competitiveness;
- Strengthen the knowledge base of ETF related to education reforms that aim at enhancing competitiveness;
- Explore how ETF can best support the competitiveness agenda as spelled out in the EU 2020 strategy, in the context of the partner countries;
Produce tools to help people to deepen their knowledge and understanding of how education policies can contribute to sustainable economic growth and competitiveness.

It seems that the project has been identified and designed by ILP staff with the collaboration of international and local experts and then proposed to the Countries’ stakeholders: Ukraine, Armenia, and Egypt. In the first phase, Syria and Russia (Q1 2008) were also part of the project.

**Quality of project design**

The project can be divided in two periods, 2008/2009 and 2010. The difference between the two periods is the abandonment of the FRISCO component for reasons that have never been clearly described. They have though been explained in Turin during the meetings with the project experts; the skills needed to apply and manage such a sophisticated tool were not compatible with the national contexts. The discontinuation of FRISCO led to a reformulation of the project’s specific objectives, which have been completely changed in the PIP.

The structures of the 2008, 2009 and 2010 Logical Frameworks do not comply with the European approach and they seem to be used as more of a summary table of project activities and intentions rather than as a tool for planning, management and evaluation.

It should be pointed out that the project is one of the few that has an annual LF updating. In particular the project has the following characteristics:

The general objective is correctly formulated as a general statement which the project can contribute to but it lacks indicators.

The formulation of the project’s specific objectives evolved during the project. In the 2008/2009 LF they were:

- improved conceptual understanding of economic competitiveness;
- increased use of available statistics and indexes for policy development;
- better forecasting of future skills needs in competitive knowledge economies.

The objectives are formulated in general terms (improvement of…) without a definition of the target against which they can be verified.

The results are correctly formulated and clearly linked to the activities.

The 2010 Logical Framework is structured in three components, each with a specific purpose; the components are as follows:

- Connection between education and training policies, and economic growth and competitiveness analysed;
- Knowledge base of ETF strengthened, in relation to education reforms that aim at enhancing competitiveness, and the way in which ETF can best support the competitiveness agenda explored, as spelled out in the EU 2020 strategy, in the context of the partner countries;
- Tools produced to help people deepen their knowledge and understanding of how education policies can contribute to sustainable economic growth and competitiveness.

The meaning of the first two, even if generic and without targets, is understandable. The third is clearly related to a result (tools produced) and contains the omen that the produced tools will be used for “deepening knowledge and understanding”.

The result of each specific objectives is rather generic and does not have targets.

The results are correctly formulated and clearly linked to the activities. In most cases, the indicators are hard to apply because they are generically formulated.
The assumptions should be the external conditions that affect the success, which is beyond the project management’s control and has to be managed by partners or other stakeholders. In some cases, the assumptions are confused with regular tasks which, instead, are the project team’s responsibility, for instance “Lack of internal capacity in the ETF to fully implement this plan.”

Other factors, such as “Partner countries’ situations in terms of economic development and education policies differ too much from each other in order to create a coherent picture of competitiveness”, should be part of normal data planning instead of an external factor to be managed.

Furthermore, it is difficult to understand the connection between the external conditions and the intervention logic, since it lacks a level (there are three levels instead of four, the result level is missing).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preconditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of internal capacity in the ETF to fully implement this plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner countries’ situations in terms of economic development and education policies differ too much from each other in order to create a coherent picture of competitiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient level of scientific papers to be accepted by journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constrains to hire best possible external expertise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost all the sources of verification are missing. For example, among those mentioned in the LF (Mission reports and Quarterly Progress Reports; Interviews; Discussions in technical meetings; Research papers) only the Quarterly Progress Reports are available.

Conclusions
In general, the objectives and project strategies comply with the need to update ETF expertise and to propose political options to the partner Countries to review competitiveness in the fields of education, training and employment.

The problems addressed by the project were well analyzed during the preliminary activities. The level of the experts involved in the project’s identification phase and design is a clear sign confirming the quality of the initial setting. It is highlighted that the international experts involved included specialists from the Turku School of Economics’, Finland Futures Research Centre (FFRC), the Chamber of Commerce in Turin, and companies based in Turin and Piedmont aiming to understand their vision of education for their business competitiveness.

There is no clearly mention in the reports of relation problems with the stakeholders; their interest and participation is always considered good.

The project, unlike other ILPs, does not plan for the presence of local structured organizations (such as, Working Groups and Consultative Groups) and the research results, worked on with local organizations or experts, are presented and discussed with stakeholders during seminars.

In the first two years there were three specific objectives, replaced by new three purposes in 2010; and three results correspond to each specific objective. This brings the total of the “chain of the objectives” to over 15, an extremely high number especially if the size of the project is taken into consideration.

Furthermore, the number of Countries involved (initially 5 reduced to 3 during the last year) increases the risk of dispersion and fragmentation.
The change of the objectives in 2010 is unclear. Even though work with FRISCO was discontinued, the documentation does not explain why the other two objectives were changed.

It is important to note that changing the project’s specific objective is not standard practice, since the specific objective represents the main feature and *raison d’être* of a project. This issue is barely explored in the project documentation and it is not adequately addressed in the PIPs.

In this regard, we cite a recommendation given to the project team (Q4) “The project team is asked to take note that project planning documents such as LFM, Outputs annex, etc. may need to be adjusted to take into account changes agreed during the previous year and opportunities/risks/delays reported on here.”

In a research project, such a change should be the subject of an in-depth reflection and part of the lessons learnt, because the failure of a hypothesis is not an error, but a normal component of the project strategy.

**Recommendation**

To identify local institutions which can become reference points and to draw up necessary agreements to clarify the steps of transferring project results to local strategies.

Furthermore, this would facilitate the continuity of the work also in view of the Turin process.

A better use of the Logical Framework in line with European guidelines is recommended.

More specifically: i) define one specific objective; ii) results must be defined as goods and services produced and delivered; iii) assumptions should refer only to conditions which are beyond the control and responsibility of the project management (external conditions); and iv) indicators (quantitative or qualitative) have to be simple and verifiable.

The project report should give more attention to the collection of quantitative and qualitative data and information related to the proposed indicators.

### 4.5.2. Impact

At this stage of the project process, the data don’t yet allow for an understanding of the contribution given by the specific objectives and results to the general objective, “Better education policies that promote economic competitiveness and growth in Partner countries.”

There are no data yet on dissemination activities.

The institutional analysis of the local stakeholders and representatives is absent. This limits the assessment of their capacity to disseminate the results of the experiences within their own organizations.

**Conclusion**

Even though it is too early to assess if the interests of stakeholders will turn into deep and widespread changes in policy objectives, some results provide a good background from which to improve the education policies for promoting economic competitiveness. For instance, in Egypt “The report on Competitiveness, Education and Training is a joint venture between ETF, the Egyptian National Competitiveness Council (ENCC) and the EU TVET Reform Programme. The relevant authorities have decided to link the ETF report to the drafting of the Egyptian National Competitiveness Strategy. Our report will feed in the chapter on HRD, which is one of the key items in the Strategy.”

In Ukraine: “The national seminar was held at the University Scientific Council Meeting hall in Kyiv on 3-4 March 2010, in cooperation with the Ukrainian Competitiveness Council (UCC). The seminar focused on global competitiveness measurements and European strategies related to education and training for creativity, innovation and economic competitiveness. Around 70 people among university representatives, policy-makers, business leaders and researchers participated and the discussions were very lively.”
Recommendations

Identifying, through an institutional analysis, the best channels and opportunities to disseminate results of and information on the projects; it is preferable to use local resources managed by stakeholders since they can ensure a more widespread coverage and the continuity of delivery.

4.5.3. Efficiency

In 2008 the activities focused on identifying ongoing work in the field of education and training for competitiveness, on planning the tools for research and data collection, and on selecting national and international experts and local services providers.

The main activities have been the following:

- Initial analysis of Human Capital Indexes in WEF and IMD databases completed.
- Identification of local partners in Armenia (National Competitiveness Council), Ukraine (three competitiveness-related NGOs), Syria and Egypt completed.
- Pilot interview carried out with one local private company in Piedmont STA Group.
- Procedure for direct contract with Turku School of Economics’ Finland Futures Research Centre (FFRC) at final stage to obtain expertise on an intelligence system that would allow countries to predict skills and human capital needs in general in the medium term, using current competitiveness databases and economic trend analysis.
- Visit to Moscow and initial discussions on the possible involvement of Moscow or St. Petersburg regions in this project.
- Theoretical framework of the project presented to an international audience during the Grasping the Future conference in Helsinki.

This led to the following outputs/ results:

1. Solid conceptual and operational foundation established for the project.
2. Data collection tools designed and initial data collected on the basis of pilot experiences in Piedmont.
3. Education Intelligence System 2.0 developed including a draft manual for Education Intelligence System 2.0. (Q1, Q2 2008).

In this first phase, the activities were dynamic, exchanges within experts took place, contacts were made, and no delays have been reported. Furthermore no significant changes or problems related to human and financial resources have been reported.

According to the plan (PIP 2009), in 2009 the project focused on the issue of “What is the role of education and training in building economic competitiveness?” Some of the main components are:

- Use of available data from the WEF competitiveness index for specific country analyses.
- Two draft journal papers and two audio podcasts on education and creativity, innovation and competitiveness.
- Research and development work on FRISCO and testing its beta version.
- Piloting tailored workshops to be held in participating Partner countries on competitiveness and education in a “knowledge society”.

There is a good correspondence with the implemented activities (Q1/Q2/Q4 2009), for example:

- Technical meeting was held at the ETF in January with experts from Morocco, Armenia, Croatia, Ukraine, Egypt, and Russia.
Two articles published in the European Journal of Education.

Interviews among representatives of local education policy-makers and local business leaders.

Several presentations have been made by the project team members in seminars held by the EC.

FRISCO remains the main problem, for the work “has been discontinued” and it will be definitely abandoned. “On 23 June 2009 the management made the final decision that all efforts to continue a contractual partnership with the Turku School of Economics will be abandoned” (Q2).

This decision has the following impact on the project:

- the project is stripped of its main innovative component, and as a result adjustments in the further planning of work in 2009 and 2010 will need to be discussed and agreed on;
- there is a risk that some of the 6 countries, who had initially made a commitment to work with ETF on the competitiveness issue, might no longer continue with the project, because FRISCO is no longer part of it.

At the beginning of 2010 the project was completed reformulated with new specific objectives and results and a strong emphasis on the Countries. The main activities were (PIP 2010):

- Armenia: The project methodology was tested in Armenia in 2009. In 2010 the research will be further extended to 2 regions and results presented in 2 workshops at the local level.
- Ukraine: Data collection and interviews will be finalised and a report will be drawn up. Together with the modules tested in Armenia, this will form the basis for the workshop on competitiveness and education, which will be held in Kiev on 3-4 March 2010.
- Egypt: the national workshop on competitiveness and education will be held in Cairo on 23 February 2010, in collaboration with the Egyptian National Competitiveness Council (ENCC).
- Others:
  - Comparing EU and partner countries’ expertise and experience, by an analysis of the interconnection between economic policies and education policies in selected European Union countries (3 to 5), and comparison with respective policies in Armenia, Ukraine and Egypt;
  - Dissemination strategy: A small conclusive workshop on competitiveness and education will take place in Turin on 8 November 2010. The workshop will gather together experts from the partner countries and the EU, to draw lessons from respective experiences.
  - Wrap-up of innovation and learning and lessons for the future: The ETF team will draw preliminary project findings by end-June (Q2). A comprehensive summary of lessons learned will be completed by the end of 2010, along with concrete indications for further areas of work in the domain of education and training for competitiveness. (PIP 2010)

By looking at the activities reported in the Q5 and Q6 reports, its seem that most of them have been carried out, in spite of some delays in Egypt and Ukraine due to unexpected events (for example, the pandemic flu in Ukraine).

The report (Q5) highlights the importance of guaranteeing the stability and continuity of resources:

There is a risk of low visibility of the project results and of reduced consolidation of innovation and learning from this project, if proper resources are not re-allocated for its implementation. The cut of Title 3 allocation was operated in February 2010 (20.000 EUR less out of 80.000 EUR); the recruitment for a new staff member with competence on skills for enterprises, supposed to become part of the ILP COMP project too, is not launched yet.

Risk Analysis
A risk is linked to a possible negative event that can cause the project (or part of it) to fail. Some external conditions defined as risks, such as “Lack of internal capacity in the ETF to fully implement this plan” and “Partner countries’ situations in terms of economic development and education policies differ too much from each other in order to create a coherent picture of competitiveness”, should be considered normal project characteristics. The first definition of a risk is a precondition for starting a project, while, in the second, the difference between countries is an obvious condition of context. On the contrary “The FRISCO turns out to be too complicated to be implemented in Partner countries” is a real risk, correctly described.

Conclusions
Despite the undoubted complexity inherent in managing this project, due to the fragmentation of purposes and the number of contexts involved, overall, the implementation timescales seem to be met. The reduction of funds and the delays in the recruitment of experts have had an impact on management and reduced its efficiency. In fact, the project strategies (objectives, results, activities) are set-up according to the resources (internal coherence), and any change which takes place affects the quality of the whole.

The project has shown to be flexible and adaptable, and the team has proven to be capable of coping with and managing unexpected situations.

Probably an insufficient analysis of risks and contingencies contributed to increasing the difficulties and workload. For instance, the difficulties to implement the FRISCO component, although identified as a risk, have been underestimated.

Recommendation
The main recommendation is to ensure the stability of the project team, limiting the mobility and maintaining the internal consistency of the initial project resources.

Some of the difficulties could be predicted through a more thorough analysis of risks and conditions of success.

4.5.4. Effectiveness
The evaluation of effectiveness is complex due to the considerable fragmentation of purposes and results. Furthermore, while there is a good amount of data on project activities, information on the extent to which the objective has been achieved - the changes that occurred in partner countries and the degree of ETF expertise enhancement - is quite scarce.

The most significant “Sources of verification” are the Quarterly Progress Reports and Research Papers.

Logical Framework 2008 – 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific objective(s)</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved conceptual understanding of economic competitiveness. Increased use of available statistics and indexes for policy development. Better forecasting of future skills needs in competitive knowledge economies</td>
<td>number of references to competitiveness in education policy and strategy documents level of use of available competitiveness statistics from IMD, WEF, EU and WB databases number of forecasts of skills needs that are based on analytically explained methodology</td>
<td>Mission reports and Quarterly Progress Reports Interviews Discussions in technical meetings Research papers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SO 1  The indicator, “Number of references to competitiveness in education policy and strategy documents”, is too generic (it is unclear which references are referred to) in spite of its quantitative nature.

According to the 2009 Q4, it can be taken as a proxy indicator that the large volume of activities and opportunities for discussion and reflection might have contributed to the improvement of the concept of economic competitiveness, i.e. the technical meeting at the ETF on 15-16 January gathered experts from Morocco, Armenia, Croatia, Ukraine, Egypt, and Russia. “The meeting was very successful and the occasion for discussing the Global Economic Competitiveness Index, ways of building scenarios for predicting the future (Basic principles of Education Intelligent System), and what it is in education that fosters competitiveness. National landscapes of economic competitiveness were also presented.”

Some articles (“Pedagogy of Economic Competitiveness and Sustainable Development” and “Creativity and innovation through lifelong learning”) have been published in the “Journal of Lifelong Learning in Europe.” Moreover, several presentations have been made by project team members in seminars held by the EC.

SO2  The information on the indicator “Level of use of available competitiveness statistics from IMD, WEF, EU and WB databases” is insufficient. In the 2008 Q8 a series of activities are given as a simulation, in particular with the WEF, from which the level of achieved skills is yet to be verified.

SO3  The activity has been suspended.

Results 2008/2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Source of verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1: Three articles, six podcasts and one monograph published</td>
<td>Professional status of journals</td>
<td>referee comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2: Descriptive manual to use available economic and human capital statistics and indexes</td>
<td>Dissemination of manual on use of statistics</td>
<td>Editorial Board reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3: Education Intelligence System</td>
<td>Feedback from pilot users of the EIS</td>
<td>Peer reviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sufficient information has not been gathered from the three cited sources of verification: “referee comments; Editorial Board reviews and Peer reviews”. During this period, publications (articles and podcasts) have been produced.

Logical Framework 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific objective(s)</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1: connection between education and training policies, and economic growth and competitiveness analysed;</td>
<td>• the knowledge base generated by the project is solid enough to contribute to the work programme of the ETF and its expert collaboration with the European Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: knowledge base of ETF strengthened, in relation to education reforms that aim at enhancing competitiveness, and the way in which ETF can best support the competitiveness agenda explored, as spelled out in the EU 2020 strategy, in the context of the partner countries;</td>
<td>• number of references to competitiveness in education policy and strategy documents of the participating countries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: tools produced to help people deepen their knowledge and understanding of how education policies can contribute to sustainable economic growth and competitiveness.</td>
<td>• feedback from stakeholders during technical meetings, field trials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OS1 The formulation of the objective and the indicator, “The knowledge base generated by the project is solid enough ...” (when is knowledge is “solid enough” ?), are generic and not easily valuable. Furthermore, there is no information on the indicator: “Number of references to competitiveness in education policy and strategy documents of the participating countries”.

OS2 There is a lack of data on the “feedback from ETF experts during in-house meetings” indicator.

OS3 There is, therefore, no sufficient information on the indicator, “feedback from stakeholders during technical meetings, field trials”.

Results 2010
Even if the majority of indicators are properly formulated, relevant information is missing or incomplete in the available documentation. Most of the sources of verification are not available. Furthermore, only few data are available (e.g. number of external presentations made), while the other data are inaccurate or are not yet accessible (e.g. feedback from field trials; number of in-house meetings held; feedback from participants in workshops, etc.).

R 1.1 - 1.2 – 1.3 The formulation is generic (e.g. “Improved Conceptual Understanding Of Economic Competitiveness In Europe” (!) The wording “Better Understanding …” implies the knowledge, at least descriptive, of the baseline data and above all more details on the behaviour of stakeholders. There is no further elaboration on the comparison between “EU and partners countries’ expertise and experience”.

R2.1, 2.2. - 2.3 Some of these results seem to have been achieved (e.g. R 2.1 Professional/scientific articles published on link between education and competitiveness), while for 2.3, “Recommendations to ETF for future WPs developed”, we must wait for the project to end;

R3.1 - 3.2 - 3.3 According to the available data, this result seems to have been achieved. “An overall scheme for national seminar on education and economic competitiveness” and the “Analytical instruments (survey design)” have been developed.

From Q6 2010, we know that in Egypt and Ukraine seminars were held for the presentation and discussion of competitiveness, with a high number of participants and an active presence of international institutions and the government.

Egypt: The national seminar “Education, Training and Competitiveness: International Experiences and Local Realities” was organized in cooperation with the Egyptian National Competitiveness Council (ENCC). It hosted around 100 participants including Government representatives, donor agencies, academics, entrepreneurs, media representatives and others. The Egyptian Minister of Higher Education was present and participated in the discussions, which were enthusiastic and allowed a multifaceted vision of the topic.”

Ukraine: “The national seminar was held at the University Scientific Council Meeting hall in Kyivin cooperation with the Ukrainian Competitiveness Council (UCC). Around 70 people among university representatives, policy-makers, business leaders and researchers participated and the discussions were very lively”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources of verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Improved Conceptual Understanding Of Economic Competitiveness In Europe; 1.2 Better Understanding Of the Factors That Are Relevant For Competitiveness In Partner Countries; 1.3 EU and partner countries’ expertise and experience compared.</td>
<td>- number of interviewed specialists - number of technical meetings held - number of external presentations made - number of visits to professional institutions - feedback from field trials - number of in-house meetings held - number of professional/scientific articles published - professional status of journals - number of and feedback from participants in workshops in Egypt, Armenia and Ukraine - number of and feedback from participants in conclusive workshop in Turin</td>
<td>- Reports on data collection in the partner countries - Report on experiences on competitiveness and education in the EU - Referee comments - Editorial Board reviews - Peer reviews - List of participants of events - Mission reports and Quarterly Progress Reports - ETF Policy Brief</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Conclusions**

The evaluability of effectiveness is reduced by at least three major causes: i) the generic formulation of objectives and results; ii) absence of complete and structured data on quantitative and qualitative indicators; and iii) high fragmentation of the objectives and results.

Even if it is necessary to wait for the conclusion of the project to evaluate the degree of achievement of the purposes, so far, the project’s main positive effects have been the increase in knowledge of the ETF/ILP staff on competitiveness issues and of the representative of stakeholders directly involved in the projects activities.

The strategic elements on the production of tools, purpose three and the three related results, can be considered achieved: 3.1 an overall scheme for national seminar developed; 3.2 Analytical instruments (survey design) developed; and 3.3 Indications formulated for the future in respective countries.

**Recommendations**

- Decrease the number of specific objectives to one (no more than two if the project is well structured around two components).
- A more detailed definition of the objectives and results that should include the targets or describe the final condition against which to make the evaluation.
- Use of valuable indicators (quantitative and qualitative) for the collection of data and relevant information.
- It is also suggested to give more attention to significant data collection both in relation to the proposed indicators and, more generally, to the changes that the project has introduced (or is introducing) even if unexpected and not described by the objectives and results of the project.

**Sustainability**

Since the project is still in progress, only predictions on sustainability are possible.

The project does not mention specific activities aimed at sustainable conditions, a criterion that does not appear in the three “2006 Guidelines”. In regards to the relations with the partner countries, there is no mention of capacity building, nor any information on the inclusion of Competitiveness project results in government budgets and means and procedures which could allow the continuity of benefits.

It should be noted that capacity building support to partner countries is one of the functions of the ETF (F2).

In relation to continuity of actions within the ETF no specific resources or activities are specified.

**Conclusions**

Sustainability has not been considered a criterion in the project guidelines; hence resources to ensure the continuity of benefits of the ILPs in Partner countries have not been included in the project’s plans.

There are no capacity / institutional building actions to ease the adoption of the project proposals by the local institutions.

It is observed that capacity is one of the functions (F2) in the framework of the ETF mission and that it is explicitly mentioned in the Turin Process strategy.

However, the intense activities and the relations with stakeholders have already established several conditions for sustainability in the countries, such as:

- a) correspondence between local needs and policies with projects objectives;
- b) the consensus of local institutions and social stakeholders;
c) good participation of stakeholders and social partners at the project activities.

The main problems for sustainability are:

d) low level of capacity building of local institutional and social stakeholders;

f) transient nature of local organizational structures, set up under ILPs only for project activities.

**Recommendations**

Sustainability depends on a number of institutional, political, social, economic, technical and technological factors. For this reason, the measures suggested for the other criteria, such as relevance, effectiveness and impact, will contribute to the improvement of sustainability.

Taking into account the ETF functions and the objectives of the Turin process, the main recommendation is to enhance local capacities to continue the competitiveness analysis and to apply the tools provided by the project, through specific and capacity building activities. For example:

- Capacity building actions should be foreseen in a project agreement with the local partner, in order to integrate the actions with ongoing training activities (i.e. in the learning lifelong approach), to identify more relevant strategies and topics in relation to local needs, and to permanently qualify local training offers.

- Capacity building should include the enhancement of human resources skills in the whole process of competitiveness analysis and understanding, through different and integrated strategies, such as technical assistance, study visits in Italy, local seminars and meetings with ILP experts, and thematic web forums at national and regional levels in specific websites.

**4.5.6. Coherence And Complementarity**

Even if references to European policies are not always explicit, the project is linked to the European experiences in the sector. “This ILP focuses on countries covered by the Pre-Accession and Neighbourhood Instruments. This project also contributes to the activities in European Year of Creativity and Innovation in 2009” (PIP 2009).

Mainly during the preliminary stage, the project is coherent with its research nature “emphasises learning from ongoing efforts in and out of ETF to understand the nature of competitiveness by establishing partnerships with key institutions and individuals in this field” (PIP 2009).

The partnership is broad and well, i.e. it includes the World Economic Forum, International Institute for Management Development, European Commission, CEDEFOP (SkillsNet), World Bank and OECD. Furthermore there are “links with the businesses in Turin (such as Fiat Group) in order to broaden views on competitiveness in local enterprises.”

The synergy with other ILPs is relevant, for “it will take stock of National Qualifications Framework project, Key Competencies project and Entrepreneurial Learning project in order to ensure internal synergy in HRD strategic work in the ETF” (PIP 2009).

There is no complete analysis of activities carried out by other donors on the VET and LM in Partner Countries in order to develop possible complementarities.

**4.5.7. European Added Value**

This criterion was not included in the ILP Guidelines, so it was not specifically addressed by the team in the project design and implementation.

There is no complete analysis of the presence of European programs in the VET and LM sectors managed by Member Countries and by EC Delegations, nor on possible coordinating or harmonizing functions carried out by them in the same areas.
At the European level, the preeminent role held by ETF seems confirmed, i.e. from Q6 2010 we know that “There is manifest interest on the part of business communities to tackle competitiveness also on the side of human capital. They are not always equipped to elaborate adequate policy messages to the governmental authorities; hence ETF is perceived as useful in making the bridge and facilitating dialogue between the two sides”.

**Conclusions**

The European added value is not been explicitly stated in the ILP Guidelines. This has not allowed for a detailed analysis in the individual Partner Countries of the presence of competitiveness in the interventions of the Commission and the Member Countries to support their actions.

In general, the absence of an analysis of the competitiveness programs (or similar programs) on behalf of the European Countries and the Commission in the Partner Countries, has not allowed an elaboration of a specific strategy to support them, through the ILP results.

Nevertheless, the European origin of the ILP proposals is clearly understood by the Partner Countries’ stakeholders, which seem to have appreciated the high quality of the proposals.

In regards to the dissemination in Europe, the experiences and partial project results have been disseminated through a remarkable activity of seminars and meetings, which have certainly highlighted ETF’s role as an avant-garde institution in the VET and LM politics.

**Project documentation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNING</th>
<th>REPORTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National report Ukr_EN</td>
<td>Kalous_Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC ILP PIP 2010_FINAL</td>
<td>Annex 2 Outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC ILP PIP 2008 FINAL</td>
<td>Project reporting Q6_revised by CIH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex 1 Logical framework ILP0901</td>
<td>Q4 comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex 1 Logical framework ILP0801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitiveness budget 2009</td>
<td>Perception Survey Egypt_final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETC ILP PIP 2009 FINAL</td>
<td>EFT final report_final (Egypt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTRIES REPORTS AND OTHER MATERIAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schooling (in EN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity and Innovation through LLL (in EN)_edited</td>
<td>ToRs international expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine Competitiveness Box 2009</td>
<td>ToRs local expert_TVET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine Competitiveness Report 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>