



**Independent Evaluation of the
Multi-stakeholder Programme for Productive and Decent Work for Youth
in the Mano River Union (MRU)**
(TF/RAF/08/025/A25/B25/C25/D25)

Final Report

Contents

- Executive summary 1
- Résumé analytique 7
- 1. Background 16
- 2. Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation 17
- 3. Methodology..... 18
- 4. Findings 19
 - 4.1 Programme Design..... 19
 - 4.2 Relevance 22
 - 4.3 Programme progress and effectiveness 22
 - 4.3.1 Component 1a - Promotion and development of youth-led businesses and social projects (UNIDO and ILO)..... 23
 - 4.3.2 Component 1b: Financial scheme for youth-led projects (YEN and UNIDO)..... 26
 - 4.3.3 Component 2a: Development of Youth Employable Skills in Cooperation with Private Sector Companies (UNIDO)..... 28
 - 4.3.4 Component 2b: Training and Skills Development to increase employability of youths (ILO)..... 28
 - 4.3.5 Component 3: Sub-regional Labour Market Intermediation (Employment Services) and Information Services (ILO) 29
 - 4.3.6 Component 4: Sub-regional youth forum, experience shared, and programme management (UNIDO) 30
- 5. Management arrangements and efficiency..... 32
 - 5.1 Administration 32
 - 5.2 Delivering as One 33
 - 5.3 Resource use 33
 - 5.4 Monitoring and evaluation 34
- 6. Ownership and sustainability..... 35
- 7. Conclusions 36
 - 7.1 Lessons learnt 38
- 8. Recommendations 41

- ANNEX 1 – Terms of Reference
- ANNEX 2 – Persons Met
- ANNEX 3 – Additional Evaluation Questions
- ANNEX 4 – YEN Grant Scheme

Abbreviations and acronyms

3AE	Agence Autonome d'Assistance intégrée aux Entreprises
AGEFOP	Agence Nationale de la Formation Professionnelle
AGEROUTE	Agence de Gestion des Routes
AGUIPE	Agence Guinéenne pour la Promotion de l'Emploi
AO	Area Office (ILO)
AU	African Union
BDS	Business Development Services
CBO	Community-based Organization
CCI	Chambre de Commerce et d'Industrie
CIFIJEC	Club Ivoirien des Fonds d'Insertion des Jeunes Entrepreneurs de la CONFEJES
CPC	Community Production Centre
CTA	Chief Technical Adviser
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
FDFP	Fonds de Développement de la Formation Professionnelle
FNS	Fonds National de Solidarité
FONIJ	Fonds National pour l'Insertion des Jeunes
HLP	High-Level Panel on System-Wide Coherence
HQ	Headquarters
ICT	Information and Communication Technologies
ILO	International Labour Organization
LAF	Les Amis du Futur
LEAP	Liberia Employment Action Program
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MFI	Micro Finance Institution
MOD	Miscellaneous Obligation Document
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MRU	Mano River Union
MSE	Micro- and Small Enterprises
NGO	Non-governmental organization
UNMIL	United Nations Mission in Liberia
PFS	Plate Forme de Services
PRODIGE	Programme des Initiatives Génératrices d'Emplois
RC	Resident Coordinator
RO	Regional Office (ILO)
SIYB	Start and Improve Your Business
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers
UN	United Nations
UNCDF	UN Capital Development Fund
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNMIL	UN Mission in Liberia
UNPBF	UN Peace-Building Fund
USD	United States Dollar
YEN	Youth Employment Network
YEP	Youth Employment Programme (Guinea)
YES	Youth Employment Scheme (Sierra Leone)
YETO	Youth Employment Technical Officer

Executive summary

In February 2007, national leaders from several West African states met in Accra, Ghana, to discuss the problems related to the high levels of youth unemployment in the sub-region. The meeting gave rise to the present programme on development of Productive and Decent Work for Youth in the Mano River Union (MRU) countries (Sierra Leone, Liberia, Guinea and Côte d'Ivoire). The programme was designed in 2007, and it was decided that it would be hosted by the MRU Secretariat and implemented jointly by UNIDO, ILO and the Youth Employment Network (YEN) Secretariat.

The development objective of the programme was: 'Creating opportunities for decent and productive work for under- and unemployed youth in the MRU countries, thereby contributing to social, political and economic stability in the sub-region'.

The Immediate Objectives/Outcomes of the programme were the following:

- Under- and unemployed youth, particularly marginalized poor urban youth, are engaged in productive and decent work (employed and self-employed, in the formal and informal sector).
- Youth take the lead in the creation of opportunities for productive and decent work.
- Improved or more services delivered by institutions involved in youth employment.
- Increased employability of youth in highly-demanded areas in trans-national companies (TNCs) and private companies.

Implementation started in March 2008 although no funding had been identified beyond the USD five million granted by the Government of Japan for the first year. When preparations took longer than expected, the donor accepted an extension until end 2009. At this moment ILO halted its activities, while UNIDO was granted another extension until the end of June 2010.

The MRU programme was jointly evaluated by UNIDO and ILO who contracted Mr. Erik Lyby and Mr. Mohamadou Sy as independent evaluators. This report presents the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation mission conducted in June/July 2010.

FINDINGS

The evaluation team finds the programme to be highly relevant to the challenges faced by the MRU countries with regard to the very high and visible levels of youth un- and underemployment. The programme is in line with government policies, UN priorities, and links up with other activities in which the UN agencies are involved in the countries. It addresses both issues of poverty reduction and social development, as well as political stability and security in the longer term.

The programme was designed with a total budget of USD 21.5 million for four years, and started on the basis of a Plan of Action for the first year with a budget of USD 5 million, although no funding beyond the first year had been identified. The risk of not being able to secure more funds was not addressed in the programme design. The implementation modalities were to be based on the *Delivering as One* concept, but were not detailed in the programme document. In practice, the activities were divided into components during the joint exploratory and planning missions, and assigned to the agencies in accordance with their respective areas of expertise. The programme consists of the following components:

1. Development of self-employing businesses
 - a. Youth entrepreneurship promotion (UNIDO and ILO)
 - b. Funding facility for youth-led projects (YEN and UNIDO)
2. Development of youth employability
 - a. Partnerships with the private sector for youth employability (UNIDO)
 - b. Training and skills development to increase employability of youth (ILO)
3. Sub-regional Labour Market Information System (ILO)
4. Sub-regional youth forum, experience sharing, and programme management (UNIDO).

Effectiveness

Given the short duration of the activities, the effectiveness in terms of a stronger engagement of under- and unemployed youth, particularly marginalized poor urban youth in productive and decent work, in the formal and informal sector is still limited. The extent to which outcomes could be achieved varies between the countries due to social, economic and historical differences. Overall, conditions in Côte d'Ivoire were more favourable than those in the other three countries.

In component 1a, the border areas between Sierra Leone, Liberia and Guinea were selected for direct intervention in skills training for youths by existing entrepreneurs. The chosen modality was "supported apprenticeship" by which the entrepreneur/trainer would receive some needed equipment as well as training materials, against his/her acceptance of taking in a group of (in most cases around 15) trainees for a specified period of time. The trainers were given study tours to get exposure to new approaches within their trades. Around 2,600 youths received training, mostly in traditional trades such as tailoring, tie-and-dye, hairdressing, carpentry, etc. The border areas being remote and hard to access became a logistical challenge, especially with regard to procurement. Much equipment and training materials came with delays, while others never turned up due to the funding becoming exhausted. This led to frustration among trainers and trainees.

In component 1b, a competitive grant scheme by YEN, supported technically by UNIDO, awarded 15 grants to youth organisations across the MRU for innovative ideas that would lead to employment. The selected projects demonstrated great diversity and comprised inter alia production of building materials and construction, bee keeping, fish drying, waste collection and recycling, reforestation, computer repair, etc. The YEN Grant Scheme took longer than expected for soliciting applications, the assessment of applications, and the selection of qualified applicants. However, in spite of delays the overall progress is good and the YEN grantees are effective in reaching their planned outcomes.

In component 2a, UNIDO would take steps to establish contacts with large enterprises with a view to promote jobs for youths. Contacts were made, a stakeholder forum held in Sierra Leone, but no lasting cooperation was established. In Côte d'Ivoire, some partnerships were developed and some youths trained. However, in a generally unfavourable economic environment, most of the businesses targeted by the programme were not in a position to recruit trainees. Studies were carried out on BDS provision in the countries, especially with regard to access to microfinance services for youths.

In component 2b, the ILO undertook training in Sierra Leone and Liberia using its Start-and-Improve-Your-Business (SIYB) methodology and tools. 200 youths received basic business understanding (GYBI) and 25 were taken to the trainer level and certified. Within the short implementation time, no master trainers (capable of providing ToT) could be trained and certified. ILO was also involved in

TVET reform process and national Decent Work programmes. Different other trainings were carried out, in Côte d'Ivoire in cooperation with labour-based road rehabilitation.

In component 3, ILO organised the setting up of an Employment Services Centre in the Liberian Ministry of Labour. A number of studies were carried in the other countries, but some were stopped before completion due to the ending of ILO activities by 31 December 2009.

In component 4, a virtual MRU Youth Communication Platform was created as a first of its kind, as requested in the Accra communiqué, with 600 registered users at the time of evaluation. One communication hub has been located within existing youth structures in each of the four capitals.

Efficiency

The administrative practices of the UN agencies impacted on efficient delivery and led to many delays. Hiring of project staff was not coordinated, delayed, and with short contract offers. Except for component 1b, the agencies worked in relative isolation from each other on their components. As far as resource use is concerned, UNIDO and ILO both added to the programme with their own regular budget resources, while YEN mobilised co-funding from other sources.

Ownership and sustainability

Ownership varied across the countries. Most government representatives interviewed were in favour of the programme. However, the MRU Secretariat in spite of being host to the programme did not assume any ownership over it. Local government was directly involved and taking ownership only in a few cases (Côte d'Ivoire). As most activities were still on-going, it is premature to say if they will become technically or financially sustainable. Some have potential to do so.

CONCLUSIONS

A good start has been made, but the job is not finished. Much uncertainty remains as to whether the training will result in gainful employment and decent work for rural and urban youth, especially the stated target groups of *“under- and unemployed youth, particularly marginalized poor urban youth”*.

The selection of the border areas for direct training interventions made a lot of sense, since these were the breeding grounds of rebellion and destruction, and many young people missed schooling and lack employable skills. However, the design of the programme did not limit itself to targeting this population but went out to comprise a much broader selection. The result was a complex programme with many target groups – something that added to the challenges in implementation.

The training approaches were not coordinated. The contents of the trainings were mostly designed without reference to market surveys and future trends. ILO's SIYB training was delivered by competent consultants. However, the SIYB cycle is relatively long and it was not possible to train up to the master trainer level in one year. Without certified master trainers to carry out ToT, the replication of the SIYB tools will be limited. Surprisingly, SIYB was only used in the ILO components.

The use of existing Micro- and Small Enterprises (MSE) entrepreneurs as trainers in component 1a in a real business environment helps ensure that the training will be relevant to local markets. However, it is not clear that it will lead to (self-) employment of the trainees, as this will also depend on the continued market demand and their access to financial services. The short training of these

trainers was insufficient for them to impart on their trainees the necessary skills to become business people. For the results to become sustainable, more support to the trainers is needed, especially through coaching in the fields of business understanding and microfinance.

The trades selected for training are conventional and widespread in the rural areas, and competition within them is already high. In spite of the border areas having high agricultural potential, very little training is done in agriculture-related fields such as improved food processing and providing services for agricultural production.

The YEN grant scheme is intended to allow national/local community-based youth organizations to actively participate in employment generating projects, especially innovative ones. The majority of projects funded under the Grant Scheme are indeed quite innovative.

The Communication Platform represents a new approach that is being tested in the four countries. It has generated considerable interest and support from the youths as well as from governments. If promoted widely, it has the potential to become an important means of communication between the youths themselves and other main stakeholders with interest in youth employment.

Decent Work principles were emphasised in some components but less so in others. The concept is integrated in most ILO training programmes. Some workshops in the border areas were well-organised with adequate measures for occupational safety, but there were also cases without such measures, where the workshop presented a real hazard to the trainees. More emphasis should be placed on this area. The conditions under which the programme staff were hired clearly fell outside of what could be called decent work due to short and precarious contracts with gaps in between.

Basic funding principles, such as the possible distortion of the market for micro-finance through the use of grants for commercial activities, or compromising ownership through training for free or even with a stipend to the trainees, became subject to much debate among programme managers. However, no common philosophy or policy on these questions was arrived at. The Evaluation Team considers the differences in approaches applied in the MRU programme as flexible adaptations to local conditions – unproblematic in the given contexts.

The ownership by stakeholders varies. While the MRU Secretariat did not feel ownership, the support in principle from other stakeholders was quite strong. What is needed is a much stronger direct involvement of them in the programme. This should be taken very seriously in the event of a new phase being conceived.

The programme was not Delivered as One, and a number of potential synergies were missed – the development and joint use of ILO's SIYB programme especially represents a missed opportunity. A national coordinator was appointed in each country, and a regional coordinator to oversee the overall programme. However, these staff came into place at a late point in time and did not have the opportunity to participate in the hiring of field staff. Regular programme meetings at country level, bringing all the components together, were not held; instead programme staff tended to refer and report vertically within their own system rather than horizontally.

Monitoring and evaluation were given insufficient attention under the programme, probably one of the consequences of the extreme implementation pressure. Only YEN included a systematic impact assessment under its component. The programme-wide monitoring and evaluation under component 4 did not materialize. Project funds for an independent evaluation were not retained.

The conditions on the funding – to produce results in a very short time – proved a real constraint, and UNIDO had to be granted an extension. The administrative bureaucracy further led to extensive delays and costly waste of time that should have been spent on substantive issues instead. The agencies' reputation came under stress as a consequence – frustration was expressed in the case of ILO over an abrupt closure, while UNIDO was criticized for not being able to deliver the full support.

LESSONS LEARNED

The programme became overly complex and difficult to manage, due to high geographical and linguistic diversity, with three implementing partners addressing too many different target groups. An important lesson is that the use of short-term emergency funding for medium-term income creation activities entails considerable risk and should be avoided. Otherwise, efficiency may be compromised by excessive spending pressure and important tasks may not be completed. In general, short-term funding should only be accepted if supplemented by:

- Planning of a quick-impact programme that can be implemented within the fixed time frame, *in casu* one year, with the available funding. All procurement (including vehicles, IT equipment etc.) should be local in order to save time and rapidly become operational. Local service providers already in place should be drawn upon as much as feasible.
- Revising the overall programme into phase 1 and phase 2, with the longer-term institutional capacity building objectives being limited to phase 2.
- Immediately designing and embarking on a joint fund-raising campaign for phase 2. All the stakeholders should participate actively in the campaign.

The formulation of a joint work programme limited to the Japanese grant, with activities tailored to what was realistic and feasible within the prescribed (very short) time, and with a clear exit strategy in case no further funding would become available in time for a smooth continuation, should have been prepared jointly by the partner agencies. This would have been helpful to manage expectations better, and avoid disappointments.

The selection of the border areas was justified but also presented logistical challenges. Procurement of building materials, equipment and training materials to a variety of small businesses in remote areas, under complicated procurement procedures, took up too much of the field staff's time. A lesson to learn is to avoid turning programme staff into procurement officers, but rather outsource the function to a professional procurement agent with experience on the local scene.

The “Delivering as One” approach forms an important part of the UN reform process and is indispensable for the UN system to continue its relevance in international development cooperation. It focuses on coordination of the UN agencies at country level. There are four “Ones” at country level: One Programme; One Budgetary Framework and Fund; One Leader; and One Office. The MRU Programme does not follow these principles – it became Receiving as One and Delivering as Many. The full-scale “Delivering as One” approach must inspire any follow-up MRU programme, by bringing the three Ones together in a new cooperation framework, with special emphasis on One Leader. In the present case, the intention to Deliver as One should have been followed up at a higher management level in the involved agencies, with clearer lines of reporting and delegation of authority and better control.

MAIN RECOMMENDATIONS

Scenario 1 – one-year perspective (exit strategy)

1. As a matter of urgency UNIDO should secure the necessary funding to allow for an honourable completion of unfinished activities. As lead agency, UNIDO should consult with ILO and YEN and prepare a planning document with a clear exit strategy and a contingency plan for the handing over of physical assets to the partner organisations.

Scenario 2 – four-year perspective

2. The MRU Secretariat should convene the partners for the redesign of the programme and the formulation of a joint fundraising strategy that should be effectively owned and driven by the Secretariat.
3. The redesigned approach of a future programme should identify new and innovative sectors and technologies that can generate jobs; re-focus on marginalised urban youths as it was intended in the initial design; promote SIYB as the main business training tool in the programme and negotiate with MFIs innovative solutions for better access to micro-finance.
4. The coordination mechanisms of a future programme should be improved and aligned with the Delivering as One principles. These principles should be considered as preconditions for the joint approach to succeed; in case one or more of the participating agencies is not willing or able to adhere to them, it may be better for it to opt out.
5. The agencies (especially UNIDO) should review their financial rules and procurement procedures with a view to decentralise and enable efficient and timely delivery of operational activities at the country level.

Résumé analytique

En février 2007, les dirigeants nationaux de divers Etats ouest-africains se sont réunis à Accra, Ghana, pour discuter des problèmes liés aux taux de chômage élevés des jeunes dans cette sous-région. Cette réunion a débouché sur le présent programme de Promotion de l'Emploi productif et du Travail décent pour les jeunes dans les pays de l'Union du fleuve Mano (UFM) (Sierra Leone, Libéria, Guinée et Côte d'Ivoire). Ce programme a été élaboré en 2007. Il avait alors été décidé que le programme serait placé sous tutelle de l'UFM et mis en œuvre de façon conjointe par l'Organisation pour le développement industriel des Nations Unies (ONUDI), le Bureau International du Travail (BIT) et le Secrétariat du Réseau pour l'emploi des jeunes (YEN).

L'Objectif de développement du programme est de « *Créer des opportunités d'emploi productif et de travail décent pour les jeunes sous-employés et au chômage dans les pays de l'UFM, contribuant ainsi à la stabilité sociale, politique et économique de la sous-région* ».

Les résultats immédiats envisagés par le programme étaient les suivants :

- Occuper les jeunes sous-employés ou au chômage, en particulier les jeunes citadins pauvres et marginalisés, à un travail productif et décent (employés et travailleurs indépendants, dans les secteurs formel et informel).
- Inciter les jeunes à prendre des initiatives afin de créer des opportunités de travail productif et décent.
- Aider à ce que les institutions impliquées dans la promotion de l'emploi des jeunes fournissent des services de meilleure qualité ou plus nombreux.
- Augmenter l'employabilité des jeunes par les entreprises transnationales (TNC) et privées dans les domaines à forte demande.

La mise en place du programme a débuté en mars 2008, alors qu'aucun financement n'avait pu être identifié au-delà des cinq millions de dollars (USD) accordés par le gouvernement japonais pour la première année. Les préparatifs prenant plus de temps que prévu, le donateur avait accepté une extension jusqu'à fin 2009. À ce moment-là, le BIT dut cesser ses activités pendant que l'ONUDI bénéficiait d'une extension supplémentaire jusqu'à fin juin 2010.

Le programme de l'UFM a été évalué conjointement par l'ONUDI et le BIT, qui ont engagé MM. Erik Lyby et Mohamadou Sy comme évaluateurs indépendants. Ce rapport présente les constats, conclusions et recommandations de cette mission d'évaluation, effectuée en juin/juillet 2010.

CONSTATS

L'équipe d'évaluation considère le programme comme étant très pertinent pour répondre aux défis rencontrés par les pays de l'UFM au sujet des taux très élevés et apparents de chômage et de sous-emplois des jeunes. Le programme s'aligne sur les politiques des états concernés, sur les priorités de l'Organisation des Nations Unies (ONU), et fait le lien avec les autres activités menées par les agences de l'ONU dans ces pays. Il vise à la fois les problématiques de la réduction de la pauvreté et du développement social, et, à plus long-terme, la stabilité politique et la sécurité.

Le programme a été conçu pour un budget total de 21,5 millions USD pour quatre ans. Il a été lancé sur la base d'un Plan d'action pour la première année, comprenant un budget de 5 millions USD,

alors qu'aucun financement au-delà de ce montant n'avait pu être identifié. Le risque de ne pas pouvoir obtenir plus de fonds n'avait pas été pris en compte lors de la conception du programme. Les modalités de mise en place devaient se baser sur l'initiative « Unis dans l'action » mais n'avaient pas été détaillées dans le document de programme. En pratique, les activités ont été divisées en composantes lors des missions jointes d'exploration et de planification, puis assignées aux agences selon leurs domaines de compétence respectifs. Le programme comprend les composantes suivantes :

1. Développement d'entrepreneuriat et de l'auto-emploi
 - a. Promotion de l'entrepreneuriat parmi les jeunes (ONUDI et BIT)
 - b. Mécanisme de fonds pour des initiatives conduites par des jeunes (YEN et ONUDI)
2. Développement de l'employabilité des jeunes
 - a. Partenariats avec le secteur privé pour l'employabilité des jeunes (ONUDI)
 - b. Formation et développement des compétences pour accroître l'employabilité des jeunes (BIT)
3. Système d'information sous-régional du marché du travail (BIT)
4. Forum sous-régional pour les jeunes, partage d'expérience et gestion du programme (ONUDI).

Efficacité

Compte tenu de la courte durée des activités, l'efficacité du programme reste limitée en ce qui concerne l'objectif d'augmenter les opportunités de travail productif et décent dans les secteurs formel et informel pour les jeunes sous-employés et au chômage (et en particulier les jeunes citadins pauvres). La mesure dans laquelle des résultats pourraient être obtenus ultérieurement varie selon les pays, en raison des différences d'ordres social, économique et historique. Globalement, les conditions étaient plus favorables en Côte d'Ivoire que dans les trois autres pays.

Dans la composante 1a, les zones frontalières entre la Sierra Leone, le Libéria et la Guinée avaient été sélectionnées pour mettre en place des interventions directes : des formations, dispensées par des entrepreneurs existants, pour développer les compétences des jeunes. Pour ces interventions, l'« apprentissage soutenu » avait été retenu comme modalité : l'entrepreneur/formateur recevrait de l'équipement utile, ainsi que du matériel de formation, et consentirait en contrepartie à prendre en charge un groupe d'apprentis (d'environ 15 personnes dans la plupart des cas) pour une période donnée. Les formateurs bénéficiaient de voyages d'études afin d'être exposés à de nouvelles approches au sein de leurs métiers. Environ 2600 jeunes ont reçu une formation, la plupart du temps dans des métiers traditionnels tels que la couture, la teinture en nouant, la coiffure, la menuiserie etc. Les zones frontalières, reculées et difficiles d'accès, sont devenues un défi logistique, surtout en termes d'approvisionnement. Une grande partie de l'équipement et du matériel de formation ont été livrés avec du retard, tandis qu'une autre partie n'a jamais été livrée en raison de l'épuisement des fonds, tout ceci conduisant à la frustration des formateurs et des apprentis.

Dans la composante 1b, un mécanisme compétitif de mise à disposition de fonds lancé par le YEN, et soutenu techniquement par l'ONUDI, a accordé des fonds à 15 organisations de jeunes à travers l'UFM pour soutenir des idées innovantes censées mener à la création d'emplois. Les projets sélectionnés étaient d'une grande diversité et comprenaient *inter alia* la production de matériaux de construction et la construction même, l'élevage d'abeilles, le séchage de poisson, la collecte de déchets et le recyclage, la reforestation, la création artistique par ordinateur, etc. Le mécanisme

compétitif de mise à disposition de fonds du YEN a mis plus de temps que prévu pour solliciter des candidatures, les évaluer et sélectionner des candidats qualifiés. Cependant, malgré les retards, les progrès ont été globalement positifs et les boursiers du YEN sont efficaces dans l'obtention des résultats qu'ils avaient prévus.

Dans la composante 2a, l'ONUDI prévoyait d'établir le contact avec de grandes entreprises dans le but de promouvoir l'emploi pour les jeunes. Des contacts ont été établis, un forum pour les parties prenantes a été tenu en Sierra Leone, mais aucune coopération durable n'a été établie. En Côte d'Ivoire, certains partenariats ont été développés et quelques jeunes ont été formés. Cependant, en raison d'un environnement économique généralement défavorable, la plupart des entreprises ciblées par le programme n'étaient pas en mesure de recruter des apprentis. Des études ont été menées sur la mise à disposition de services pour le développement d'entreprises (Business Development Services) dans les pays de l'UFM, surtout en ce qui concerne l'accès aux services de micro-finance pour les jeunes.

Dans la composante 2b, le BIT a dispensé des formations en Sierra Leone et au Libéria à l'aide de sa méthodologie et de ses outils « Start-and-Improve-Your-Business » (SIYB). 200 jeunes ont reçu une formation du type « basic business understanding » (GYBI), afin de comprendre les bases de l'entrepreneuriat, et 25 ont atteint le niveau de formateur et ont été certifiés en tant que tels. Durant la courte période de mise en œuvre, aucun formateur-maître, capable de former des formateurs, n'a pu être formé et certifié. Le BIT est également impliqué dans le processus de réforme de la formation et de l'éducation professionnelle et des programmes nationaux de travail décent. D'autres formations diverses ont été dispensées en Côte d'Ivoire en coopération avec la remise en état des routes à l'aide de méthodes à forte intensité de main-d'œuvre.

Dans la composante 3, le BIT a organisé la mise en place d'un Centre de services pour l'emploi au sein du Ministère du Travail libérien. Un certain nombre d'études ont été menées dans les autres pays, mais certaines d'entre elles ont été interrompues de manière prématurée en raison de l'arrêt des activités du BIT prenant effet le 31 Décembre 2009.

Dans la composante 4, une plateforme virtuelle de Communication des jeunes de l'UFM, la première du genre, qui comptait 600 utilisateurs inscrits au moment de l'évaluation, a été créée comme requis dans le communiqué d'Accra. Une antenne de communication a été créée au sein des structures existantes pour les jeunes dans chacune des quatre capitales.

Efficiences

Les pratiques administratives des agences de l'ONU ont affecté l'efficacité des activités du programme et ont conduit à de nombreux retards. Le recrutement du personnel pour la gestion de projets n'a pas été coordonné, il a par conséquent été retardé et s'est fait sous forme de contrats à court-terme. Les agences de l'ONU ont travaillé sur leurs composantes de manière relativement isolée, mise à part pour la mise en place de la composante 1b. En ce qui concerne l'utilisation des ressources, l'ONUDI et le BIT ont injecté des fonds propres au programme, tandis que le YEN a mobilisé des fonds provenant d'autres sources par co-financement.

Appropriation et pérennité

L'engagement varie selon les pays. La plupart des gouvernements interrogés étaient en faveur du programme. Cependant, le Secrétariat de l'UFM, pourtant organisme de tutelle désigné, ne s'est pas approprié le programme. Les autorités locales étaient directement impliquées mais ne se sont approprié le programme que dans peu de cas (Côte d'Ivoire). Compte tenu du fait que la plupart des activités étaient encore en cours au moment de l'évaluation, il est trop tôt pour savoir si elles deviendront techniquement et financièrement pérennes. Cela dit, certaines d'entre elles en ont le potentiel.

CONCLUSIONS

Malgré un bon début du programme, le travail est loin d'être fini. De nombreux doutes subsistent quant à savoir si les formations permettront aux jeunes, et spécialement aux groupes-cible de « jeunes sous-employés et chômeurs, en particulier les jeunes citadins pauvres et marginalisés », d'accéder à un emploi rémunéré et à effectuer un travail décent.

La sélection des zones frontalières pour effectuer les interventions directes de formation était pertinente. En effet, ces régions étaient le berceau de la rébellion et de la destruction: beaucoup de jeunes n'y ont pas été scolarisés et manquent par conséquent de compétences nécessaires à l'emploi. Cependant, la conception du programme ne s'est pas limitée à cette population-cible, et a tenté d'inclure une sélection bien plus large de bénéficiaires. Par conséquent, le programme est devenu complexe, cherchant à assister de nombreux groupes-cible, ajoutant aux défis de mise en place du programme.

Les différentes approches de formation n'ont pas été coordonnées. Le contenu des formations a souvent été conçu sans référence aux études de marché et aux tendances à venir. La formation SIYB du BIT a été dispensée par des consultants compétents. Cependant, le cycle SIYB est relativement long et il n'a pas été possible de former des formateurs-maîtres en un an. Sans formateurs-maîtres la reproduction des outils SIYB sera limitée. Chose étonnante, le SIYB n'a été utilisé que dans les composantes du BIT.

Dans la composante 1a, l'utilisation, comme formateurs, d'entrepreneurs provenant de Micro et petites entreprises (MPE) existantes, et ceci dans un environnement de travail réel, a permis d'assurer la pertinence de la formation pour les marchés locaux. Cependant, il n'est pas certain qu'elle mènera à l'auto-emploi des apprentis, étant donné que cela dépendra également de la demande soutenue du marché ainsi que de leur accès à des ressources financières. La courte formation des formateurs était insuffisante pour qu'ils transmettent à leurs apprentis les compétences entrepreneuriales nécessaires. Pour que les résultats soient durables, les formateurs doivent recevoir plus de soutien, en particulier au travers d'une formation approfondie dans les domaines de compréhension des affaires et de micro-finance.

Les industries sélectionnées pour les formations sont traditionnelles et très répandues dans les zones rurales. La compétition y est déjà importante. En dépit du fort potentiel agricole des zones frontalières, très peu de formations sont dispensées dans ce domaine, notamment pour l'amélioration des procédés de transformation des aliments ou encore l'offre de services pour la production agricole.

Le Mécanisme compétitif de mise à disposition de fonds du YEN cherche à permettre à des organisations communautaires nationales ou locales de jeunes de participer activement dans des projets générateurs d'emplois, favorisant leur caractère novateur. La majorité des projets financés sous ce Mécanisme sont en effet plutôt innovants.

La Plateforme de Communication représente une nouvelle approche, actuellement testée dans les quatre pays. Elle a bénéficié d'un intérêt et d'un soutien considérables de la part des jeunes et des gouvernements. A condition de bénéficier d'une large publicité, elle pourrait devenir un moyen de communication important entre les jeunes-mêmes et les autres parties prenantes principales ayant un intérêt pour l'emploi des jeunes.

Les principes d'un Travail décent ont été mis en avant dans certaines composantes mais bien moins dans d'autres. Le concept est intégré dans la plupart des programmes de formation du BIT. Certains ateliers dans les zones frontalières ont été bien organisés, avec des mesures adéquates pour assurer la sécurité au travail. Dans d'autres cas cependant, ces mesures étaient absentes et les conditions de travail représentaient un réel risque pour les apprentis. Les programmes devraient insister davantage sur cet aspect à l'avenir. Les conditions sous lesquelles les employés ont été recrutés ne sont absolument pas dignes de celles d'un travail décent, compte tenu de la courte durée et de la précarité des contrats, souvent espacés entre eux.

Des principes basiques de financement, comme les possibilités de distorsion du marché de la micro-finance par l'utilisation de fonds non récupérables à des fins commerciales, ou de compromettre l'engagement des apprentis en les formant gratuitement, voire même en leur accordant des bourses, sont devenus l'objet de grands débats au sein des gestionnaires du programme. Aucune philosophie ou politique commune n'a pu être déterminée à ce sujet. Cependant, l'équipe d'évaluation considère les différentes approches appliquées sous le programme comme des adaptations flexibles aux conditions locales, qui ne posent pas réellement problème dans les conditions observées.

L'appropriation varie selon les parties prenantes. Tandis que le Secrétariat de l'UFM ne s'est pas approprié le programme, le soutien d'autres parties prenantes a en principe été plutôt conséquent. Il est important que toutes les parties augmentent leur engagement direct dans le programme. Cet aspect devrait être pris en considération avec sérieux en cas d'élaboration d'une nouvelle phase.

Le programme n'a pas été mis en place de façon coordonnée entre les agences (selon l'initiative «Unis dans l'action» des Nations Unies), et celles-ci ont manqué l'occasion de bénéficier d'un certain nombre de synergies potentielles. En particulier, elles n'ont pas saisi l'opportunité de développer et d'utiliser conjointement le programme SIYB du BIT. Un coordonateur national a été désigné dans chaque pays, ainsi qu'un coordonateur régional pour superviser l'ensemble du programme. Or, ces employés sont entrés en fonction tardivement et n'ont pas eu la possibilité de participer au recrutement du personnel de terrain. Il n'y a pas eu de réunions régulières au niveau national réunissant toutes les composantes du programme. Au lieu de cela, les employés du programme avaient tendance à consulter et à référer de manière verticale plutôt qu'horizontale, restant cloisonnés au sein de leur propre agence.

Le suivi et l'évaluation n'ont pas reçu suffisamment d'attention sous ce programme, probablement en raison de la pression extrême de mise en œuvre. Seule la composante du YEN comprend un dispositif d'évaluation systématique de l'impact. Le suivi et l'évaluation harmonisés de l'ensemble du

programme n'ont pas pris forme sous la composante 4. Les fonds de projet nécessaires pour mener l'évaluation indépendante n'ont pas été réservés.

Les conditions sous lesquelles le financement avait été accordé, et selon lesquelles il fallait produire des résultats en un très court laps de temps, se sont avérées être une réelle contrainte. L'ONUDI a par conséquent eu besoin de solliciter une extension. De plus, la bureaucratie administrative a causé des retards considérables et une perte de temps onéreuse. Ce temps précieux aurait plutôt dû être consacré à des problèmes plus substantiels. La réputation des agences en a subi les conséquences négatives : la frustration s'est exprimée face à l'interruption abrupte des activités du BIT, tandis que l'ONUDI a été critiquée pour ne pas avoir été capable de mettre en place la totalité de l'assistance prévue.

ENSEIGNEMENTS

Le programme est devenu excessivement complexe et difficile à gérer en raison d'une grande diversité géographique et linguistique, et de la présence de trois agences d'exécution partenaires qui s'adressaient à trop de groupes-cible différents. Une leçon importante à tirer est qu'il est risqué de financer des activités visant le long et moyen-terme par un financement d'urgence à court-terme. Ceci devrait donc être évité à l'avenir. Autrement, la pression excessive à la dépense pourrait compromettre l'efficacité des activités. De plus, des tâches importantes risqueraient de ne pas pouvoir être menées à bien. En général, le financement à court-terme ne devrait être accepté qu'à condition d'être complété par :

- La planification d'un programme d'impact-rapide qui peut être mis en place en un laps de temps prédéterminé, *in casu* en un an, avec le financement disponible. La totalité de l'acquisition de matériel (y compris véhicules, équipement IT etc.) devrait se faire localement afin d'économiser du temps et de devenir opérationnel rapidement. Il faudrait faire appel, autant que possible, aux fournisseurs de service locaux déjà en place.
- La révision de l'ensemble du programme et sa séparation en deux phases (phase 1 et phase 2), en limitant les objectifs de développement de compétences à plus long-terme à la phase 2.
- La conception immédiate et le lancement d'une campagne commune de collecte de fonds pour la phase 2. Toutes les parties prenantes devraient participer activement à cette campagne.

Les agences partenaires auraient dû formuler conjointement un programme de travail commun, limité au budget consenti par le Japon, dans lequel les activités auraient été conçues de manière réaliste et plausible, en tenant compte du temps (très court) imparti, et qui aurait prévu une stratégie de sortie dans le cas où aucun financement supplémentaire ne serait disponible à temps pour assurer la continuité harmonieuse du programme. Un tel programme de travail aurait été utile afin de mieux gérer les attentes et d'éviter les déceptions.

La sélection des zones frontalières était justifiée mais présentait des défis logistiques. Le personnel présent sur le terrain a dû investir trop de temps pour permettre l'approvisionnement d'une quantité de petites entreprises, situées dans des zones difficiles d'accès, en matériaux de construction, en équipement et en matériel de formation, tout ceci en présence de procédures d'approvisionnement compliquées. Un enseignement à tirer est qu'il vaut mieux sous-traiter cette fonction à un agent

d'approvisionnement professionnel et expérimenté, ayant connaissance du contexte local, plutôt que d'en charger des employés du programme.

L'initiative « Unis dans l'Action » forme une part importante du processus de réforme de l'ONU et est nécessaire pour que le système de l'ONU continue à être pertinent dans le domaine de la coopération pour le développement international. Elle est centrée sur la coordination des agences de l'ONU au niveau national et repose sur quatre piliers au niveau national: Un programme unique, Un cadre budgétaire unique, Un responsable unique, et Un bureau unique. Par contre, le programme de l'UFM n'a pas respecté ces principes en virant vers « la réception unifiée des fonds et la réalisation désunie des actions ». L'initiative « Unis dans l'Action » doit être au cœur de la suite du programme de l'UFM, en rassemblant les trois agences au sein d'un nouveau cadre de coopération, et en mettant un accent particulier sur l'aspect « Un responsable unique ». Dans le cas présent, l'initiative « Unis dans l'action » aurait dû être poursuivie à un niveau plus élevé de la direction des agences impliquées, à l'aide de règles plus claires en matière de responsabilité et de délégation d'autorité, ainsi que d'un meilleur contrôle.

RECOMMANDATIONS

Scenario 1 – perspective à un an (stratégie de sortie)

1. L'ONUDI devrait chercher d'urgence à obtenir le financement nécessaire à la complétion honorable des activités inachevées. En tant que chef de file, l'ONUDI devrait consulter le BIT et le YEN afin de préparer un document de planification comprenant une stratégie de sortie claire et un plan de réserve pour la transmission de ses actifs physiques aux organisations partenaires. L'accent devrait être mis sur le fait de compléter ce qui a été débuté, surtout dans les zones frontalières: fournir le matériel de formation promis; organiser la remise de diplôme des apprentis; renforcer les compétences entrepreneuriales des formateurs; réaliser l'étude de nouveaux marchés; formuler, tester et suivre des projets d'entreprise; et mettre les apprentis en contact avec les IMF locales afin qu'ils puissent accéder à des fonds en formant des groupes. Un soutien supplémentaire à la plateforme de communication et aux centres peut être compris/inclus dans la mesure des fonds disponibles.

Scenario 2 – perspective à quatre ans

2. L'ONUDI devrait inviter le Secrétariat de l'UFM à convoquer les différents partenaires afin d'élaborer une stratégie conjointe de collecte des fonds que le Secrétariat devrait efficacement s'approprier et diriger. Avant de lancer la campagne de collecte de fonds, la conception initiale de ce programme de quatre ans devrait être examinée conjointement par toutes les parties prenantes sous la direction de l'UFM. Le document de projet devrait être révisé afin de refléter les nouvelles priorités ainsi que les enseignements tirés de la première année en termes de conception, de modalités de mise en œuvre et de gestion. Le Programme des Nations Unies pour le développement (PNUD), le Fonds d'équipement pour les Nations Unies (FENU) et le Fonds pour la consolidation de la paix devraient être invités à prendre part à cet examen et au partenariat à venir.
3. Lors de la reformulation du futur programme, les partenaires devraient prendre en considération les points suivants :

- (a) Aller plus loin que la formation et identifier des secteurs et technologies nouveaux et innovants, pouvant générer des emplois. L'agriculture et l'industrie de la pêche comptent parmi les secteurs prometteurs, dans lesquels il devrait être possible de faire le lien avec des programmes de développement en cours ou à venir, afin d'assurer que de la main-d'œuvre qualifiée est bien disponible pour les appuyer. Le secteur de l'énergie offre également des opportunités : les technologies de production d'énergie, notamment éolienne, se prêtent à la production à petite échelle
 - (b) Se recentrer sur les jeunes citadins marginalisés et sans éducation en tant que groupe-cible important, comme prévu lors de la conception initiale.
 - (c) Promouvoir le SIYB en tant qu'outil principal de formation entrepreneuriale au sein du programme, à utiliser dans toutes les activités concernées. Un objectif de 20 formateurs-maître par pays participant devrait être fixé pour assurer la présence continue d'une capacité suffisante en formation de formateurs.
 - (d) Entrer en négociations avec les grandes Institutions de micro-finance (IMF) au sujet d'un mécanisme de financement innovant, par lequel le gouvernement (au travers de financement de programme) accepte de pourvoir l'IMF d'un fonds collatéral. En contrepartie, le fonds serait géré de manière professionnelle et un grand nombre de jeunes entrepreneurs pourraient en bénéficier. Dans d'autres pays ouest-africains, l'expérience a montré que ce type de mécanisme était un moyen pragmatique d'aider les jeunes entreprises à accéder à un capital d'emprunt. Pour cela, il serait bon de faire appel à l'expertise du programme de finance sociale du BIT.
4. Les mécanismes de coordination d'un futur programme devraient être améliorés et alignés sur les principes de l'initiative « Unis dans l'Action ». Ces principes devraient être considérés comme étant des conditions nécessaires au succès de l'approche commune ; dans le cas où une (ou plusieurs) des agences ne voudrai(en)t ou ne pourrai(en)t y adhérer, il vaudrait peut-être mieux que celle(s)-ci se retire(nt).
- a) Le Comité directeur de l'UFM devrait être ravivé et un plan contenant 6 réunions mensuelles convoquées et organisées par le Secrétariat de l'UFM devrait être accepté d'emblée. Un cadre supérieur devrait être nommé par l'UFM au poste de Directeur de programme, chargé de la coordination globale.
 - b) Au niveau national, l'équipe des Nations Unies aura un responsable (provenant d'une des agences participantes) dédié au poste du Consultant Technique Principal (CTP) auprès de chacune des principales organisations partenaires (telles que le Secrétariat de l'UFM, le Ministère de la jeunesse, le Ministère du travail, le Ministère de l'industrie, la Chambre de commerce, etc.)
 - c) Le CTP sera le premier à être recruté et il/elle participera au recrutement de tous les autres employés du programme; tout le personnel sera placé sous des contrats d'un an avec possibilité d'extension; ils rendront compte techniquement au CTP, indépendamment de leur affiliation à une agence particulière; le CTP assurera un échange d'information de haut niveau avec les organisations partenaires, tout comme au sein de l'équipe nationale, au moyen de réunions d'équipe bihebdomadaires.

- d) Il y aura un budget pour le programme de chaque pays, administré de façon quotidienne par le CTP, qui assignera également les tâches issues du programme-pays au sein de l'équipe en charge de celui-ci.
 - e) Le CTP aura un compte local à disposition pour les coûts opérationnels du programme, tels que le transport, les séminaires de formation, l'impression de matériel; tout l'approvisionnement pour les formations en entreprise (équipement, matériel de formation etc.) sera sous-traité à un agent d'approvisionnement local compétent, soumis à des audits externes.
 - f) Les sièges des Agences, les Bureau régionaux et les Bureaux de pays (affiliés au BIT) prendront en charge la collecte des fonds, l'orientation politique, le contrôle et l'évaluation, et assisteront les opérations du pays à l'aide d'un soutien technique et de conseils, sans toutefois être impliqués dans la gestion du programme au quotidien.
 - g) La coordination entre l'ONUDI, le BIT et le Secrétariat du YEN devrait se baser non seulement sur les avantages comparatifs perçus, mais également sur les activités effectuées conjointement durant la phase de mise en œuvre, afin de construire des synergies en ciblant des groupes spécifiques de jeunes. Des règles claires de communication devraient être établies tout au long de la mise en œuvre entre les partenaires à tous les niveaux: au niveau du siège, de la région et du pays.
5. Les agences (en particulier l'ONUDI) devraient reconsidérer leurs règles financières et leurs procédures d'approvisionnement afin d'entamer une décentralisation et de permettre une mise en place efficiente et rapide des activités opérationnelles au niveau national.

1. Background

At the joint initiative of UNIDO and the African Union, a High Level Consultative Meeting on Productive and Decent Work for Youth in West Africa with emphasis on the Mano River Union (MRU) was convened in February 2007 in Accra, Ghana. The Meeting brought together representatives of Sierra Leone, Togo, Liberia, Guinea and Côte d'Ivoire as well as United Nations agencies, the MRU Secretariat, development partners, representatives of youth civil society organizations and the private sector. The meeting produced a communiqué in which the "Participants unanimously recognized that the issue of youth employment constitutes a major challenge particularly as it has implications for the political stability of the Mano River Union countries".

In spite of a background of protracted civil strife, Sierra Leone and Liberia are now moving from a post-conflict recovery to laying the foundations for long-term development. Remarkable progress in the economy and political process has been noted. However, despite this progress, the situation in the region remains fragile with a fairly hostile economic environment and poor infrastructure. Unemployment is high, especially for the youth, and the public and private labour markets have very limited capacity to absorb them. Youth unemployment rates for 2003 are mentioned in the MRU Programme Document as 31% in Côte d'Ivoire, 65% in Sierra Leone, and 88% in Liberia. Although these numbers should be treated with some caution, this common challenge in the region clearly requires concerted and sustainable efforts by governments, the international community, the private sector, civil society, youth themselves, and other relevant stakeholders to generate tangible prospects that can contribute to a better future for young people.

Governments of the MRU countries have tried to find solutions to the high youth unemployment. Youth employment is cited among their top priorities, and all four countries have ministries of youth, youth employment schemes, and a number of special initiatives for the youths. In Guinea, there is the National Youth Employment Fund (FONIJ), in Liberia the Liberia Employment Action Program (LEAP), in Sierra Leone the Youth Employment Scheme (YES), and in Côte d'Ivoire the National Solidarity Fund (FNS). However, the public funds for youth employment remain limited; institutional weaknesses are part of the reality, with limited coordination at the national level.

The leaders who met in Accra recognized that the future of West Africa in general, and the MRU countries in particular, in terms of peace, stability and development depends on the prospects of its youth. The young people need not just jobs but decent ones, as well as inclusive development policies.

The programme being evaluated here is a follow-up to the Accra High-Level Meeting. It is conceived as a four-year programme with a budget of USD 21.5 million to be implemented jointly by UNIDO, ILO and YEN, with funding for the first year (USD 5 million) from the Government of Japan.

2. Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation¹

The **purpose** of this independent evaluation is to determine the appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the first year of implementation of the joint programme, and to present conclusions and recommendations for the next phase of the programme. Furthermore, it should provide lessons learned for the key stakeholders of the programme and the ILO, UNIDO, YEN Secretariat to continuously improve performance and outcomes of future similar programmes.

The specific objectives of the final evaluation are:

- To assess progress made towards achieving the objectives set out in the programme document and the impact of the initiatives implemented during the first phase in terms of changes in policies and institutions and increased productive and decent work prospects for young people, as well as identify areas that can be sustained and scaled-up;
- To verify that funds were used effectively and efficiently to deliver results;
- To measure the extent to which ILO, UNIDO and YEN Secretariat have individually and collectively contributed to achieve the programme objectives;
- To assess the extent to which the programme has contributed to the achievement of national development goals that relate to the promotion of productive and decent work for young people in each of the four countries (including contribution to and alignment with the National Development Plans, UNDAF, DWCPs (where available) and UNIDO National Cooperation frameworks);
- To identify “good” practice and share lessons learned regarding the promotion of productive and decent work for youth (e.g. relevance of the strategy and methodological and institutional arrangements for promoting decent employment for youth within the national development frameworks, and for strengthening national capacity to promote productive and decent work for youth);
- To identify and explain any difficulties or challenges, specific to the context or overall implementation, and suggest ways of overcoming them in the next phase;

The **scope** of the independent evaluation was to look into the Multi-stakeholder Programme for Productive and Decent Work for Youth implemented in the four countries as well as those works implemented at sub-regional and regional levels from September 2008 to date by the programme. As this is a joint programme of ILO, UNIDO and YEN Secretariat, the evaluation looked at the working relationship and joint achievement of the three different organizations and analyzed progress made independently as well as jointly by the organizations. The evaluation also assessed the management and coordination of the programme.

The principal **clients** of this evaluation are the MRU Secretariat; the governments of Sierra Leone, Liberia, Guinea and Côte d’Ivoire; the government of Japan; the Sub Regional Steering Committee and the Technical Management Unit; UNIDO, ILO (Regional Office, ILO Dakar, ILO Abuja and sectors/YEP), YEN Secretariat, ILO and UNIDO constituents, as well as stakeholders and implementing partners in the programme countries.

¹ Please see annex 1: Terms of Reference for details

3. Methodology

The evaluation was carried out jointly by UNIDO and ILO who contracted Erik Lyby (team leader) and Mohamadou SY as external evaluators. The evaluation methodology was based on the Terms of References shown in Annex 1 and followed a process in eight steps:

- 1 Desk review of programme documents, progress reports, tools developed, etc.
- 2 Briefing at UNIDO headquarters and Dakar ILO sub regional office
- 3 Design of evaluation tools
- 4 Field work based on interviews and direct observations included interviews with the following:
 - UNIDO and ILO representatives and staff
 - The MRU Secretariat in Freetown
 - Ministries and agencies of youth, labour, and vocational training in the four countries
 - National coordinators, field staff and consultants in the countries
 - Financial and technical partners: UNDP, French Cooperation, Chamber of Commerce, consulting firms, implementing agencies, trainers, businesses, etc.
 - Beneficiaries of training: women and youth especially.
- 5 Visits at selected project sites, youth communication hubs, etc.
- 6 Debriefings in Freetown and Vienna (with video links to Geneva, Abuja and Dakar)
- 7 Analysis and preparation of a draft report including comments received on the debriefing note
- 8 Preparation of a final evaluation report including comments on the draft report.

After the briefings and desk review the team met in Freetown on the 16 June 2010 to further refine the approach and divide the tasks. This included the preparation of a more specific list of evaluation questions (Annex 3). The methodology for answering the key evaluation questions was through a participatory, inclusive and gender-sensitive approach. Triangulation of the data collected was used to validate their accuracy and adequateness.

The fieldwork was divided in such a way that Mohamadou Sy visited Guinea and Côte d'Ivoire, and Erik Lyby Sierra Leone and Liberia, each spending approximately a week in each country. Almost all programme activities were visited and relevant personnel interviewed – see List of People Met in annex 2. The team met again in Freetown on 02 July for discussions and preparation of a debriefing note that was presented to the Sierra Leone stakeholders on 6 July, followed by a presentation in UNIDO Vienna the following day with video-links to ILO offices in Geneva, Dakar and Abuja. A series of telephone interviews followed during the preparation of the draft report. During the month of August the draft report was circulated among the MRU secretariat, the involved UNIDO, ILO and YEN staff and other main stakeholders and comments integrated as appropriate into the initial draft.

The evaluation team wishes to extend its sincere thanks to all those who contributed to make the mission a productive one – the trainers, Government and CSO representatives, as well as the staff at field, regional and HQ levels of the three implementing agencies who contributed to the exercise with remarkable commitment and professionalism.

It should be noted that the findings, conclusions and recommendations presented in this report are those of the independent evaluation team and do not necessarily represent opinions of the involved governments, UN agencies, or other stakeholders.

4. Findings

Below are presented the findings of the evaluation team on the Programme Design; the Relevance of the programme; its Effectiveness (in reaching its objectives); the Efficiency of the management set-up and use of resources; and the Ownership by partner institutions in the countries. Due to the short implementation period, the assessment of any long-term impact is considered to be premature and is not included. The chapter on Findings concentrates on the evidence that was collected and tries to avoid judgemental statements. This is then followed by the team's Conclusions, Lessons Learnt, and Recommendations for the future.

4.1 Programme Design

The programme justification is based on extensive and solid analysis of a wide range of factors related to the issue of youth and employment in West Africa and particularly in post-crisis states. The four countries comprise one of the world's youngest and poorest population. Liberia's per capita income is the third-lowest in the world (USD 130), while Sierra Leone's is the fifth lowest (USD 220) and Guinea ranks fifteenth (USD 370). Côte d'Ivoire's per capita rate is somewhat higher (USD 840). After years of civil war (Côte d'Ivoire: 2002-2003, Liberia: 1989-2003, Sierra Leone 1991-2002, Guinea: unrest in February 2007) much remains to be done to ensure stability and lasting peace in the sub-region².

Youth employment is high on the agenda of all four governments, and subsequent to the Accra High-Level Meeting the UN agencies were encouraged to develop programmes and projects in support of this priority. The MRU 4-year programme was jointly formulated by UNIDO and ILO with UNDP and the MRU Secretariat following the joint UNIDO/ILO/UNDP/YEN/UNOWA exploratory mission in May/June 2007. Fundraising was successful for the first year with the Japanese Government making a grant of USD 5 million available in March 2008. This grant was made from special emergency funds and under the strict condition that it would be used in one year of implementation, i.e. by March 2009. Subsequently, the First Year Plan of Action was formulated based on the joint UNIDO/ILO formulation mission in April-May 2008, and the programme document was finalised with the four-year programme document remaining as the overall framework and signed in July 2008. Initially the programme was designed to run for a four-year period with a USD 21.5 million budget. No further funding was secured at the time when it was decided to embark on the implementation, based on the expectation that the remaining funds could be raised so as to continue in year 2 as planned.

The four-year sub-regional programme to be implemented in four countries is described as consisting of the following components:

- 1 Development of self-employing businesses
 - a. Youth entrepreneurship promotion
 - b. Funding facility for youth-led projects
- 2 Development of youth employability
 - a. Partnerships with the private sector for youth employability
 - b. Training and skills development to increase employability of youth

² MRU Youth Employment Joint project document, April 2008

- 3 Subregional Labour Market Information System (Employment Services) and Information Services
- 4 Subregional youth forum, experience sharing, and programme management.

A UN Preparatory Meeting took place in Accra prior to the High-Level Meeting with the participation of the ILO, UNIDO, UNICEF, FAO, World Bank, UNDP, and representatives of UNCT from the Mano River countries and Côte d'Ivoire. The Secretary-General of the Mano River Union also participated. The purpose of the meeting was "to determine a multi-stakeholder approach to deliver as one on youth employment in the Mano River region"³.

The programme document follows this line and refers to "Delivering as One"⁴ as the implementation modality. The MRU Secretariat would host the sub-regional programme and obtain political support and guidance, as well as mobilise partners and donors. In support of this, UNIDO provided initial capacity strengthening technical assistance to the MRU Secretariat in Freetown, Sierra Leone, from October 2007. A Steering Committee was set up, consisting of MRU Member States representatives, Youth Groups, UN partner agencies, and donors, as well as National Steering Committees at the country level. The implementing UN agencies were foreseen to be UNIDO, ILO and UNDP, however, UNDP withdrew and the Youth Employment Network (YEN) joined UNIDO and ILO as implementing partner. The programme document does not go into any detail about the way in which the UN partners would "Deliver as One". The resulting design of the programme document was ambitious, with complex partnerships and implementation modalities. In practice, the tasks and budgets were divided between the agencies in a joint planning mission to the MRU countries in April 2008.

The approach described in the document was to become youth-led and comprised several diverse target groups:

- Marginalized, poor urban youth;
- Young people that have a business idea or would like to become entrepreneurs in the agricultural, productive and services sector;
- Young people that already own a business regardless of size or sector.

UNIDO First Year Plan of Action follows the same overall flow as the four-year document, but identifies the border regions between the countries as the geographical focus area. The Plan includes a budget for the Japanese funding of USD 5 million. An international Chief Technical Adviser is foreseen for 7 months to coordinate the programme; however, in view of the short time between September 2008 and March 2009, that post was substituted by a regional and four national coordinators. An additional intention for this was to strengthen the local and youth-led orientation.

³ Annex to Communiqué from the High-Level Meeting, Accra 19-20 February 2007

⁴ Delivering as One forms part of the UN reform process and is based on the recommendations of the Report A/61/583 of the High-Level Panel (HLP) on System-Wide Coherence presented to the UNGA in November 2006

The resulting design for the first year looks as follows:

Table 1: Programme components by country and implementing agency⁵

	Sierra Leone	Liberia	Guinea	Côte d'Ivoire
1a) Promotion and development of youth-led businesses and social projects				
UNIDO	Youth business entrepreneurship skill development program (Kailahun, Koindu)	Youth business entrepreneurship skill development programme (Ganta)	Community-based skills upgrading based on CPC in Forest Guinea (Guékédou)	Entrepreneurship caravan (entrepreneurial awareness, skills and education, 8 districts)
ILO	N/A	BDS services for youth entrepreneurship (Monrovia)	Youth Employment Programme and IYB trainers network implemented in Forest Guinea (Kissidougou)	Support to SYB/IYB network and PRODIGE (four districts)
1b) Funding facility for youth-led projects				
YEN UNIDO	Competitive grant scheme	Competitive grant scheme	Competitive grant scheme	Competitive grant scheme
UNIDO	Financial sector study	Financial sector study	Financial sectors study	Financial sector study
2a) Development of youth employable skills, in partnership with private sector businesses, based on Corporate Social responsibility				
UNIDO	Pilot youth technical skills programme	Pilot youth technical skills programme	Semi-skills upgrading program in mining areas (Beyla, Lola)	Private led partnerships for market-oriented youth skills
2b) Training and skills development to increase employability of youth				
ILO	Up to date courses and curricula for TVET institutions developed	Up to date courses and curricula for TVET institutions (Ganta)	Report on workforce development for the mining sector cluster	AGEROUTE on-the-job-training and SME devpt. schemes strengthened
			Strategic plan for the <i>Salon de l'Emploi et de la Formation</i>	Dual apprenticeship scheme developed in four districts
3) Subregional Labour Market Intermediation (Employment services) and Information Services				
ILO	Work plan for establishment of 6 - 13 job centres	Mobile employment services units	Self-sustaining LIMS at the local level (Kissidougou)	Local employment services in Abidjan and southern areas strengthened, incl. study on FDI requirements
4) Sub regional youth forum, experience sharing and programme management				
UNIDO	Country programme management & logistics	Country programme management & logistics	Country programme management & logistics	Country programme management & logistics
UNIDO	Communication platform - Youth forum - Steering Committee			

⁵ In UNIDO, the project responsibility was split between the unit for “Youth and Women Entrepreneurship” (components 1a and 2a) and the unit for “Special Programmes” dealing, among others, with post-conflict projects (component 1b and 4).

In spite of the overall programme justification being related to political stability and potential threats from a large population of uneducated and unemployed young men, and in the absence of a gender analysis, the document argues in favour of gender equality in relation to job opportunities created.

The four-year document lists a series of risk factors, such as weaknesses in the partner organizations, labour market institutions, youth organizations, and the private sector in general. Two assumptions are implicitly made but not listed: (1) that funding for the subsequent three years would be obtained; and (2) that the cooperating agencies would be able to tap on each other's strengths to create synergies. Both of these would appear to be killer assumptions that ought to have been addressed upfront.

4.2 Relevance

As recognised by the High-Level Meeting and repeated in numerous statements by the affected Governments, the challenge of un- and underemployment by the very large group of young people many of whom had missed the opportunity of a normal childhood during war, is huge and a threat to states with a recent history of violent civil strife. The programme is also in line with the priorities of the ILO, UNIDO and YEN, which are all mandated by their executive bodies to promote youth employment in post-crisis situations.

The MRU programme had linkages with other on-going activities by UNIDO and ILO, such as the UNIDO support to Growth Centres in Sierra Leone, training in Guékédou in Guinea, and Mini-Hydro Power in Liberia, and ILO's development of Decent Work country plans, support to TVET reform, labour market information and employment services, labour-based infrastructure, etc.

It also complements several initiatives in the countries supported by the IFIs and other development partners. These include inter alia:

- Sierra Leone: the PRSP; the UN Joint Vision; the Youth Employment Scheme (YES)
- Liberia: the PRSP which includes a national Employment Policy; the Liberia Action Employment Program (LEAP)
- Guinea: Youth Employment Program (YEP)
- Côte d'Ivoire: *Programme des Initiatives Génératrices d'Emplois* (PRODIGE); Entrepreneurship Caravan.

As such the programme is highly relevant to the challenges to provide jobs for the youth on a large scale.

4.3 Programme progress and effectiveness

Considerable differences were found between the four countries in terms of effectiveness with regard to reaching the foreseen outcomes. These differences can to some extent be ascribed to their recent history and level of destruction during the years of conflict as well as their institutional and economic environments.

4.3.1 Component 1a - Promotion and development of youth-led businesses and social projects (UNIDO and ILO)

Sierra Leone and Liberia

The two countries experienced a long and ugly war that ended in 2002-03. The border areas – Kailahun and Koindu in Sierra Leone, and Ganta in Nimba County, Liberia, were at the heart of the wars and saw the worst destruction and atrocities committed. The MRU programme chose these areas for intervention under Component 1a: Youth entrepreneurial skills development. The activities under this component are basically similar in the two countries.

In Sierra Leone, Component 1a started in September 2009. 12 trainers from the private sector in each of the two towns (existing entrepreneurs) were selected to be responsible for the training and were sent on training (ToT) in N’Zerekore in Guinea. In Liberia, the training was officially launched in December 2009, with 305 potential trainees and 12 trainers from the private sector. The trainers were sent on a study tour to the Songhai Centre in Benin and the training commenced shortly after.

The projects in Kailahun and Koindu started with the construction of a training and production centre in each town, which were used as training sites for builders. The broader training effectively started in March 2010 with the arrival of equipment and training materials; however, the supplies were short of the lists submitted by the trainers and only partly covered their needs. The reason for cutting down on the requirements was given as shortage of funding. Trainers stated that they were not consulted about the nature of the cuts, leading to some of them receiving equipment or materials that were of lesser priority, and missing others that were more important to them. This impacted on the training that could be given. This is a constant bone of contention between the trainers, trainees, and the programme staff; while the trainers are experienced and independent entrepreneurs and generally say that they want to carry out the training for the full period no matter what, they feel they have been short-changed and the training has become more limited in scope than foreseen. Examples are many: a builder asking for 75 bags of cement and getting 25; a hairdresser getting a generator that is of limited use and needing hair for extensions instead; etc.

Table 2: Training in Kailahun, Koindu and Ganta

Training Activity	No. of trainees June 2010			Total trainees
	Sierra Leone - Kailahun	Sierra Leone - Koindu	Liberia – Ganta	
Carpentry	11	13	12	36
Auto mechanic	9	13	15	37
Tailoring	26	18	32	76
Embroidery		21		21
Gara tie dying	73	50	20	143
Weaving	15	8		23
It computer literacy	30			30
Hair dressing	16	18	44	78
Blacksmithing	7	6		13
Metalwork/welding	20		17	37
Plumbing			16	16
Soap making	18	41	56	115
Building		13	15	28
Total trainees	225	201	227	653

Training courses are generally foreseen to be of 6 months duration, meaning that at the time of the evaluation no trainee had yet graduated. Some trainees had dropped out during the first months (exact number unknown), and the number of trainees by training activity is shown below. The division by gender is fairly equal, as some areas are considered as being mainly of a male nature and others more female. There are however also a number of cases where males entered “female” areas and vice versa.

Taken together, the trades attracting most trainees were 1. Gara tie-dying, 2. Soap-making, 3. Tailoring/embroidery, and 4. Hairdressing. The quality of the products corresponds to what is commonly accepted in the rural areas, with scope for further development. Some trainers had made use of ideas they obtained in the study tour to Guinea (new hairstyles, fashion, furniture, etc...).

Examination of the financial records kept by the trainers showed that their understanding of the value of keeping track of incomes and expenses was limited, and few had a bank account. The training-of-trainers that they had received was short; many kept the records more because they were told to do so than because they saw the use of it for their own business. Clearly, the business understanding that these trainers are able to impart on their trainees is quite limited.

The majority of trainees had none or very little formal schooling. This made the theoretical training a particular challenge for the trainer, who would have to include the basics of literacy and numeracy for them to understand the differences between the materials they use, measuring dimensions of wood or metal, etc. With few training materials available, the balance between the theoretical and the practical swings towards the “talk and chalk”. Basic literacy had been introduced in the beginning as a separate course (rather than being mainstreamed into the vocational training), but with limited success, and it was discontinued after a while.

The First year Plan of Action is silent on the number of youth to be trained in the two countries, but there is mention of 5 trainers each from Kailahun and Koindu, and from Ganta and Gbarnga in Liberia. The number of trainers has been reached in Liberia (although all in Ganta) and doubled in Sierra Leone. The number of trainees is clearly as high as it can be if any quality measures are to be observed (e.g. 15 trainees in one hairdressing or tailoring shop must be close to the limit).

Quantitatively therefore, the programme is effective in reaching the beneficiaries. However, with long delays and shortfalls in the training materials to be received, the quality is likely to have suffered and the ultimate impact uncertain. Several foreseen activities meant for the youth to come closer to business development services such as initial enterprise financing were not carried out.

Guinea

At the Community Production Centre (CPC) in Forest Guinea (Guéckédou), UNIDO trained 1,969 youths in practical entrepreneurial and technical skills in various fields such as food processing adapted technologies, soap making, hairdressing, etc., supplemented with adult literacy training. As opposed to Sierra Leone and Liberia where similar training courses were of 6 months duration, those in Guéckédou were shorter, only 2 months each. About 60% of the beneficiaries are young single mothers, female artisans and unemployed university graduates.

Table 3: Training in Guéckédou

Training activities	Number of trainees		Total
	Male	Female	
Enterprise culture	224	100	324
Functional literacy	218	342	560
Technology geared to food processing	94	5	99
Carpentry	210	-	210
Hairdressing	1	198	199
Tailoring	90	97	187
Embroidery	-	190	190
Dyeing and soap making	8	192	200
TOTAL	845	1124	1,969

A youth “Employment House” was created in Kissidougou in partnership with the Guinean Agency for Employment Promotion (AGUIPE to manage local labour data, train and orient job seekers, assist them in CV writing, etc.

13 young men and women visited the Songhai Centre in Benin and got exposure to innovative and integrated agri-business practices.

At the employment house in Kissidougou, ILO trained 15 trainers from the consulting firm 3AE in SYB (Start-Your-Business) and 30 women in small business management and marketing. Out of the 15 trainers, 6 were identified as service providers in SYB training in partnership with 3AE. The 6 trainers trained 70 young people and 70 business plans were elaborated but not one of them was funded. However, many of the business plans were not really market oriented – each trainee wanted to have his or her own business plan regardless the limited demand for the services or products he or she planned to offer. AGUIPE tried hard to improve the quality of the business plans, but it was found difficult given their huge number. There was more of a focus on quantity to the detriment of quality.

Youths were also hesitant to combine their limited resources in groups and work towards the common goal of business development and job creation.

In Kissidougou alone there is a funding need for USD 430,000 (USD 250,000 for the 70 youth business plans and USD 180,000 for the business women).

Most of the outputs of this component have been produced, with benefits accruing equally to male and female. Partnerships have been developed with parastatal institutions and consulting firms. However, as no business plan was funded, some of the youths expressed disappointment, having the impression that the trainings they received and the business plans elaborated were useless.

Côte d’Ivoire

The Ministry of Industry of Côte d’Ivoire organized a first caravan in 2008 in 6 districts. In 2009, under component 1a of the MRU programme, UNIDO supported the second Entrepreneurship Caravan conducted in collaboration with the Ministry of Industry in 12 districts countrywide. The activity was implemented by 3 consulting firms based in Abidjan. 2,884 youths benefited from that activity in terms of information about entrepreneurship principles and strategies.

UNIDO contracted local firms to conduct socioeconomic studies to identify economic opportunities in 12 districts. The results were used for the entrepreneurship caravan and the training of trainers in entrepreneurship.

The UNIDO training expert coordinated the preparation of a trainer's manual on entrepreneurship and small business management, and 246 local trainers were trained in 12 districts. The manual was prepared in order to support the training of trainers during the caravan. The manual addressed, inter alia, the following issues:

- Training approaches and techniques
- The definition of entrepreneurship?
- How to become an entrepreneur?
- How to design a business plan?
- How to manage a business?

UNIDO supported the development of 18 business plans, of which 12 were submitted for funding by institutions such as UNDP. The Chamber of Commerce was not involved in the Caravan, and UNIDO produced its own training materials instead of using the ILO ones. As the consulting firms were based in Abidjan, the youths did not benefit from close monitoring once they finished preparing their business plans. As part of this component, 12 young people visited the Songhai centre and shared its experience in agricultural development.

ILO trained 9 SYB/IYB trainers in 3 localities in West-central (Gagnoa, Issia, and Bouaflé) and 60 youths in business plan development. Altogether, 57 business plans were prepared but not a single one was funded, as time was too short to further develop the business plans and explore funding opportunities. On the other hand, in partnership with AGEFOP (PFS), PRODIGE and the national SYB/IYB network, 100 PRODIGE beneficiaries were trained by ILO under a literacy project and a micro-loan management project. The training lasted 4 months and one may question the quality of the training given the limited time. The training took place in urban areas only and some rural women were frustrated for not being involved.

The objectives of the component have been partly achieved. However, some key players like the Chamber of Commerce and the national SIYB Network were not involved in the implementation of the Entrepreneurship Caravan. Business plans were elaborated but not funded, which generated frustration among the youth.

4.3.2 Component 1b: Financial scheme for youth-led projects (YEN and UNIDO)

Table 4 shows that fourteen projects were funded under the competitive YEN grant scheme (please see Annex 4 for more details).

In Côte d'Ivoire, 4 youth projects located in 6 districts were selected out of the 75 proposals. The total budget of the four projects is USD 108,208. Partnerships were signed with ANADER (National Rural Development Agency) for technical monitoring and local authorities who provided the beneficiaries with land either for their farming activities or for other purposes such as smoking fish. The four projects are under implementation. It is expected that they will benefit directly to 111 disadvantaged people, among whom 66% women.

The planning and management tools provided by YEN under the Grant Scheme were found to be useful, and the partnership with Ecobank contributed to an effective and transparent management of financial resources. Disbursements were validated by the national coordinator in accordance with the planning of activities and the projects needs clearly identified.

Table 4: YEN Grant Projects

Country	YEN Grant Project	USD
Cote d'ivoire	Cane rat production for meat	24,353
	Snail production	7,585
	Construction of fish smoking facilities	49,865
	Beach cleaning and tourism activities	26,406
Guinea	Reforestation	42,346
	Recycling of plastic waste	44,171
	Development of products from the moringa oleifera tree	24,714
Liberia	Bricks for life project	26,159
	Creative arts for sustainable empowerment (case)	5,833
	Center for women's empowerment	40,598
	Transition from school to work (job-shop)	46,009
Sierra Leone	Kailahun field researchers (project dropped)	0
	Mapaki youth training and manufacturing centre	48,778
	Women in sustainable bee-keeping activities	22,483
	Employment promotion and private waste management	23,595

The beneficiaries of the YEN grants in Côte d'Ivoire report the following constraints on their operations:

- Some forest projects require up to three years to become productive. In such a case, the beneficiaries need a good working capital.
- Unforeseen expenses. For example, the women of the smoking fish project in Grand Bassam (Côte d'Ivoire) have to spend money every day for local transportation and food because their new site is about 4 kilometres away from the place where they live.
- Limited financial resources because of the dollar rate decline

In Guinea, the total budget of the 3 YEN projects amounted to USD 111,231. The competitive grant scheme aims at generating about 129 full time decent jobs along with 430 other beneficiaries. About 52% of the direct beneficiaries are young women. In addition to job creation, the projects contribute to protect the environment. All 3 projects are under implementation.

In Liberia, The Bricks for Life project trains 20 disadvantaged youths (16 male, 4 female) from the neighbourhood in brick-making for the local market. Other projects cater primarily for youths with some education, including university graduates. "Creative Arts" provide computer training as a means to enter into computerised graphic design. The Job-shop project is a youth-led combination of two months intensive ICT and management training followed by placement in private or public enterprises. The Centre for Women's Empowerment provides training primarily in literacy and the traditional female occupations: tailoring, tie-dye, baking, cosmetology, interior decorating, weaving. The first batch of 130 young women was ready for graduation at the time of the evaluation.

In Sierra Leone, construction of the Mapaki training centre was at an advanced stage during the evaluation, but the training (apart from that in the construction) was just starting. The centre caters

for disadvantaged youth in a rural area and enjoys strong support by the local community. 50 young men work on the construction, while training is carried out for women in gara tie-dyeing and weaving. Blacksmithing is taught to young men, and agricultural subjects to both sexes.

Overall, the YEN Grant Scheme took longer than expected for soliciting applications, the assessment of applications, and the selection of qualified applicants. However, in spite of delays the overall progress is good and the YEN grantees are effective in reaching the outcomes described in their applications.

The UNIDO part of component 1b consisted of a number of financial sector studies with a view to youth access to MFI services. The studies were carried out by the post-crisis unit in all four countries and synthesised into a subregional study, without involving UNIDO specialized investment unit. The studies show that microfinance services are increasingly becoming available by professional MFIs in the region, including the more remote areas. However, it also shows that youth have difficulties in accessing MFIs' services and what the restrictions are on the MFIs' side. The challenges for youth to get access to microfinance can be summarised as follows:

- Most MFIs do not lend to start-ups, only to existing businesses, even very small ones.
- Group solidarity can function in lieu of collateral, but some youths hesitate to form groups.
- Some MF products (e.g. from BRAC) are limited to women, leaving out the young men.
- And the majority of micro-loans go to retail trade.

These challenges are not necessarily insurmountable. However, the studies came too late to be useful for the planning and do not appear to have been used in the training under component 1a in either country, in spite of financing of enterprises being an expressed activity to address. As mentioned above, the trainers in the border areas have limited knowledge of the workings of MF, and the trainees have none. The programme has not been effective in imparting microfinance understanding to the youth and their trainers, neither have they made the existing MFIs aware of the potential business for them in the trained youths, nor bringing the two sides together in a dialogue.

4.3.3 Component 2a: Development of Youth Employable Skills in Cooperation with Private Sector Companies (UNIDO)

Little progress can be noted on this component in Sierra Leone or Liberia. Contacts have been made, a stakeholder forum held in Sierra Leone, but no longer-lasting cooperation was established.

In Côte d'Ivoire, to increase youth employability and enhance skills, partnerships were developed with the private sector (large companies), the Chamber of Commerce and Industry (CCI), the Fund for the Development of Vocational Training (FDFP), and a youth organization named CIFIJEC. 100 youths were trained (75 by UNIDO and 25 by the trainers of CIFIJEC). The trainings aimed at improving the employability of the youths and preparing their immersion in big businesses. A roster of 1,000 youths was established. In addition, 20 youths received a practical training in 6 companies, 5 got temporary contracts and 2 hired. However, due to an adverse economic environment, most of the businesses targeted by the programme were not in a position to recruit trainees.

4.3.4 Component 2b: Training and Skills Development to increase employability of youths (ILO)

In Sierra Leone, Start-and-Improve-Your-Business (SIYB) training was carried out by ILO with 15 trainers achieving level 2 certificates and 100 trainees being exposed to first-level business

understanding. In Liberia, 30 young people received SIYB training, and 10 had ToT in hospitality services. 90 graduates from Ministry of Youth's Informal Apprenticeship programme were trained on the Generate Your Business Idea (GYBI) Package. With different funding, the ILO is assisting the Sierra Leonean Ministry of Labour in the development of a National Decent Work Programme.

In Liberia, a national TVET consultations conference was held and a draft TVET policy and bill were produced, and ILO continues to support TVET reform in Liberia within the framework of the Joint Programme on Youth Employment and Empowerment. Under the MRU Programme, the ILO also supported the Government in the implementation of the Vacation Jobs Programme by facilitating the participation of 100 high school and university students in job search during their three-months vacations, support to the Job on Training Programme (an apprenticeship programme for 90 youths), the sponsorship of 10 trainers from the Ministry of Youth and Sports Business Occupational Training Centre for a training of trainers course in the hospitality industry. In addition, a directory of Business Development Service (BDS) service providers was produced.

In Guinea, ILO conducted a socio-economic profile of Kissidougou district. The report revealed a number of business opportunities for local youth, but also the organizational weaknesses of youth associations. Based on these findings, ILO took the initiative to train the leaders of 26 youth associations in organizational governance – an activity not foreseen in the First Year Plan of Action.

A draft strategic development plan for the *Salon de l'Emploi* was also produced, but the work was suspended due to the prevailing hostile socio-political environment in December 2008.

In Côte d'Ivoire, youth skills in road construction and maintenance were enhanced, 18 team leaders (including 5 young women) were trained in partnership with AGEROUTE. Using the ILO labour-based methodology and on-the-job training initiative, AGEROUTE targeted 236 youths (29% of women) in road rehabilitation. Finally 5.6 kilometres of road were rehabilitated, which contributed to boost the local economy. Unfortunately, time did not allow organizing the beneficiaries in a cooperative.

As part of the component, a study on the development of SMEs in road construction and maintenance was conducted and a programme to promote SMEs in the sector was formulated. Finally, a dual entrepreneurship scheme project document was developed in the field of tailoring.

4.3.5 Component 3: Sub-regional Labour Market Intermediation (Employment Services) and Information Services (ILO)

In Sierra Leone, ILO and the Ministry of Labour conducted regional surveys on high-demand jobs, followed by an expert meeting. Training needs assessments were carried out on youths with disabilities, and workshops were held with their organisations.

An employment exchange stakeholder forum was held with participation from ILO's constituents, universities, UN agencies, youth organizations and technical/vocational institutions, and a national Stakeholder Advisory Group was formed to advance the agenda of providing employment services to the youth and the country.

In Liberia, the ILO under the MRU programme organised the establishment of a National Bureau for Employment Services in the Ministry of Labour. This involved rehabilitation of the offices, procurement of all necessary equipment, development of a starter toolkit, and training of the staff in setting up the database and running the centre. The Centre was functional at the time of the

evaluation, and new job seekers (especially recent university graduates) were coming forward every day to have their profiles entered. The demand for employees so far mostly came from NGOs or the Government, but a reaching-out function to private sector enterprises was under preparation.

In Guinea, the study on Labour Market Intermediation and Information Services was not conducted. The ToR were finalized in December 2009 and the consultants recruited but ILO had to stop its activities under the MRU programme in the same month.

However, the *Maison de l'Emploi* in Kissidougou carried out a local study on local labour market focusing on the number of employers, job seekers, etc. A software application on data collection and processing has been produced and tested.

In Côte d'Ivoire, the major activities under component 3 were successfully completed. In fact, the study to identify the staff qualifications required by SMEs in the road sector and their employment constraints was successfully completed and validated. However, the study to identify the staff qualifications required by foreign companies in such areas as agro-industry, banking, mines and telecommunication was completed but not validated.

A fact-finding study by ILO consultants was conducted in 7 local mission sites in selected areas for the Platform Services (PFS) innovative approach. The local missions offer youth services especially in the areas of career guidance, business training, job search assistance and job placement. With the technical support of the CCI as implementing agency, the World Bank has funded 5 new PFS and is planning to start 12 more. The fact-finding study was conducted by ILO consultants with the following objectives:

- Assess the effectiveness of the PFS ;
- Assess the capacity of the staff to deliver quality services to the youth;
- Analyze the PFS information system.

Recently, all PFS joined in one umbrella organization with a board of directors. The newly created organization was given 1,500 square metres by the state for the building of its offices and part of the funding provided by the French Cooperation.

4.3.6 Component 4: Sub-regional youth forum, experience shared, and programme management (UNIDO)

This component was designed to combine the overall programme management (steering committee, M&E, administration...) with the setting up of a sub-regional network with the objective to promote "Solidarity among youth at the sub-regional level". The related outcome is foreseen as: "Youth cooperate at the sub-regional level". The management part is dealt with below in section 5.

An MRU Sub-regional Youth Forum, the first of its kind, was held in March 2009 and brought together 120 youth representatives and stakeholders from the four MRU countries. It allowed youth representatives of all four countries to physically meet, create social capital amongst each other, network and exchange, which then continued virtually on the MRU Youth Communication Platform.

Over 600 users are registered with the platform, and over 200 youth groups and government ministries received training on platform use. Over 1000 electronic pages were created with more than 500 individual contributions. The MRU Youth Communication Platform allows youth civil society organisations to network and communicate with one another and with governments. Several

instances have been reported in which productive dialogue has taken place between Francophone and Anglophone countries, and in Liberia the Ministry of Youth has been quoted as saying the platform has the potential impact of finally allowing the Ministry to talk to the youth. A similar situation is found in Guinea.

Subsequently, four “communication hubs” were established by UNIDO in cooperation with NGOs in the capitals to provide internet and computer access to youth beneficiaries. The hubs were selected based on the following criteria: 1. Proven experience in IT related youth projects; 2. Highly youth populated area; 3. basic infrastructure available; 4. network of youth organizations existing. The hubs offer training and access to the web-based platform. Four hubs were established in the first phase with the remaining four hubs expected to be established during successive years of implementation. A monitoring framework has been put in place and produces large quantities of data.

In Freetown, the communication hub provides training to young people on standard Microsoft applications; 15 young women and 34 men have been trained so far. They are mostly university students and pay a nominal fee for the training. The programme provided four computers, a printer, a photocopier and a generator. There is as yet no internet access. At the time of the evaluation, the photocopier was not in use. Two UNIDO staff are attached to the hub and to the grant scheme.

In Monrovia, a somewhat similar setup exists, however with internet connection. The host organisation has an ambitious plan for expansion to two levels where a larger and more accessible centre at street level with up to 20 work stations will cater for the computer training, while only the current (upstairs) one will be for internet users. Three UNIDO staff are attached to this component as well as to the YEN grant scheme.

In Conakry, the communication hub was set up and managed by *Les Amis du Futur* (LAF), a youth-led organization. 53 youth organizations benefited from the platform training opportunities, 190 young people benefited of basic IT skills training and open source training sessions (105 men and 85 women) and 20 staff members of the Ministry of Youth and Employment received training on various topics in Information Technology, Microsoft Word, and Excel (these trainees do not have internet access). The activities of the hub are currently suspended because LAF is in search of better offices in a more prominent area in Conakry.

In Abidjan, the youth-led organization WECaN was identified as the partner organization. It hosts the communication platform and conducts the computer training activities. About 36 youth organizations have been registered in the platform, 145 youths trained and web sites created for partner organizations such as FDFP, the Ministry of Youth, the Ministry of Industry, etc. For the initial phase, only youth who were members of partner associations were targeted because the NGO wanted to give priority to job seekers instead of students.

The state of development of the communication hubs differs considerably between the countries. The hub in Cote d'Ivoire is very promising. Activities are conducted on a regular basis and relationships with the programme are good. Youths take some initiatives (business plan, *bourse de l'entrepreneuriat*, etc.). The hub in Liberia also is quite advanced, while the one in Guinea has potential for development. The hub in Sierra Leone still has a long way to go. In all cases, their future financial sustainability requires continued hard work by the host organisations.

5. Management arrangements and efficiency

5.1 Administration

Administrative practices varied between the implementing partners. Whereas UNIDO remains with highly centralized management procedures, the ILO went through a decentralization of authority and functions long ago, from Geneva Headquarters to its regional Office (RO) in Addis Ababa and further down the line to the Sub-Regional (SRO) and Area Offices (AO).

The thin presence on the ground by the main agencies, especially in Liberia but also in Sierra Leone, together with **UNIDO** centralized procurement procedures made the smooth running of the field projects difficult, especially in Component 1a. The border areas are remote and hard to access, and the few suppliers that exist are situated far away from the project sites. UNIDO uses a system of MODs (Miscellaneous Obligation Documents) to be authorised by the programme manager in the Vienna Headquarters for channelling of funds through UNDP, even for very small items such as fuel and DSA for field missions. No authority is devolved to the country level, hence there is also no flexibility to react quickly to unexpected situations.

Local procurement has to follow the rules of competitive bidding which requires three proforma invoices to be considered for each purchase. In many instances, the goods were no longer available when the authorisation was received. In other cases the suppliers refused to deliver without being paid in advance, which is also not permitted. In the case of Sierra Leone, the General Service Tax (GST) was introduced at the beginning of 2010 adding 15% to all prices, at a time when many proformas were in circulation. Many suppliers closed down their shops in protest, and the work on procurement of equipment and training materials had to be redone. In spite of extraordinary efforts by UNIDO staff at Headquarters and in the field, this led to long delays and contributed to the situation where the remaining items could not be supplied due to funds being exhausted.

The ILO uses External Purchase Authorisations (EPAs) that are issued from the RO to the responsible Area Office. In the case of Liberia and Sierra Leone the AO is placed in Abuja, Nigeria. The RO can transfer the full amount available on a budget line in one go, after which the AO can divide it into sub-EPAs according to the need for cash in the country in question. In Liberia, ILO could use an old imprest account from a completed project for the transfer of funds to the YETO. In Sierra Leone, the transfers went through UNDP. The ILO transfers went relatively smoothly, which may relate to the nature of the expenses: mostly for the capitals, and including much less equipment than those by UNIDO. ILO's decentralised system, while looking quite complicated at the surface, may be more flexible and better suited for complex field projects than UNIDO concentration of authority at Vienna Headquarters.

Field staff were hired on short and precarious contracts with gaps in between, and this became a challenge to the Decent Work concept. Field staff were nonetheless found to be highly committed to the programme, but also frustrated over the continuous uncertainties with regard to the future. The shortages in delivery of training materials in component 1a generated some hard feelings among the trainers and local authorities that made the work of the field staff very difficult.

The case of the YEN grants presents a different set-up. The information campaign and selection procedures took a relatively long time, resulting in the projects taking off late in the first year. On the

other hand, the funds are transferred to the partner organisations in three tranches, which relieves YEN from getting involved in any complicated procurement on the ground. This is a great advantage for this component. However, some officers complained that they could not do the monitoring frequently and in time because funds were transferred with delays. As a consequence, site visits were limited, as was the guidance and support that should have taken place.

5.2 Delivering as One

Coordination of three agencies in four countries has been a challenge, and a clear definition of the meaning of “Delivering as One” in the MRU countries was never developed. Instead, the division of tasks and budgets was agreed in a joint planning mission according to what was seen as each agency’s comparative technical advantages. Joint decision-making and information sharing has been weak. Programme delivery has differed in time between the agencies, and the fielding of programme staff came with delays and was not coordinated centrally among the agencies. Hiring of national coordinators generally took place after the UNIDO and ILO specialists were in place instead of vice versa. There was for example no UNIDO staff on the ground in Liberia during the implementation of the ILO SIYB and other parts of the Programme. Some attempts were made to establish local coordination along the way, but with limited success.

The time pressure to deliver the Japanese grant within one year made coordination even more challenging. The initial deadline of 31 December 2009 was maintained until October, in spite of limited delivery up to this date. Consequently, the ILO accelerated its activities to meet this deadline. Contracts of the YETOs expired on the 31 December, although some activities were still on-going. Meanwhile UNIDO, who had no chance of completing the work especially on component 1a by the end of 2009, requested and obtained an extension of six-months from the donor. Apparently, this extension was only for UNIDO, while ILO had to terminate the programme as planned and return any unused funds. In several cases, ILO continued beyond the deadline with its own regular budget resources to bring the activities to a close, e.g. the two YETO in Liberia only left after March 2010.

Agency Headquarters and sub-regional offices do not seem to have urged their respective field staff to “Deliver as One” in practical terms. Particularly surprising to the evaluators was the lack of coordination around the well-tested ILO SIYB training package. UNIDO staff were generally not familiar with this package and applied other business training tools instead, apparently with limited success (see 4.3.1 above). Field staff report that information, reports, etc. was not freely shared between the components on the ground but often had to be obtained through agency Headquarters.

The First Year Action Plan included the post of an international Regional Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) for 7 months but this post was later converted into short-term consultancies. It is quite likely that a CTA with overall responsibility for the programme would have provided more efficient coordination and obtained more synergies between the components and between the agencies.

5.3 Resource use

A complex programme such as the present one, implemented quickly under difficult conditions, will by its nature require substantive inputs from HQ and programme staff, as well as from short-term consultants. The technical and administrative agency backstopping is covered under the agency support costs (USD 0.5 million), whereas programme staff and consultants appear on the programme budget lines 11 to 19. The Japanese grant was divided between the agencies into three separate

budgets, as mentioned earlier. A review of the resulting budgets show that professional and support staff costs consumed USD 1.7 million, of which 30% was for international consultants and the balance for national personnel and travel costs. Component 4, the Communication Platform and hubs used 72% of its budget for consultancies, which is considered natural in view of the nature of the work to be done. Overall, UNIDO used 41% of its budget on staff costs, while the corresponding figure for the ILO was 24%. The other large amounts went into in-service training and seminars (USD 1 million) and procurement of equipment – cars, computers, training equipment and materials, etc. – (USD 1 million). The balance went into operational expenses.

It should be noted that both UNIDO and ILO contributed to the programme by using their own resources at a level of close to USD one million for each of the agencies. This included, inter alia, UNIDO initial Support to the MRU Secretariat at a cost of EUR 575,000, and ILO funding the road rehabilitation in Côte d'Ivoire as a training ground (USD 180,000), as well as the international consultants to set up the Employment Services and Skills Development. The ILO also supported the YETO posts financially as well as MRU programme monitoring and technical backstopping through the country focal point.

Three factors in particular impacted on the cost-effectiveness. The first one was the time pressure to spend the Japanese grant very quickly, a pressure that increased considerably around October 2009, when it was still unclear if an extension in time might be granted by the donor. This probably led to hasty decisions that could have benefitted from more reflection. The second factor is the financial rules of the agencies which are not conducive to implementation of field projects under difficult conditions. The third factor is the lack of joint strategic planning on how best to tackle the problems of youth employment on the ground.

However, given these provisos, the hard work of the staff succeeded in making the implementation to be as efficient as the conditions would allow.

5.4 Monitoring and evaluation

One objective of component 4 implemented by UNIDO "Special Programmes" Unit is described as: "Ongoing quality monitoring and evaluation of the programme focusing on actual impact on youth lives from the youth's perspectives, particularly marginalised youth", with the associated means of verification being: "Steering committee reports".

Regular monitoring reports have been produced by the various project officers in accordance with the usual formats of the respective agencies. The focus has been on implementation issues, and little sharing of these reports has occurred. Since only one steering committee meeting was held at the beginning of the project, steering committee reports to document the overall progress do not exist.

Taking into account the difficulties to systematically assess project impact during the short duration of the project, the YEN decided to conduct a rigorous case study on one of the youth groups supported under component 1b. To this end, they randomly selected one beneficiary and one control group under the grant for women entrepreneurship training in Liberia. The results of this impact assessment are expected to be available in early 2011. Neither UNIDO nor ILO planned for a similar exercise.

Under component 4, a fair amount of information was collected but only on the activities under this component. The initial idea of a unified programme-wide monitoring under this component did not materialize.

Because no evaluation funds were retained under this component, or under the programme as a whole, the UNIDO evaluation unit had to mobilize evaluation funds from separate sources to enable this independent evaluation. This practice is not in line with the UNIDO evaluation policy.

6. Ownership and sustainability

In spite of strong backing to the programme from the MRU Governments being repeatedly expressed, only one Steering Committee meeting took place, at the very beginning of the programme in November 2008. Since then the Committee did not meet. In the programme document national steering committees were foreseen for all countries but only in Côte d'Ivoire such a committee was established – but only in December 2009 and with less frequent meetings than planned. Formally, the MRU Secretariat hosts the programme but (except for Côte d'Ivoire) the MRU Secretariat representations in the countries were not even informed about the programme. The HQ of the MRU Secretariat in Freetown considers the programme a UN exercise that they support by making office space available, but over which they take no ownership or initiative. This is a cause for concern, not only for the sustainability of the achievements but also as a missed opportunity to involve the Secretariat in fund-raising for the next phases.

The Government representatives met during the evaluation were generally favourable to the programme (“We need it!”), but many expressed discomfort with the level of information they received. Information about the financial situation related to the shortages of funding for the full first year as well as subsequent years was only given at a general level. A recurrent point that was made by government officials was the need for leadership, - which the complex implementation modality was unable to produce.

Ownership by national partners varies by country. In Guinea, the ownership by the Ministry of Youth is still limited, whereas ILO's *Maison de l'Emploi* initiative in Kissidougou was successfully owned by AGUIPE. The office is still running with 3 staff members, even though ILO stopped its activities. In Côte d'Ivoire, the programme supported mostly existing national initiatives (pilot PFS, PRODIGE, AGEROUTE, national SIYB network...etc.). These activities are also part of the Decent Work Country Programme signed by the national tripartite constituents, which is a strength in terms of ownership. The MRU programme in Côte d'Ivoire provided a good opportunity for putting in place a national steering committee, building partnerships with the local administration, large businesses and the Japanese embassy. It gave visibility to the implementing agencies and to the Japanese government.

The direct involvement of local authorities in the programme was negligible in Sierra Leone and Liberia. District Councils and Chiefs expressed great interest in the programme, but did not feel they were given any ownership over it. This is quite surprising, as a strong local ownership could go a long way to ensure that the activities will correspond to local needs, and to help overcome practical problems as they crop up. This was shown in Côte d'Ivoire where local governments were closely associated. For example in Agou and Grand Bassam, the local government provided the women's group with a site, offered its political support to the programme, and nominated 2 focal points. Also all the Platform Services are housed by the district councils and the staff paid by them.

As the YEN projects are still under implementation, it is difficult to say whether the achievements and benefits are likely to be sustained. So far, the beneficiaries have not been organized in cooperatives yet and their management capacities are limited. They still rely heavily on the coordinators of the projects.

None of the communication hubs are currently self-sustainable. They have been receiving a high level of support from UNIDO and will continue needing that for some time to come. It is not clear, whether this level of support will become available.

7. Conclusions

A good start has been made, but the job is not finished. Much uncertainty remains as to whether the training will result in gainful employment and decent work for rural and urban youth, especially the stated target groups of *“under- and unemployed youth, particularly marginalized poor urban youth”*.

The selection of the border areas for direct training interventions made a lot of sense, since these were the breeding grounds of rebellion and destruction. Although many young people from there have since migrated to the cities, the border areas still have a high population of youths who missed schooling and lack employable skills. However, the design of the programme did not limit itself to targeting this population but went out to comprise a much broader selection. The result was a complex programme with many target groups and facing considerable challenges in implementation.

The training approaches were not coordinated between the agencies. The contents of the trainings were mostly designed without reference to market surveys and future trends. ILO’s SIYB training was delivered by competent consultants, in Côte d’Ivoire in partnership with the national SIYB Network. In Guinea, SIYB training was done by 3AE, a parastatal institution specialized in SIYB training (2 master trainers) and microfinance (recognized by the Central Bank of Guinea). UNIDO used its own training programmes, while the training under the YEN grant scheme varied with the proposals of the implementing partners.

Inviting business owners or managers to the training sessions was a useful means for experience sharing with the trainees and a practical way of building trainee capacities and giving them exposure to the business world.

The ILO’s SIYB cycle is relatively long. It was not possible to train up to the master trainer level in one year. Without certified master trainers to carry out ToT, the replication of the SIYB tools will be limited. There is also a need for training in new SIYB products (rural and female entrepreneurship).

The use of existing MSE entrepreneurs as trainers under component 1a in a real business environment does help to ensure that the training will be relevant to local markets. However, it is not at all clear that it will lead to (self-) employment of the trainees, as this will also depend on the continued market demand and their access to financial services. The short training of these trainers (mostly through a study tour) has been insufficient for them to impart on their trainees the necessary skills to become business people who understand the market, are able to prepare and use financial records, and establish and manage a bank account. For the results to become sustainable, more support to the trainers is needed, especially through coaching in the fields of business understanding and microfinance. The prospects of such follow-up support were unclear at the time of evaluation.

The shortfalls in delivery of training materials reduced the effectiveness of the training.

Not everyone has the ability and resolution to become a successful entrepreneur, and selection of those with high potential is paramount. While many youths may be streetwise or have other qualifications, it would be too optimistic to think that they would all qualify for – or have ambitions to become – self-employed business-people. Follow-up support to the most committed is necessary for a maximum of the trainees to succeed in this respect.

The trades selected for training are conventional and widespread in the rural areas, and competition within them is already high. In spite of the border areas having high agricultural potential, very little training is done in agriculture-related fields such as improved food processing and providing services for agricultural production.

The YEN grant scheme is intended to allow national/local community-based youth organizations to actively participate in employment generating projects, especially innovative ones. The majority of projects funded under the Grant Scheme are indeed quite innovative. For example, the waste recycling projects in Guinea and Sierra Leone are expected to generate revenues, jobs and protect the environment, as well as develop relationships with the business sector and promote craftsmanship. The *moringa oleifera* project in Guinea promotes the use of this specific tree to produce tea leaves, butter, water purifier, soap, oil, fertilizer, etc.

The Communication Platform represents a new approach that is being tested in the four countries. It has generated considerable interest and support from the youths as well as from governments. If promoted widely, it has the potential to become an important means of communication between the main stakeholders with interest in youth employment, such as youth organisations, NGOs, private employers, ministries and others. However, at the time of the evaluation no direct effect in getting young people into jobs could be ascertained by the platform managers in the four countries.

Decent Work principles were emphasised in some components but less so in others. The concept is integrated in most ILO training programmes. Some workshops in the border areas were well-organised with adequate measures for occupational safety, but there were also cases without such measures, where the workshop presented a real hazard to the trainees. More emphasis should be placed on this area. The conditions under which the programme staff were hired clearly fell outside of what could be called decent work due to short and precarious contracts with gaps in between.

The basic funding principles for training became a subject of much debate among the implementing agencies and project managers, and the result was a mix of different approaches being applied. Immediate post-conflict recovery often involves free training offers, sometimes with a payment to the trainees. Moving on from there into more normal development situations where training services come at a cost can be difficult, as the affected populations become used to being paid for their participation.

UNIDO trainees in the border areas do not receive any incentive payment (such as a stipend, or a free lunch...), and trainers are not paid salaries but receive some equipment and training materials as their compensation. This minimalist approach gives some assurance of a real interest by the trainees, and a commitment of the trainers to their communities. Opposed to that, the ILO/SIYB general position is that all training should be paid for. In trainings offered by YEN grant scheme recipients, i.e. local youth-led CSOs, it is common that trainees are being paid a wage during their training.

Computer training in the communication hubs is given for a fee, reportedly below market rates. This is necessary if the hubs are to become self-sustained.

The Evaluation Team considers the differences in approaches applied in the MRU programme as flexible adaptations to local conditions – unproblematic in the given contexts.

The ownership by stakeholders varies. While the MRU Secretariat did not feel ownership, the support in principle from other stakeholders was quite strong. What is needed is a much stronger direct involvement of them in the programme. This should be taken very seriously in the event of a new phase being conceived.

The programme was not Delivered as One, and a number of potential synergies were missed – the development and joint use of ILO’s SIYB programme especially represents a missed opportunity. A national coordinator was appointed in each country, and a regional coordinator to oversee the overall programme. However, these staff came into place at a late point in time and did not have the opportunity to participate in the hiring of field staff. Regular programme meetings at country level, bringing all the components together, were not held; instead programme staff tended to refer and report vertically within their own system rather than horizontally.

The conditions on the funding – to produce results in a very short time – proved a real constraint, and UNIDO had to be granted an extension. The administrative bureaucracy further led to extensive delays and costly waste of time that should have been spent on substantive issues instead. The agencies’ reputation came under stress as a consequence – frustration was expressed in the case of ILO over an abrupt closure, while UNIDO was criticized for not being able to deliver the full support.

Monitoring and evaluation were given too limited attention under the programme. This flaw is probably one of the consequences of the extreme implementation pressure under which the programme was executed. However, this practice is not commensurate with the considerable financial volume of the operation and its nature as a “pilot”. Only YEN included a systematic impact assessment under its component. The programme-wide monitoring and evaluation under component 4 did not materialize. Project funds for an independent evaluation were not retained.

7.1 Lessons learnt

The programme became overly complex and difficult to manage, due to high geographical and linguistic diversity, with three implementing partners addressing too many different target groups. A simpler programme design would have been better adapted to the short duration given for implementation of the Japanese grant. Quite likely, it would have resulted in reduced spending pressure and more efficient implementation. Longer-term capacity development through training programmes such as SIYB requires more than one year.

An important lesson is that the use of short-term emergency funding for medium-term income creation activities entails considerable risk and should be avoided. Efficiency may be compromised by excessive spending pressure and it may not be possible to complete essential tasks during the short period of time. Short-term funding should only be accepted if supplemented by:

- Planning of a quick-impact programme that can be implemented within the fixed time frame, *in casu* one year, with the available funding. All procurement (including vehicles, IT equipment etc.) should be local in order to save time and rapidly become operational. Local service providers already in place should be drawn upon as much as feasible.
- Revising the overall programme into phase 1 and phase 2, with the longer-term institutional capacity building objectives being limited to phase 2.

- Immediately designing and embarking on a joint fund-raising campaign for phase 2. All the stakeholders should participate actively in the campaign.

The formulation of a joint programme document limited to the Japanese grant, with activities tailored to what was realistic and feasible within the prescribed (very short) time, and with a clear exit strategy in case no further funding would become available in time for a smooth continuation, should have been prepared jointly by the partner agencies. This would have been helpful to manage expectations better, and avoid disappointments.

The selection of the border areas was well justified but also presented heavy logistical challenges. Procurement of building materials, equipment and training materials to a variety of small businesses in a difficult environment, using bureaucratic procurement procedures that led to some purchases having to be repeated or redone several times, took up a disproportionate part of the field staff's time. A lesson to learn here is to avoid turning programme staff into procurement officers, but rather outsource the function to a professional procurement agent – a company with experience and knowledge of the local scene.

Although “marginalised urban youths” formed part of the target group as described in the programme document, the majority of urban youth that became involved in the programme have achieved education, with many being college or university graduates. They may come from poor backgrounds, but by virtue of their education their chances in life are far better than those of the really marginalised youth – exactly the very visible urban youth who missed schooling during the wars – that the programme argued to be a danger to political stability. These are a difficult segment to address, but efforts ought to be made to find ways to integrate as many as possible into mainstream economic activity.

Coordination of the training, especially through the use of SIYB and other packages, could have resulted in more employment opportunities being generated, especially if follow-up programme activities such as linkages with micro-finance and potential markets had been based on a common conceptual platform. The abrupt end of funding especially for the ILO components in December 2009 contributed to making such an approach impossible. Unfortunately, the high expectations of the involved youths became frustrated.

The intention to “Deliver as One” should have been followed up at high managerial level in the involved agencies, to formulate the avenue to be followed in the collaboration – with clear lines of reporting and delegation of authority. The approach should aim at flexibility at the country level, and take into consideration the institutional rules and regulations that can make the implementation of field projects by UN agencies slow and unnecessarily rigid.

The “Delivering as One” approach as formulated in the HLP report focuses on coordination of the UN agencies at country level; it is less concerned with the regional and subregional levels. There are four “Ones” at country level: One Programme; One Budgetary Framework and Fund; One Leader; and One Office. The MRU Youth Employment programme does not have One Office (which is anyway less important in this case), and it certainly has “Many Leaders”. Initially, the programme was described as One Programme with One Budgetary framework – however, the “One Programme” was quickly divided into “Many Components” and assigned to different implementing agencies, and the “One Budget” was split accordingly. It became Receiving as One and Delivering as Many.

The Delivering as One is an important part of the UN reform process, which is considered by many as indispensable for the UN system to continue its relevance as an important partner in international development cooperation. Its implementation is not without difficulties, but good progress is being made in many countries. This is in line with other trends in international development cooperation, such as those of the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness which also leads to simplified reporting procedures and uniform financial management procedures. The full-scale “Delivering as One” approach must inspire any follow-up MRU programme, by bringing the three Ones together in a new cooperation framework, with special emphasis on One Leader – overall, but also in each country.

8. Recommendations

Scenario 1 – one-year perspective (exit strategy)

1. As a matter of urgency UNIDO should secure the necessary funding to allow for an honourable completion of the programme. As lead agency, UNIDO should consult with ILO and YEN and prepare a planning document with a clear exit strategy and a contingency plan for the handing over of physical assets to the partner organisations. The emphasis should be on completion of what has been started, particularly in the border areas: providing the promised supplies of training materials, organising graduation of trainees, strengthening the business skills of the trainers, carrying out market surveys in new markets, formulating business plans that are tested and followed up, and bringing the trainees into contact with MFIs in the local areas with a view to form groups and get access to capital. Further support to the communication platform and hubs can be included to the extent that funds are available.

Scenario 2 – four-year perspective

2. UNIDO should invite the MRU Secretariat to convene the partners for the formulation of a joint fundraising strategy that should be effectively owned and driven by the Secretariat. Under the guidance of the MRU Secretariat, the initial design of the four-year programme should be subjected to a joint review by all main stakeholders before a fundraising campaign is launched. The programme document should be revised so as to reflect any new priorities as well as the lessons learnt from the first year in terms of design, implementation modalities and management. UNDP, UNCDF and the UN Peace-Building Fund (UNPBF) should be invited to be part of the review and future partnership.
3. When redesigning the approach of a future programme the partners should consider the following:
 - (a) Go beyond training and identify new and innovative sectors and technologies that can generate jobs. Promising sectors include agriculture and fisheries, where it should be possible to link up with on-going or planned development programmes to ensure that skilled manpower is available to support them. The energy sector offers opportunities in power and wind power technologies that lend themselves to small-scale production.
 - (b) Re-focus on marginalised and uneducated urban youths as an important target group as it was intended in the initial design.
 - (c) Promote SIYB as the main business training tool in the programme, to be used in all relevant activities. A target of 20 master trainers should be set for each participating country to ensure the continued presence of sufficient ToT capacity.
 - (d) Enter into negotiations with big MFIs about an innovative financing scheme by which the Government (with programme funding) accepts to provide the MFI with a collateral fund. In return, the fund would be managed in a professional way and many youth entrepreneurs could benefit from it. Experience in other West African countries has shown this as a feasible

way for the Government to help start-ups get access to loan capital. The expertise of ILO's Social Finance programme should be drawn upon in this effort.

4. The coordination mechanisms of a future programme should be improved and aligned with the Delivering as One principles. These principles should be considered as preconditions for the joint approach to succeed; in case one or more of the participating agencies is not willing or able to adhere to them, it may be better for it to opt out.
 - h) The MRU Steering Committee is revived and a plan with six-monthly meetings convened and organised by the MRU Secretariat is agreed up-front. The MRU Secretariat appoints one of its senior staff members as the Programme Director to be in charge of the overall coordination.
 - i) The UN team at country level will have one dedicated leader from one of the participating agencies with the post of Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) to be placed with the main partner organisation (such as the MRU Secretariat, Ministry of Youth, Ministry of Employment, Ministry of Industry, Chamber of Commerce, etc.).
 - j) The CTA will be the first to be recruited and he/she will participate in the recruitment of all other programme staff; all staff will be offered one-year contracts with possibility of extension; they will report technically to the CTA regardless of their agency affiliation; the CTA will ensure a high level of information sharing with the partner organisations, as well as within the country team through the holding of bi-weekly team meetings.
 - k) There will be one programme budget for each country administered on a daily basis by the CTA who will also assign duties from the country programme within the country programme team.
 - l) The CTA will have an imprest account available for operating costs of the programme such as transport, training seminars, printing of materials; all procurement for on-the-job training (equipment, training materials...) will be outsourced to a competent local procurement agent with external auditing.
 - m) Agency Headquarters, ROs and AOs will take charge of fund-raising, policy guidance, monitoring and evaluation, and support the country operations with technical backstopping and advice, but without getting involved in day-to-day programme management.
 - n) Coordination among UNIDO, ILO and YEN Secretariat should be based not only on perceived comparative advantages but also on joint activities in the implementation phase, building synergies by targeting specific youth groups. Clear communication lines should be established throughout the implementation among partners at all levels – Headquarters, regional and country level.
5. The agencies (especially UNIDO) should review their financial rules and procurement procedures with a view to decentralise and enable efficient and timely delivery of operational activities at the country level.

ANNEX 1: Terms of Reference

TOR for the Independent Evaluation of the Project

Multi-stakeholder Programme for Productive and Decent Work for Youth

in the Manu River Union (MRU) (TF/RAF/08/025/A25/B25)

A. Introduction and Rationale for the Evaluation

The “Multi-stakeholder Programme for Productive and Decent Work for Youth in the Manu River Union (MRU)” countries is being implemented by UNIDO, ILO and YEN SECRETARIAT to support the urgent call from governments and other players to address the huge youth employment challenge in the region. The first phase of the programme started in September 2008 with funding of 5 million USD from the Government of Japan. The overall envelope and responsibility of this funding was given to UNIDO. Table 1 shows the distribution of the budget by components and implementing agencies.

Table 1

Programme components	USD
TF/RAF/08/025 (UNIDO in Sierra Leone and Liberia)	1,223,095
TF/RAF/08/A25 (UNIDO in Guinea and Côte d’Ivoire)	1,110,700
TF/RAF/08/B25 (UNIDO communication platform and Youth Forum)	753,460
TF/RAF/08/C25 (ILO component)	1,056,207
TF/RAF//08/D25 (YEN Secretariat component)	440,978
Total (excluding PSC):	4,584,440
Total (including PSC):	5,000,000

The ILO and YEN SECRETARIAT components were completed on 31 December 2009 and the UNIDO components are expected to be finalized by 30 June 2010. An independent evaluation of this first phase of the programme is mandatory for both UNIDO and ILO in line with their respective evaluation policies. The focus of this evaluation should be on the realization of programme outputs and outcomes. In addition, the evaluation should show the emerging impact and potential “impact drivers” that might be built into future programmes.

The evaluation should be conducted jointly by UNIDO, ILO and YEN SECRETARIAT and examine the relevance, strategic fit and validity of the programme design, and assess programme outcomes from the point of view of effectiveness, efficiency of resource use, and sustainability. It should also review the institutional arrangements for programme management, monitoring and evaluation in the four countries of intervention. In addition to the assessment of what has been done, the evaluation should be forward looking, describing lessons learned and providing guidance for the design of a possible future phase of this programme and of similar programmes/projects elsewhere. The evaluation must adhere to the Norms and Standards of the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG), the quality standards of the OECD Development Assistance Committee and the evaluation policies and key principles of project evaluation of the three participating UN Organizations.

B. Background of the Programme

The programme covers the MRU countries Sierra Leone, Liberia, Guinea and Côte d'Ivoire. The programme aimed to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development and peace consolidation in the MRU countries by creating opportunities for decent and productive work for under and unemployed youth in the sub region.

The countries of the Mano River Union have one of the world's youngest and poorest populations. Nearly three out of four people in the sub-region, or 71.3%, are under the age of 30 and youth unemployment rates run around 70%, and are as high as 88% in Liberia. Female youth, often overlooked in youth employment programmes, deserve special attention as they account for half of the youth population. When young people do find a job, it is often in the informal economy, in low-paid, low skilled and unprotected jobs.

The grave and damaging effects on already vulnerable youth populations from long years of civil conflict have made it difficult for Governments to cope with a complex youth-employment equation, which requires job-creation, skills-upgrading in urban and rural areas, conflict-management, reconciliation, and peace-building. Each of these constitutes a serious challenge and, cumulatively, they pose a major hurdle that needs to be overcome.

The future of the MRU countries, and West Africa as a whole, is conditioned by the prospects for young people, in terms of finding decent jobs and means of livelihood. Without a resolution to this problem, difficulties of establishing genuine peace, security, and development in the sub-region will continue to exert spill over-effects throughout West Africa. In addition, the young people in these countries will face pressures to migrate illegally, and at considerable risk to themselves. Irregular and uncontrolled migration can have adverse consequences for both, the home and the host country.

Overcoming the threats requires concerted efforts by governments, the international community, constituents, the private sector, youth themselves, and other relevant stakeholders to generate prospects that afford a better future for young people hence the commitment of ILO, UNIDO and YEN SECRETARIAT to "deliver as one" on the issue of youth employment in the sub-region. The "Multi-stakeholder Programme for Productive and Decent Work for Youth in MRU countries and Côte d'Ivoire" is therefore a response to increasing calls for harnessing the capacities of youth as a potential social and economic resource for peace building and stability. Accordingly, the principal aim of the programme is to contribute to the socio-political stability and pro-poor economic growth in the sub-region by providing opportunities for employment creation.

Table 2 shows the structure of the programme by components, countries and implementing partners. The institutional arrangement of the programme consists of three levels: MRU secretariat based in Sierra Leone, Sub Regional Steering Committee and the Technical Management Unit. The MRU Secretary General coordinates the implementation of the programme in addition to advocating for continued political support for the programme and mobilization of partners and donors. The Sub Regional Steering Committee, co-chaired by the Secretary General and the UNIDO Representative for the Mano River Union, is responsible for the establishment of programme policies and for overseeing the implementation of activities carried out under the programme and serves as the final decision making body.

Table 2: Programme components and activities by country

	Sierra Leone	Liberia	Guinea	Côte d'Ivoire
1a) Promotion and development of youth-led businesses and social projects				
UNIDO	Youth business entrepreneurship skill development programme (Kailahun, Koindu)	Youth business entrepreneurship skill development programme (Ganta)	Community-based skills upgrading based on CPC in Forest Guinea (Guéckédou)	Entrepreneurship caravan (entrepreneurial awareness, skills and education, 8 districts)
ILO	N/A	BDS services for youth entrepreneurship (Monrovia)	Youth Employment Programme and IYB trainers network implemented in Forest Guinea (Kissidougou)	Support to SYB/IYB network and PRODIGE (four districts)
1b) Financial scheme for youth-led projects				
YEN	Competitive grant scheme	Competitive grant scheme	Competitive grant scheme	Competitive grant scheme
UNIDO	Financial sector study	Financial sector study	Financial sectors study	Financial sector study
2a) Programmes to give youth employable skills, in partnership with private sector businesses, based on Corporate Social responsibility				
UNIDO	Pilot youth technical skills programme	Pilot youth technical skills programme	Semi-skills upgrading programme in mining areas of Forest Guinea (Beyla, Lola)	Private led partnerships for market-oriented youth skills
2b) Training and skills development to increase employability of youth				
ILO	Up to date courses and curricula for TVET institutions developed	Up to date courses and curricula for TVET institutions (Ganta)	Report on workforce development for the mining sector cluster	AGEROUTE on-the-job-training and SME development schemes strengthened
			Strategic development plan for the Salon de l'Emploi et de la Formation	Dual apprenticeship scheme developed in four districts
3) Sub regional Labour Market Intermediation (Employment services) and Information Services				
ILO	Work plan for establishment of 6 - 13 job centers	Mobile employment services units	Self-sustaining LIMS at the local level (Kissidougou)	Local employment services in Abidjan and southern areas strengthened, including study on FDI requirements
UNIDO	Country programme management & logistics	Country programme management & logistics	Country programme management & logistics	Country programme management & logistics
4) Sub regional youth forum, experience sharing and programme management				
UNIDO	Communication platform Youth forum Steering Committee			

The Technical Management Unit is responsible for the effective integration and harmonization of available technical and human resources. The Unit is headed by a Programme Coordinator, who is responsible for the day to day management of the programme. The Programme

Coordinator works closely with National Coordinators who are responsible for the implementation of the programme at country level. National Coordinators are working closely with national partners. In addition, partner agencies have assigned programme staff at different level. For example, ILO has assigned one Youth Employment Technical Officer (YETO) per country that was responsible for the project implementation as per the work plan designed. ILO has also recruited MRU Specialists in Liberia to oversee activities in all four countries. These included the Skills Specialist, Employment Specialist and a UN Joint Programme Manager.

C. Purpose, Scope and Clients of the evaluation

Purpose:

The purpose of this evaluation is to determine the appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the joint programme so as to learn from these experiences to continuously improve performance and outcomes. In addition, it is expected that the evaluation findings will lead to conclusions and recommendations useful for future joint programme management and implementation.

The findings of the evaluation will contribute to improving the next phase of the programme and provide lessons learned for the key stakeholders of the programme and the ILO, UNIDO, YEN SECRETARIAT in their future efforts of dealing with similar programmes.

Hence, the specific objectives of the final evaluation are:

- To assess progress made towards achieving the objectives set out in the programme document and the impact of the initiatives implemented during the first phase in terms of changes in policies and institutions and increased decent work prospects for young people, as well as identify areas that can be sustained and scaled-up;
- To verify that funds were used effectively and efficiently to deliver results;
- To measure the extent to which ILO, UNIDO and YEN SECRETARIAT have individually and collectively contributed to achieve the programme objectives.
- To assess the extent to which the programme has contributed to the achievement of national development goals that relate to the promotion of decent work for young people in each of the four countries (including contribution to and alignment with the National Development Plans, UNDAF, DWCPs, (where available) and UNIDO National Cooperation frameworks),
- To identify “good” practice and share lessons learned regarding the promotion of decent work for youth (e.g. relevance of the strategy and methodological and institutional arrangements for promoting decent employment for youth within the national development frameworks, and for strengthening national capacity to promote decent work for youth);
- To identify and explain any difficulties or challenges, specific to the context or overall implementation, and suggest ways of overcoming them in the next phase;

Scope:

This independent evaluation will look into the Multi-stakeholder Programme for Productive and Decent Work for Youth implemented in the four countries as well as those works implemented at sub-regional and regional levels from September 2008 to date by the programme. As this is a joint programme of ILO, UNIDO and YEN SECRETARIAT, the evaluation should look at the working relationship and joint achievement of the three different organizations and analyze progress made independently as well as jointly by the organizations. The evaluation will also assess the management and coordination of the programme.

Clients:

The principal clients for this evaluation are the MRU secretariat; the governments of Sierra Leone, Liberia, Guinea and Côte d'Ivoire; the government of Japan; the Sub Regional Steering Committee and the Technical Management Unit; UNIDO, ILO (Regional Office, ILO Dakar, ILO Abuja and sectors/YEP), YEN SECRETARIAT, ILO and UNIDO constituents, as well as stakeholders and implementing partners in the programme countries.

D. Key evaluation questions and analytical framework

The questions to be addressed will be further refined after consultation with the programme team and local stakeholders. This list must therefore be considered tentative.

- I. Relevance and strategic fit
 - To what extent did the programme support national development priorities and policies on youth employment, ILO's Decent Work Country Programmes, ILO Policy on youth employment and UNIDO National Cooperation frameworks?
 - How well did the programme complement other relevant programmes/initiatives of ILO, UNIDO, YEN SECRETARIAT and other UN or non-UN international development aid organizations in the target countries?
- II. Validity of design
 - Was the design process adequate? Was it based on a needs analysis of the target groups? How have stakeholders been involved in programme planning and implementation? Was a gender analysis included?
 - Was the resulting programme design logical and coherent? Is the intervention logic from outputs to outcomes and to the development objective logical and plausible?
 - Did the project design give adequate attention to assumptions and risks? Is the logical framework complete (vertical and horizontal logic?)
 - With the benefit of hindsight, were the programme design and strategy realistic?
- III. Programme progress and effectiveness
 - Have the quantity and quality of the outputs produced been satisfactory? To what extent did the programme achieve its objectives?
 - Has the programme been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional etc. changes in the programme environment?
 - Do the benefits accrue equally to young men and women?
 - In which areas (geographic, outcomes) does the programme have the greatest achievements? Why is this and what are the supporting factors? How can these achievements be scaled-up in the next phase? In which areas (geographic, outcomes) does the programme have the least achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they be improved?
- IV. Effectiveness of management arrangements and efficiency of resource use

- To what extent were the management, monitoring, and governance arrangements for the programme of the joint programme partners (ILO, UNIDO and YEN SECRETARIAT) adequate? Was there a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities by all parties involved? Did project staff on the ground receive adequate management support?
- Were the available resources adequate and efficiently used?
- How effectively did the programme management monitor programme performance and results? Was a monitoring & evaluation system in place and how effective is it?
- Has cooperation among programme partners (ILO, UNIDO, YEN SECRETARIAT) been efficient? What is the value addition of the cooperation/ jointness of the programme? Was there a mechanism to facilitate coherence and synergy by the partners? How effective was it?

V. Ownership and sustainability

- How effective has the programme been in establishing national ownership?
- How is the programme perceived by national and local authorities and partners?
- Did the programme receive adequate political, technical and administrative support from its national partners?
- Is there any progress in national programme partners' capacity to carry forward the programme?
- Did the programme succeed in integrating its approach into government administrative institutions?

VI Recommendations and lessons learned

- What are the recommendations for the design and implementation of the next phase of the project? How could the synergy between the different implementing organizations be enhanced?
- How should monitoring and evaluation be organized at the different levels of the programme (regional; national; project)? What could be appropriate indicators and monitoring tools?
- What good practices can be learned from the programme that can be applied to similar future projects? What should have been different, and should be avoided in similar future projects?
- Can the programme approach be replicated and scaled up in Mano River Union countries and/or in other regions with similar problems elsewhere?

E. Main Outputs and Deliverables of the Evaluation

The main expected output is an evaluation report on the “Plan of Action for Year One” of the “Multi-Stakeholder Programme for Productive and Decent Work for Youth in Mano River Union Countries”.

The report will analyze experience made during design and implementation, offer recommendations for possible future work of the “Multi-Stakeholder Programme for Productive and Decent Work for Youth in Mano River Union Countries” and lessons learned that could be applicable to future UNIDO, ILO and YEN SECRETARIAT initiatives in conflict-affected countries.

The main deliverables of the evaluation are:

- First Draft of the evaluation report
- Final draft of the evaluation report incorporating comments received
- Evaluation summary

The consultants are expected to present the evaluation findings in a workshop that will be organized in Freetown, Sierra Leone as well as at debriefings at the HQs or regional office of the participating Organizations.

The Evaluation Report should be about 25 pages long, excluding annexes and conform with the quality checklist for evaluation reports. It should contain the following: -

- Cover page with key programme data (programme title, donor, programme start and completion dates, budget, technical area, managing unit, geographical coverage); and evaluation data (type of evaluation, managing unit, start and completion dates of the evaluation mission, name(s) of evaluator(s), date of submission of evaluation report).
- Executive Summary
- Brief background on the programme and its logic
- Purpose and scope of the evaluation
- Methodology
- Findings structured along the lines of the DAC evaluation criteria
- Recommendations, including whom they are addressed to, on improvements in strategy and possible future directions
- Lessons Learned for future interventions
- Annexes – Work schedule and persons interviewed
 - List of programme outputs examined
 - Other documents consulted

F. Methodology

The evaluation is an independent evaluation and will be conducted jointly by a team of two international evaluators (one contracted by UNIDO and one by ILO). The methodology and evaluation questions will be determined by the evaluators in consultation with the Evaluation Managers and important stakeholders. The evaluators should propose the methods for data collection and analysis. All data should be sex-disaggregated and different needs of women and men and of marginalized groups targeted by the programme should be considered throughout the evaluation process.

The evaluators will carry out a desk review of the programme document, progress reports, tools developed under the programme, etc soft copies of which will be submitted to them by the MRU secretariat, Technical Management Unit/Programme Co-ordinator, National Coordinators, ILO, UNIDO and YEN SECRETARIAT. This review will be followed by a field mission of two to three weeks that will include meetings with the concerned UNIDO, ILO and YEN SECRETARIAT officials in Addis Ababa, Geneva and Vienna, the MRU secretariat in Sierra Leone, the Technical Management Unit and the National Coordinators in the programme countries and programme beneficiaries. The evaluation team will submit a mission plan covering the four partner countries that will be refined with the evaluation managers during the actual planning of the evaluation process.

A draft evaluation report will be presented to the Evaluation Managers and shared with the MRU secretariat, Technical management Unit, National Coordinator, ILO, UNIDO and YEN SECRETARIAT for comments. Consolidated comments will be sent to the evaluator for integration into the Final Evaluation Report. A summary of the evaluation report that conforms with both the ILO and UNIDO templates will be submitted separately along with the final evaluation report.

G. Management Arrangements, Work Plan and Time Frame

Management arrangements: The evaluation will be jointly managed by Mr. Gugsu Yimer Farice, Senior M&E Officer, RO-Addis, Peter Loewe, Senior Evaluation Officer, UNIDO, as well as Mr. Markus

Pilgrim from YEN SECRETARIAT. The managers will provide support, oversee the evaluation process, consolidate comments and ensure that the report corresponds with the criteria for quality control of the organizations.

Stakeholders' role: All stakeholders in the region, particularly the MRU secretariat, Technical management Unit, National Coordinators, relevant government partners, beneficiaries, constituents, UNIDO and ILO Offices and YEN SECRETARIAT will be consulted in all the process.

Support by the offices: The Technical Management Unit in Sierra Leone and the National Coordinators in the programme countries as well as UNIDO and ILO Offices in Vienna, Dakar and Abuja will ensure that all relevant documentation is made available well in advance to the consultant and will assist the evaluators with logistic and administrative support throughout the evaluation process.

Work plan and timeframe:

Task	Source of information	Time frame
Desk review of the major documents: programme documents, progress reports, mission reports, work plans, and others	The MRU secretariat, Technical management Unit, National Coordinators, UNIDO, YEN SECRETARIAT, ILO Dakar, ILO Abuja and ILO HQ	5 working days
Interviews with project managers of UNIDO, ILO and YEN SECRETARIAT (at HQ and in the field) and with partner institutions and key stakeholders in the capitals of the four participating countries	Meetings will be held in respective UNIDO, YEN SECRETARIAT, ILO and government offices, the MRU secretariat, Technical Management Unit, National Coordinators, to be arranged by the Technical Management Unit.	5 working days
Field visits at selected project sites	The members of the evaluation team will visit selected project sites, either jointly or separately depending on time and logistics	11 working days
Validation workshop	The evaluators will present, discuss and validate preliminary findings at a validation workshop in Freetown	2 working days
Debriefing in Vienna	Debriefing of UNIDO HQ staff	1 working day
Preparation and delivery of the first evaluation report draft	The evaluators will draft the evaluation report and send it to the evaluation managers who will circulate it to the MRU secretariat, Technical management Unit, National Coordinators, UNIDO, YEN SECRETARIAT, ILO, and main national partners,	6 working days

Circulation of the draft report for comments	The evaluation managers collect comments and send them to the evaluators	-
Preparation of the final evaluation report	The evaluators incorporate comments as they deem appropriate and submit the final report to the evaluation managers	2 working days
Total working days for each evaluator		32 working days

H. Qualifications

The programme evaluation requires two independent, external international consultants. The international consultants should have at least 10 years of international experience in the area of employment, private sector development or related field, and proven track record in conducting independent evaluations. As a team they should be fluent in both French and English, and have demonstrated experience in drafting high quality programme reports in both languages. Experience in West Africa and in post crisis environments would be a strong advantage.

The consultants should be available from June 1 to July 15, 2010 for the assignment.

ANNEX 2: Persons met

Name	Title
UNIDO HQ	
Margareta De Goys	Director, Evaluation Group, Office of the DG
Peter Loewe	Senior Evaluation Officer, Evaluation Group, Office of the DG
Sei Hisakawa	Team Leader, MRU Youth Employment Programme, Unit Chief, PTC/AGR/RES
Doris Hribernegg	Head, Special Programmes and LDC Group (PTC/SPL)
Julia Roth	Youth Employment Officer, Special Programmes and LDC Group (PTC/SPL)
Matteo Landi	Associate Expert, Special Programmes and LDC Group (PTC/SPL)
ILO HQ and AOs	
Mpenga Kabundi	Deputy Director, Africa region, Geneva (by phone and videoconference)
Gianni Rosas	Coordinator, Youth Employment programme, Geneva (videoconference)
Diego Rei	Youth Employment programme, Geneva (videoconference)
Sina Chuma-Mkandawire	Director, ILO Abuja AO (videoconference)
Folasade Ayonrinde	Programme Officer, Focal Point for MRU programme in ILO Abuja AO (by phone)
Dramane Haidara	Deputy Director, ILO AO Dakar (videoconference)
Claude Yao Kouame	EIIP Specialist ILO Dakar (videoconference)
Tendai Pasipanodya	Subregional Coordinator, YEN Dakar
Toro Honoré Djerma	Back stopper MRU Programme in Guinea, ILO AO Dakar
Claude Kouamé Yao	Back stopper, MRU Programme in Côte d'Ivoire, ILO AO Dakar
Joseph J. M. Momo	Programme Specialist, ILO AO Dakar
Rheda Ameer	Programme Specialist, ILO AO Dakar
Sierra Leone	
Freetown	
Linda Krumah	Director, MRU Secretariat
Simon Moribah	Deputy Secretary General (Programs), MRU Secretariat
Kofi Kuman	Deputy Secretary General (Finance/Budget), MRU Secretariat
B. Orando Yanquoi	Programme Officer (Liberia), MRU Secretariat
Hon. David O. Corew	Minister, Ministry of Trade and Industry
Michael Touré	Industrial Development Officer, MTI, UNIDO Focal Point
Anthony Koroma	Director of youth, Ministry of Youth and Sports
Hon. Moignel Kaikai	Deputy Minister, Min. of Employment, Labour and Social Security
Sitie M Sesay	S.A.S., MoELSS
Mr Moussa	Ag. Labour Commissioner, MoELSS
Sia Lajaku-Williams	National Project Officer, ILO, (Child labour project), MoELSS
Nancy Smart	National Youth Employment Officer, MRU Programme
Stephen B. Kargbo	Head of Operations, UNIDO
Wahab Lera Shaw	Regional Facilitator, UNIDO, MRU Programme
Evelyn T. Alpha	Skills Development Consultant, UNIDO, MRU Programme
Alfred B. Jusu	Administrative Assistant, UNIDO, MRU Programme
Kabba Papa Sesay	National Expert in Youth Networking, MRU Programme
Juliana S. Fornah	National Expert in Youth Networking, UNIDO, MRU Programme
Nasir Thomas	National IT Expert, UNIDO, MRU Programme
Benjamin Noballa	Chief Executive Officer, Finance Salone Ltd.
Mapaki	

Name	Title
P C Mansapaki Kebombo II	Paramount Chief, Paki-Masabong Chiefdom, Bombali District
Patrick Koroma	Coordinator, Kafoima Youth Development Organisation (YEN grantee)
Trainers and Trainees	Mapaki Youth Training and Development Centre: tailoring, gara tie-dye, weaving, agriculture, blacksmithing
Kailahun	
Maada Ndolleh	Mayor of Kailahun
Tom Nyuma	Chairman, Kailahun District Council
Mustapha E Kuruma	Chief Administrator, Kailahun District Council
Samuka Kamura	Field Officer, UNIDO Kailahun
Mamie Dambo, + trainees	Trainer, gara tie-dye
Tambo Nabieu + trainees	Trainer, soap-making
Kakpana Boima + trainees	Trainer, tailoring
Mohamed Ishmail + trainees	Trainer, weaving
Umaru Aruna + trainees	Trainer, blacksmithing
Zainab Ngobeh	Trainer, hairdressing
Musu Karimu + trainees	Trainer, hairdressing
Tamba Allieu + trainees	Trainer, welding
Jinnah Mommoh + trainees	Trainer, mechanics
Morie Lansana + trainees	Trainer, ICT
Abu Bubangura + trainees	Trainer, carpentry
Kalilu Sampha + trainees	Trainer, tailoring
Koindu	
Fallah Jusu	Ag. Paramount Chief, Koindu
Tenneh Yembasu	Women's Queen
Fanta Joshua	Ward Councillor
Oren James	UNIDO Field Officer, Koindu
David Tolno + trainees	Trainer, carpentry
Mary Sesay + trainees	Trainer, gara tie-dye
Denis Nyuma + trainees	Trainer, tailoring
Bintu Allieu + trainees	Trainer, embroidery
Sia Kendor + trainees	Trainer, hairdressing
Tamba Focko	Trainer, weaving
Diana Foryoh	Trainer, gara tie-dye
Margaret James	Trainer, soap-making
Satta Gbondo	Trainer, soap-making
Sahr T Bundor + trainees	Trainer, building construction
Fayia Morie + trainees	Trainer, mechanics
Tamba Lahai	Trainer, blacksmithing
Liberia	
Monrovia	
Hon. Etmonia David Tarpeh	Minister, Ministry of Youth and Sports
George Saah	Head, National Bureau of Employment Services, Ministry of Labour
Abayomie Cooper	Employment Officer, National Bureau of Employment Services, Min. of Labour
Joloh Sonpon	Employment Officer, National Bureau of Employment Services, Min. of Labour
Smara Skoulidis	Head, UN Resident Coordinator's Office
Mohamed Kiawhen	UNIDO MRU country coordinator
Victor Kaydor	Youth Employment technical officer (YETO), ILO
Zuo Taylor	National expert, UNIDO (communication platform and hub)

Name	Title
Thomas J Barlue	National IT expert, UNIDO (communication platform and hub)
James Y Sumo	National expert, UNIDO (communication platform and hub)
Augustus M Zayzay	President, Federation of Liberian Youth (FLY)
Lena Cummings	West African Network for Peace (WANEP)
James Makor	West African Network for Peace (WANEP)
Grace Nyemah	West African Network for Peace (WANEP)
G Wesley Collins	West African Network for Peace (WANEP)
Org Nyaneh	West African Network for Peace (WANEP)
Bartholomew Colley	Consultant, Resource Centre for Community Empowerment (RECEIVE)
S K Duworko	Consultant, Resource Centre for Community Empowerment (RECEIVE)
Leroy M Beldeh	Country Coordinator, iEARN (YEN grantee)
Kimmie L Weeks	Executive Director, Youth Action International (YEN grantee)
Isaac and Evelina	Programme coordinators, Youth Action International (YEN grantee)
J Guankerwon Gweisah	Executive Director, Youth Education Foundation Initiative YEFI (YEN grantee)
Amos B Tweh	Programme Director, Youth Education Foundation Initiative YEFI (YEN grantee)
Augustine S Arkoi	Founder/CEO, Better Future Foundation, Inc. (YEN grantee)
Ganta - Nimba County	
D Dorr Cooper	Mayor, Gompe City Council
Joshua Kamoe	UNIDO Field Officer, Ganta
Amos Gbatu + trainees	Trainer, metalworks
Jalya Somers + trainees	Trainer, hairdressing
Yah T Kpoo + trainees	Trainer, tailoring
Alphonso Saye + trainees	Trainer, tailoring
Youkulo M Korboi + trainees	Trainer, motor mechanics
Angelina Korto + trainees	Trainer, hairdressing
Abott Quoi + trainees	Trainer, masonry
Tettee S Beito + trainees	Trainer, hairdressing
Jerry Towers	Trainer, IT
Edith Boyou + trainees	Trainer, soap-making
Tom Kollie + trainees	Trainer, plumbing
Côte d'Ivoire	
André F. Carvalho	Country Director, UNDP
Valy Kanaté	Deputy chairman, Chamber of Commerce and Industry
Adama Konaté + his staff	Director of SMEs Promotion, Ministry of Industry
Jeannette Koudou	Director General, Agence Nationale de la Formation professionnelle
Adjéi Geneviève + staff	Deputy director, Ministry of Labour
Alessandro Parlato	UNIDO Resident Representative
Innocent N'dri	IT expert, UNIDO MRU project
Patrice Bogna	National Coordinator, UNIDO MRU project
Mme Assifix	YEN project coordinators, UNIDO MRU project
Herman Nicoué	Training Specialist, UNIDO MRU project
Ben Lakp Low	Director, ILO Office
Odile Sarassoro	Youth Employment Technical Officer, ILO MRU Programme
Ange Léonid Barry-Battesti	Chairman, SIYB National Network and chief of Maison de l'Apprenti (FDFP)
Nicho Ives	Master trainer, SIYB Network
Jocelyne Mensah trainees	Director of Human Resources, Sonaco
Jean-Luc Mobio + trainees	Director of Human Resources, SOLIBRA
Amallaman Emmanuel	Supervisor, SOLIBRA

Name	Title
Philippe Ndri	Project manager, Plate-Forme des Services
Pierre Anney	Director General, SIDEMAR
Alain Darwasse	Project Coordinator and technical advisor , French Cooperation
Nangui Christophe	Mayor and Chairman, Songo CLIJ
Joseph Gbamo	Animator, Songo PFS
M. Pokou Kouadio	Coordinator HIMO project, Ageroute
Koula Joseph	Coordinator, Prodige(YEN grantee)
Affé D. Romaric N'dri	Deputy Secretary General, CIFIJEC
Yao Laurent Stalinas	Chairman, Fraternité Solidarité Jeunesse Côte d'Ivoire
Yao Jules + trainees	Chairman, WeCAN NGO
Nahi Joëlle + trainees	Project Manager, Gnohonde NGO
Guinea	
Conakry	
Bafotigui Sako	Resident Representative, UNIDO
Sitan Mamadi Keita	National Coordinator of the MRU Programme, UNIDO
Falilou Barry	Secretary General, Ministry of Commerce and Industry
Adama Coulibaly	Country Director, UNDP
Saoudatou Sylla	Youth Employment expert, MRU Programme, UNIDO
Mor Laye Sylla	Food Technologies Consultant, UNIDO
Mohd. Camara	National expert, MRU Programme, UNIDO
Ibrahima Barry	Secretary General, Ministry of Youth and Sports
Abdoulaye Konté	Deputy Director, Ministry of Microfinance
Abdoulaye Konté	Deputy Director, Ministry of Microfinance
Moussa Dioubaté	Youth Employment Technical Officer, MRU Programme, ILO
Alamako Kourouma + staff	Deputy Director General, 3AE
Maxime Koivogui + staff	Deputy Director General , AGUIPE
Bademba DIALLO	Consultant, AGUIPE
Joseph Koumassadanou	AGUIPE National Consultant
Mamadou Alpha Barry	Bureau Chief, Maison de l'Emploi Kissidougou
Sény Damba	National Director, Youth Employment Scheme
Arsene Diasso Koivogui	Director General and Consultant, FODEEG
Moussa Kane + trainees	Chairman, SOS Miskines (YEN grantee)
Mamadou Bailo Barry	Planning specialist, SOS Miskines (YEN grantee)
Etienne Tolno + LAF members	LAF Chairman, Les amis du Futur
Fatimata Cherif Diallo	Project Manager, Guinée Initiative pour le Développement (YEN grantee)
Mamadou Malick Diallo	IT specialist, MRU Programme
Guéckédou	(met in Koindu)
Nyankoye Wido Camara	Chef d'Antenne, Guéckédou
Saa Eloi Taylino	Trainer, enterprise development
Cathérine Kamano	Trainer, tie-dye
Elisabeth Kamano	Trainer, embroidery
Kammah Francis Sidiki	Trainer, adapted technology

Annex 3: Additional Evaluation Questions

Training approaches

1. Training by MSEs (Comp. 1a)
 - a. Type of training – based on market survey, future trends... or just more of the same?
 - b. Are the trainers able to communicate business understanding to the trainees?
 - c. Is giving training free of charge justified when others have to pay for training?
2. Training by ILO (SIYB)
 - a. Is training of SIYB Trainers useful without training of Master Trainers?
 - b. Was the selection of candidates for SIYB training in line with MRU project goals?
 - c. Is the SIYB principle of payment (“all training must be paid for”) justified and adapted to conditions in the MRU countries?
3. Training by ILO (Employment Services)
 - a. Is this generalised service (not limited to youth or disadvantaged) in line with MRU project objectives?
 - b. Is this capacity building effort in Ministry of Labour part of an overall MRU strategy?
4. Training by Youth Organisations (YEN Grant Scheme, computer training in comm. hubs)
 - a. Are the grant schemes innovative?
 - b. Is it a problem that in most grant schemes the training is provided free of charge and the trainees are being paid a stipend or wage during the training?
 - c. Does the fee paid for computer training exclude youths with few resources?
5. Training by others (...)???

Communications platform

6. It appears that very many of the articles on the platform are written by the UNIDO consultant. A lot is also about the UN initiatives. Will it continue once the UN support stops?
7. How strong interest from the youth? --- how many of them only visit there once? --- how intense is the traffic today compared with 6-8 months ago?
8. Will young people use this as their main means of communication – instead of Facebook?
9. Some young people have discussed certain issues – such as the *Bourse de l'Entreprenariat* <http://my.mruyouthplatform.org/mru/projet-cr%C3%A9er-la-bourse-de-l+531> – is there any chance of this idea going any further – or is there a real chance that governments may pick up the idea and provide funding for it?
10. Does all of this really bring anyone into jobs?
11. How much government support is there in the 4 countries (quite strong in Liberia...)?

Ownership

12. What is the nature and strength of ownership of the project by different “owners”:
 - a. MRU secretariat?
 - b. Ministries of Youth in the 4 countries?
 - c. Youth organisations in the 4 countries?
 - d. Local government (district councils, communes....)?
 - e. YEN grant recipients?
 - f. Owners of communication hubs (iEarn and others)?
 - g. Trainers, CSOs?

Delivering as One

13. If the project was not Delivered as One – what would a real joint project organisation then look like at the country level?
14. What is needed for the involved UN agencies to run field projects such as the MRU in a timely and efficient manner?

Decent work

15. Were the principles of Decent Work observed in the project components:
 - a. MSE training (Comp. 1a)?
 - b. YEN grant schemes?
 - c. ILO SIYB training?
 - d. In project implementation with the project staff?

Finance

16. What should be the principles for getting youth enterprise start-ups access to initial loan capital?

Target groups

17. To what extent do the end beneficiaries of the project correspond to the target groups identified in the project document?

The Future

18. Mobilise funds for the full 4-year programme – what changes need to be made in the light of lessons learned:
 - a. Continue as a joint UNIDO/ILO/YEN exercise or go it alone?
 - b. Continue as sub-regional (MRU) project or country projects?
 - c. Select some components for up-scaling and leave others out – YES but if so, which ones should be selected?
19. Prepare document for one year with only EUR 800,000 – what changes need to be made in the light of lessons learned:
 - a. Continue the UNIDO-ILO joint project, or go separately?
 - b. Focus on getting the job done in the border areas – provide the promised training materials – and support with business training – for one more year?
 - c. Is the SIYB useful in this short time perspective?
 - d. Forge links with local MFIs?
 - e. Have another go at forging links with large companies – in one or more of the countries?
20. Continue support to communication hubs and platform?

Annex 4: Basic Coordinates of Grantees under YEN Competitive Grant Scheme

Country Name	Project title	Name of the organisation	YEN Grant USD	Manager	Full address	Telephone number
Cote d'ivoire	<i>ELEVAGE D'AULACODES A SAN PEDRO</i>	COMITÉ DE SUIVI À L'ACTION CITOYENNE (C.S.A.C.)	24,353	KIPLE Eric Hebert Biagne	01 BP 340 San Pedro 01	
	<i>ELEVAGE ET PRODUCTION D'ESCARGOTS GEANTS D'AFRIQUE</i>	FRATERNITE SOLIDARITE JEUNESSE COTE D'IVOIRE	7,585	YAO Laurent Stanislas	14 BP 1284 ABIDJAN 14	+(225)24390195 /47 44 01 75
	<i>CONSTRUCTION DE 30 FUMOIRS AMELIORES AU PROFIT DE JEUNES FEMMES FUMEUSES DE POISSONS A BANGOLO DUEKOU ET GRAND BASSAM</i>	ONG GNIHONDE	49,865	Mlle Nahi Joëlle	11 BP 1657 ABIDJAN 11	00225 0505 2266
	<i>ASSAINISSEMENT DES PLAGES ET CREATION D'ACTIVITES TOURISTIQUES POUR L'INSERTION DE 46 JEUNES A PORT-BOUET</i>	UNION DES JEUNES DE L'ILOT VANOU (PORT-BOUET)	26,406	BOUA AMAND JEAN-LOUIS	12 BP 2451 ABIDJAN 12	225 08 74 20 66 / 07 61 52 25
Guinée	<i>PROJET DE REBOISEMENT</i>	ASSOCIATION DES VOLONTAIRES POUR LA GESTION DES RESSOURCES NATURELLES- AVGRN	42,346	Mamadou Coumbassa	Pounihioun, BP: 190 Labé - République de Guinée	(00224) 60 34 49 37, (224) 60 34 49 37
	<i>PROJET DE RECYCLAGE DES DECHETS PLASTIQUES</i>	SOS MISKINES GUINEE - ASSOCIATION POUR LE BIEN-ETRE DES HANDICAPES ET DESHERITES DE GUINEE	44,171	Moussa KANE	705 KA 020 Manquepas-Kaloum BP 437 Conakry – République de Guinée	(+224) 64 211 311, (+224) 64 211 311 ou 63 211 311 ou 62 41 20 40
	<i>PROJET DE VULGARISATION ET DE COMMERCIALISATION DU MORINGA OLEIFERA PAR 20 COOPERANTS A NOUSSY (LBE)</i>	GUINÉE INITIATIVES POUR LE DÉVELOPPEMENT (G.U.ID.E.)	24,714	Fatoumata Chérif DIALLO	Immeuble de la CAJEK Sandervalia Kaloum (Conakry) BP : 5377	(+224) 60-30-35-22/ 00(224) 65-31-8857

Liberia	<i>BRICKS FOR LIFE PROJECT (BLP)</i>	BETTER FUTURE FOUNDATION (BFF), INC.	26,159	Debo Belvis O'diaji	Peace Island, Paynesville, Monrovia, Liberia	+231 6550212/ +231 641 7203
	<i>CREATIVE ARTS FOR SUSTAINABLE EMPOWERMENT (CASE)</i>	iEARN-Liberia	5,833	Leroy McDyiah Beldeh	New Jerusalem AG School Building, P.O. BOX 1581 Gardnesville, Liberia	+231-6-372810/+231-6-60-69-92
	<i>CENTER FOR WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT</i>	YOUTH ACTION INTERNATIONAL (YAI), INC	40,598	Kimmie Weeks	Youth Action International-Liberia, 2nd Floor, Fofana Bldg., Benson Street Monrovia, Liberia	+231 6-946464
	<i>TRANSITION FROM SCHOOL TO WORK (JOB-SHOP)</i>	YOUTH EDUCATION FOUNDATION INITIATIVE (YEFI), INC	46,009	Joker Guankerwon Gweisah	14 West Benson Street, Bright Compound Monrovia, Liberia	+231 6 652759
Sierra Leone	<i>KAILAHUN FIELD RESEARCHERS</i>	DEMOCRACY AND IMPROVEMENT ASSOCIATE, DAIA	0	Sahid Victor Vandy	SL, Luawa Chiefdom, Kailahun District, Sierra Leone	00232-76-450-970
	<i>MAPAKI YOUTH TRAINING AND MANUFACTURING CENTRE</i>	KAFOIMA YOUTH DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION (KAYDO)	48,778	Patrick Koroma	Mapaki, Bombali District, Sierra Leone	+232-033-950095
	<i>WOMEN IN SUSTAINABLE BEE-KEEPING ACTIVITIES</i>	KENEMA DISTRICT YOUTH DEVELOPMENT AGENCY (KEYDA)	22,483	Mark M. Gbondo(Mentor) Abdul K. Kamara (Mentee)	District Council Building Maxwell Khobe Street Kenema	+232-33-308142
	<i>EMPLOYMENT PROMOTION AND PRIVATE WASTE MANAGEMENT</i>	KLINE SALONE WASTE MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION (KSWMA)	23,595	Christiana Sia Tengbeh	Shelter for Africa House, National Stadium, Brook Fields. Freetown.	078 422 763, 033 320 946

