



2016:4

Sida Decentralised Evaluation

Henrik Alffram
Lisa Curman

Evaluation of Union to Union

Final Report

Evaluation of Union to Union

**Final Report
December 2015**

**Henrik Alffram
Lisa Curman**

**Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2016:4
Sida**

Authors: Henrik Alffram and Lisa Curman

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2016:4

Commissioned by Sida

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Date of final report: December 2015

Published by Citrus 2016

Art. no. Sida61963en

urn:nbn:se:sida-61963en

This publication can be downloaded from: <http://www.sida.se/publications>

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm
Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64
E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Foreword

This evaluation of Union to Union was contracted by Sida and conducted by FCG SIPU International AB. The evaluation team consisted of Henrik Alffram (Team Leader) and Lisa Curman. Quality assurance was provided by Victoria Hildenwall.

The conclusions and recommendations presented in the report are the responsibility of the evaluation team and cannot be taken as an expression of official Sida policies or viewpoints.

The evaluation was greatly assisted by staff at Union to Union, global union federations and trade unions in Colombia, Botswana, South Africa, Sweden and Uruguay. We would like to express our appreciation of their support.

Table of Contents

Foreword	5
Table of Contents	6
Abbreviations and Acronyms	7
Executive Summary	8
1 Introduction and Background	12
1.1 The assignment	12
1.2 Methodology	13
1.3 Quality assurance	16
1.4 Limitations.....	16
2 The Evaluated Intervention	17
3 Findings	19
3.1 Effectiveness.....	19
3.2 Efficiency.....	31
3.3 Relevance	36
3.4 Sustainability.....	37
4 Conclusions.....	39
4.1 Effectiveness.....	39
4.2 Efficiency.....	42
4.3 Relevance and sustainability	43
5 Recommendations	45
5.1 Recommendation to Sida and Union to Union.....	45
5.2 Recommendations to Union to Union	45
Annex 1: Literature.....	47
Annex 2: Persons Consulted	49
Annex 3: Interventions Reviewed	54
Annex 4: Inception Report.....	55
Annex 5: Terms of Reference.....	68

Abbreviations and Acronyms

BDWU	Botswana Diamond Workers' Union
BOBEU	Botswana Bank Employees' Union
BRAWU	Botswana Railways Amalgamated Workers' Union
BWI	Building and Wood Wokers' International
CEPPAWU	Chemical Energy Paper Printing Wood and Allied Workers Union
CSO	<i>Civil Society Organisations</i>
CUT	Central Unitaria de Trabajadores de Colombia
FAWU	Food and Allied Workers Union
FECODE	Federación Colombiana De Trabajadores de la Educacion
FECOLPER	Federación Colombiana de Periodistas
GUF	Global Union Federation
HRF	Hotell- och Restaurangfacket
IFJ	International Federation of Journalists
IUF	International Union of Food, Agricultural, Hotel, Restaurant, Catering, Tobacco and Allied Workers' Associations
LO	Swedish Trade Union Confederation
NUMSA	National Union of Metalworkers of South Africa
PSI	Public Services International
SACCAWU	South Africa Commercial, Catering and Allied Workers Union
SACO	Swedish Confederation of Professional Associations
SEK	Swedish Krona
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
SJF	Svenska Journalistförbundet
TCO	Swedish Confederation of Professional Employees
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNI	UNI Global Union
UNTMRA	Unión Nacional de Trabajadores Metalúrgicos y Ramas Afines
UOC	Unión de Obreros Curtidores

Executive Summary

Sida has commissioned SIPU International to conduct an evaluation of Union to Union focusing on cost effectiveness, added value, relevance and ownership. The explicit purpose of the evaluation, as set out in the Terms of Reference (ToR), is to map and analyse:

- the relevance of Union to Union's operations in relation to the Strategy for support through Swedish civil society organizations 2010-2015;
- the added value, ownership and efficiency – including conditions for sub-granting Sida's support to local partners – of Union to Union's operations in relation to its objectives and the partnership models applied; and
- the results attained in relation to Union to Union's objectives and the partnership models applied.

The Evaluation Team collected data for the evaluation through a desk review of relevant documents and statistical information, and through interviews with stakeholders and key informants relating to the specific evaluation questions identified from the ToR. Special focus was placed on analysing interventions in four project countries (Botswana, Colombia, South Africa and Uruguay) visited, but all current Union to Union-interventions were when possible used for statistical purposes.

Union to Union provides support to local trade unions around the world either through so called bilateral projects (i.e. projects in which Swedish trade unions cooperate with local trade unions), or multilateral projects (i.e. projects in which GUFs' cooperate with local trade unions). In 2014 nearly 80% of the funding disbursed by Union to Union concerned these so called multilateral projects.

Union to Union has identified five strategic priorities for its support: Capacity to organize, capacity to educate, capacity to negotiate, capacity to advocate, and capacity to administer. The Evaluation Team has found that the results attained over the past few years and well in line with these priorities. The results also correspond to the priorities set out in Sweden's Strategy for support through Swedish civil society organizations 2010-2014.

The results attained through bilateral respectively multilateral partnership models vary quite considerably. The bilateral projects have generally focused on strengthening the capacity of a single union. The multilateral projects have primarily focused on supporting cooperation between individual unions and coalition building within coun-

tries and sectors. The ultimate goal of these multilateral interventions has been to contribute to a unified, and thereby stronger, trade union movement. They have also had a focus on connecting unions regionally and internationally and to promote labour rights through international campaigns and international agreements with multilateral companies. Global and regional mobilization of the trade union movement has often been of utmost importance for the strength and security of the local unions.

There is a need to specify what role the Swedish trade unions should play in multilateral projects, in which Union to Union channels funding to a GUF which in turn support local trade unions in partner countries. The added value of the Swedish unions varies considerably from one intervention to the other, but there has generally been excessive focus on control and follow up and insufficient focus on capacity building and sharing of expertise and experiences.

Both bilateral and multilateral projects otherwise have a strong primary focus on building the capacity of local level trade unions to protect the rights and interests of their members and other workers, although some projects arguably also strive to more directly assist the unions in addressing the concerns of their members. Generally the capacity building activities supported have aimed at enhancing capacities of specific importance for trade unions. Somewhat less attention has been given to more generic issues of importance for the running of any organization. The prioritization made in this regard is logical considering that the added value of the GUFs is trade union related issues and not organizational management issues in general.

In relation to the Strategy for support through Swedish civil society organizations, the support provided by Union to Union must be regarded as highly relevant regardless of partnership model. It undoubtedly contributes to a vibrant and pluralistic civil society that improves the lives of workers and promotes democratic values and human rights.

It should be noted that regardless of whether the projects have been bilateral or multilateral, concerned local level unions have without exception perceived that they exercise a very high degree of ownership. Arguably local ownership is particularly strong in the bilateral projects, but this strength is outweighed by a concern that bilateral projects may contribute to upholding a divided, and thereby weak, trade union movement. A bilateral approach should primarily be reserved for contexts in which there to a high extent already exist a unified trade union movement that in the relevant sector is led by a single dominant actor that would benefit from support.

The budget and accounting forms that Union to Union is using are not a reliable indication of the actual amounts transferred to or used at different levels of the chain of support. The forms are in fact used and interpreted in different ways by different actors. Furthermore, to monitor how funds are transferred between different GUF levels as a way trying to understand issues of efficiency, added value and ownership, makes little sense. Focus should instead be on developing a methodology for determining and understanding how much of total funds received by a GUF – regardless of

whether it is at global, regional or local level – that can in effect be regarded as having been used in a manner that benefit local level trade unions.

It should also be noted that Union to Union's partners do not seem to be fully aware of the content of the 2014 agreement between Sida and Union to Union regarding a required increase in funding transferred to local level unions and the consequences this may have for them. The Evaluation Team is of the view, however, that the intentions behind the agreement are misguided and that its implementation would contribute to reduce the effectiveness of the support to the trade union movement. The channelling of funds directly to individual trade unions have contributed to reducing incentives for cooperation and coalition building and for ensuring sustainability through increasing the number of financially contributing members, all of which are essential ingredients for the establishment of an influential trade union movement.

An absence of quantifiable results has made it impossible to carry out a strict efficiency analysis, in which the relationship between inputs and results is assessed. It should be noted that Union to Union has no system in place to systematically compare costs between projects, even though one-off efforts, limited in scope, have been done in this regard.

A higher percentage of total funding is channelled to local level unions in bilateral projects than in multilateral projects, but from a results perspective multilateral projects are usually the preferred option. However, channelling of funds at several different levels in the multilateral projects is a matter of concern in some cases. These transfers are costly, partly because of currency conversions and partly because of bank fees, but also problematic from the perspective of financial predictability. It would in many cases be possible to reduce the number of times funds are transferred.

Key recommendations put forward by the Evaluation Team include the following:

- Sida and Union to Union should declare null and void the 2014 agreement stating that the latter should increase the share of funds transferred to partner organizations in recipient countries.
- Union to Union should ensure that all applications for support to bilateral projects are accompanied by a thorough context analysis explaining how the planned project relate to and complement other support initiatives, including multilateral partnerships.
- Union to Union should articulate in writing what role each actor in the chain of support should have, and what value they should bring, in both bilateral and multilateral projects, and establish a system for effective follow up of this.

- If Swedish trade unions should play a role in multilateral projects, Union to Union should be ensured that this is primarily a capacity building and expert role and not a follow up and monitoring role.
- Union to Union should establish a system to compare and follow up cost effectiveness between projects, including a methodology for determining and understanding how much of total funds received by a GUF – regardless of whether it is at global, regional or local level – that benefit local level trade unions.
- Union to Union should ensure that the chain of actors through which funding is channelled before it is used for the benefit of local trade unions is simplified and shortened whenever possible.
- Union to Union should develop a stronger quality assurance role and an ability to provide strategic guidance in relation to both bilateral and multilateral projects to ensure that they are well grounded in best international practice.

1 Introduction and Background

1.1 THE ASSIGNMENT

Sida has commissioned SIPU International to conduct an evaluation of Union to Union focusing on cost effectiveness, added value, relevance and ownership. The explicit purpose of the evaluation, as set out in the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the assignment, is to map and analyse:

- the relevance of Union to Union's operations in relation to the Strategy for support through Swedish civil society organizations 2010-2015;
- the added value, ownership and efficiency – including conditions for sub-granting Sida's support to local partners – of Union to Union's operations in relation to its objectives and the partnership models applied; and
- the results attained in relation to Union to Union's objectives and the partnership models applied.

Union to Union is a sub-granting framework organization that channels its support through Swedish trade unions or Global Union Federations (GUFs) that in turn cooperate with national or local trade unions. The ToR underlines the importance of identifying the relevance and added value of each actor and level in the chain of support and that these are considered in relation to cost effectiveness, local ownership and the ability to attain results or change.

Sida expects an increase in the share of Union to Union's total budget that is disbursed to local partner organizations, as indicated in the current framework agreement between Sida and Union to Union.¹ The agreement also indicates that the present evaluation should provide information helping to determine the size of this share. The ToR stresses the importance of assessing if Union to Union to a higher degree can enhance the capacity of its local partners as civil society organizations "in their own right", by for instance strengthening their administrative and financial capacity. The specific evaluation questions outlined in the ToR include the following:

¹ Sida 2014. "Underavtal mellan Sida och LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd gällande Insatsen Rambidrag Syd och Ost" (Agreement Sida-Union to Union)

- How are interventions divided and financial resources allocated between different partnership models?
- How, and on the basis of what criteria, are decisions made regarding number of initiatives, as well as size of budget, for each partnership model?
- Are the different partnership models cost effective? Why or why not?
- Are there differences in the degree to which the different partnership models ensure cost effectiveness?
- How can the different models ensure a higher degree of cost effectiveness?
- What do Union to Union's different partnership models look like?
- What are the results attained by the different partnership models in relation to Union to Union's established goals and in relation to the Strategy for support through Swedish civil society organizations 2010-2015?
- What are the reasons behind identified differences in attainment of results?
- In relation to organizations in the South, what is the added value (of different levels) of the support to global and regional organization/mobilization of the trade union movement?
- Is value added defined in relation to all levels of the chain of support? If yes, what do they look like and how are they followed up?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of the different partnership models?
- Are the different partnership models complementing each other and, if so, how?
- How and in which fields are efforts made, within the different partnership models, to enhance the capacity of local organizations?
- What is the relevance of the different partnership models in relation to the Strategy for support through Swedish civil society organizations 2010-2015?
- Are there differences in the degree to which the different partnership models ensures relevance or value added. How can the different models better ensure relevance or value added?
- Are there differences to which degree the different partnership models promote ownership? How can the different models better promote ownership?

1.2 METHODOLOGY

The evaluation was divided into three phases: inception phase, data collection phase, and analysis and reporting phase.

1.2.1 Inception

A start-up meeting was held with Sida on 2 September 2015 to discuss the purpose and scope of the evaluation, selection of case studies, and timing of the evaluation. On the basis of the conclusions from the meeting, and some initial meetings at Union to Union, a draft inception report was compiled and submitted to Sida and Union to Union on September 14. After a joint meeting with Sida and Union to Union, where further details of the assignment were discussed, the final inception report was sub-

mitted to Sida on September 21. It has since been used to guide the scope, focus and methodological approach of the assignment. The evaluation questions identified in the ToR were in the inception report structured according to OECD/DACs evaluation criteria and linked with a basic methodological approach. The inception report can be found in Annex III.

1.2.2 Data Collection

During the data collection phase the Evaluation Team collected information through a desk review of relevant documents and statistical information, and through interviews with stakeholders and key informants relating to the specific evaluation questions identified from the ToR. Special focus was placed on analysing interventions in four project countries visited, but all current Union to Union-interventions were when possible used for statistical purposes. The evaluation has not looked at the information and communication grant Union to Union receives from Sida.

The desk study comprised a broad review of documents from Union to Union and its partners identified by the Evaluation Team, Sida and Union to Union as relevant for the evaluation, including applications, assessments of applications, narrative and financial project and programme reports, planning and strategy documents and external evaluations. In relation to project documentation, primary focus was placed on documentation related to interventions in the countries visited. The Evaluation Team also reviewed Sida's assessment memos and minutes from follow-up meetings. It also considered Sweden's Strategi för stöd genom svenska organisationer i det civila samhället 2010-2015 and reviewed SIPU International's Organisational Assessments of Civil Society Organisations (CSO) in view of possible qualification as Sida's framework and/or strategic partner organisations. Key documents reviewed are set out in Annex I.

Interviews were conducted with representatives of Sida, Union to Union, Swedish member unions, GUFs' headquarters, GUFs' regional offices, GUFs' national offices and local partner organizations. All interviews were semi-structured and adapted to reflect the respondent's expected area of experience and knowledge. Most interviews were conducted face-to-face in Botswana, Colombia, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland and Uruguay. Additional interviews were carried out over Skype or telephone with informants in organizations not visited. A list of persons consulted throughout the evaluation can be found in Annex II.

Eighteen interventions in four countries were selected to be part of a deeper analysis of different kinds of Union to Union financed initiatives. The Team took into account the following factors in selecting countries to visit and interventions to examine in greater detail:

- Financial and time constraints
- Comparability between projects
- Number of projects per country

- Diversity of bilateral and multilateral projects
- Existence of country focused, regional and global projects
- Diversity in terms of thematic sectors
- Inclusion of both local unions and GUFs
- Geographical diversity

For each of the eighteen interventions, individuals representing organizations at each level of the chain of support – i.e. Union to Union, Swedish trade union, GUF (at head office, regional office and national office, when applicable) and local trade unions – were interviewed. Through this approach, the data collected was cross-validated.

1.2.3 Analysis and Reporting

During the analysis and reporting phase, assessment findings were categorized in order to help provide evidence-based answers to the evaluation questions. This report has been loosely structured around these questions and the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria.

The submission of the draft report was followed by a one-week comment period during which Sida has had the opportunity to comment on the draft and Union to Union the chance to raise any factual errors identified. The Evaluation Team considered all comments received before finalizing the report.

1.2.4 Definitions

Efficiency or cost effectiveness, relevance, ownership and added value are central concepts that have guided the evaluation. For these concepts, the evaluation team has used the following definitions:

Efficiency (or cost effectiveness) is, in line with the OECD/DAC definition, a measurement of outputs in relation to inputs. The fact that clear limitations exist as to the extent that efficiency can be assessed in interventions of the nature concerned is mentioned above under 1.4 Limitations. Other aspects of whether or not value for money is attained was therefore also be assessed.

In line with how the concept of ownership is commonly defined in the aid effectiveness discourse, ownership concern in this evaluation the degree to which Union to Union's support is aligned with its developing country partner organizations' own priorities and strategies and the degree to which Union to Union contributes to enhance the partner organizations' capacity to develop and implement their strategies. Added value concerns the advantages for a developing country partner organization of a particular partnership model or actor in comparison with other models and in comparison with the absence of any partnership.

1.3 QUALITY ASSURANCE

A senior staff member and evaluator at SIPU International has served as quality assurer for the assignment. She has reviewed the draft inception report and the draft final report, making sure the documents correspond to Sida standards. The draft final report was reviewed against Sida's Check list for draft reports (App. 2.6 of the Tender documents; Sida Framework Agreement for Evaluations, reviews and advisory services on Results Frameworks) before being submitted to Sida and stakeholders. Sida's Check list is based on OECD/DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation.

1.4 LIMITATIONS

As highlighted in the inception report, the quality of the Evaluation Team's assessment of results is directly related to the availability and quality of Union to Union's internal project and programme monitoring reports. Assessments of efficiency have also be affected by the quality of the information generated through the internal financial and project management systems. It has not been possible to make exact and detailed comparisons of costs per unit between partnership models due to an absence of documented quantifiable results and to the great variety that exist in the external environment in which projects are implemented.

2 The Evaluated Intervention

Union to Union was established in 1976 as the LO-TCO Secretariat of International Trade Union Development Cooperation. It currently has three member organizations, LO (the Swedish Trade Union Confederation), Saco (the Swedish Confederation of Professional Associations) and TCO (the Swedish Confederation of Professional Employees). Union to Union describes itself as a non-partisan and non-profit organization that "works in favour of democracy, the fair distribution of resources, and sustainable development" and that "promote human rights at work and support the creation and organisation of unions, with the goal to increase the possibility to lead a decent life."

Union to Union is one of Sidas sub-granting framework organizations. It channels support, through an existing trade union structure, from Sida to Swedish trade unions or Global Trade Union Federations (GUFs), that in turn cooperate with national or local trade unions in some 80 countries around the world.

A GUF is an "international federation of national trade unions organizing in specific industry sector or occupational groups". Many of the GUFs represent hundreds of trade unions and millions of workers. While Union to Union currently supports roughly 100 international projects, the number of local trade unions benefitting from its interventions is considerably higher. Many of the projects implemented by the GUFs are of a regional or global character, which means that each project targets several trade unions in different countries.

Union to Union's total budget amounts for 2015 to roughly SEK 130 million. Apart from membership fees from LO, TCO and Saco, which amounts to 850 000 SEK for 2015, and the own contribution from Swedish unions and GUFs, which amounts to roughly 10 % of the total budget for projects, the funding comes from Sida.

The overall goal of Union to Union is in line with ILOs Decent Work – Decent Life Agenda, which ultimately aims "to effect positive change in people's lives at the national and local levels." The support is provided by Union to Union is primarily focusing on strengthening the trade union movement to contribute to a big, strong and independent trade union movement globally and nationally in countries of operation. Union to Union's current strategy is based on the GUFs strategies and priorities for each sector. Within the current three-year programme period, Union to Union will contribute to results for the global trade union movement within the following areas: capacity to organize, capacity to educate, capacity to negotiate, capacity to advocate, and capacity to administer.

Union to Union works with the following partners and projects during the programme period 2014-2016:

GUF	Swedish affiliate	Programmes and projects	Average annual budget 2014-2016
Building and Woodworkers International (BWI)	Byggnads, Elektrikerförbundet, GS-facket, Målareförbundet, SEKO	1 multilateral programme	SEK 18 000 000
Education International (EI)	Lärarförbundet	1 bilateral programme	SEK 6 500 000
Public Services International (PSI)	SEKO, ST, Transport, Vision, Kommunal	12 multilateral projects 1 bilateral project	SEK 7 000 000
International Union for Food Workers (IUF)	Kommunal, Livs, Hotell- och restaurangfacket (HRF)	12 multilateral projects	SEK 12 000 000
IndustriALL Global union	IF Metall, Pappers, Unionen	15 multilateral projects 4 bilateral projects	SEK 14 000 000
International Federation of Journalists (IFJ)	Journalistförbundet	6 multilateral projects	SEK 6 000 000
International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC)	LO, TCO	6 bilateral projects 1 multilateral project 1 bilateral programme	SEK 14 000 000
UNI Global Union (UNI)	GS-facket, Finansförbundet, Handels, SEKO, Transport, Unionen	18 multilateral projects	SEK 12 000 000
International Transport Federation (ITF)	Transport, SEKO	5 bilateral projects 4 multilateral projects	SEK 3 500 000
Fédération Internationale des Musiciens (FIM) Fédération Internationale des Acteurs (FIA) UNI-MEI	Musikerförbundet, Teaterförbundet	5 multilateral projects 6 bilateral projects	SEK 4 000 000
International Council of Nurses (ICN)	Vårdförbundet	2 multilateral projects 1 bilateral project	SEK 2 500 000

3 Findings

This section of the report presents the Evaluation Team's findings from interviews and literature reviews in relation to the evaluation questions set out in the Terms of Reference for the assignment. For reasons of readability it has been necessary to cluster the evaluation questions and present the findings under more overarching headlines.

3.1 EFFECTIVENESS

3.1.1 The Partnership Models

Union to Union supports trade unions around the world through two primary partnership models: the bilateral model and the multilateral model. The bilateral model implies that Union to Union provides support to a Swedish trade union that in turn cooperates with a local trade union. The multilateral support is not channelled to a Swedish trade union but instead to a Global Union Federation (GUF) that in turn supports local trade unions.

Within each of the two partnerships models there are a number of variations. In 2014, Union to Union provided support to 23 Swedish trade unions and to 12 GUFs, which all had different operational procedures and cultures in place. Within an individual GUF there can also be significant structural and other management differences from one region to another. However, from an analytical perspective aiming at better understanding the strengths and weaknesses of the project approaches of Union to Union, the division between bilateral and multilateral partnership models is of primary relevance.

The two partnerships models or agreement chains are illustrated in the figure below.



In recent years, the multilateral partnership model has as shown in the table below been the dominant model both in terms of amounts budgeted and number of projects planned.

Projects and programmes 2014 – budgets divided by bilateral and multilateral (communication projects in Sweden not included)

	# Projects	Budget	% Projects	% Budget
Bilateral	24	16 473 000	23%	16%
Multilateral	82	87 388 500	77%	84%
Total	106	103 861 500	100%	100%

Source: Union to Union database

In addition to assessing the support Union to Union provides from the perspective of bilateral and multilateral partnership models, it can to some extent also be of relevance to consider if projects are of a global, regional or national nature involving one or several local trade unions. As illustrated in the table below, the vast majority of all bilateral projects are national while more than half of the multinational projects are regional.

Projects and programmes 2014 – global, regional, national (communication projects in Sweden not included)

	# Projects	# Global	# Regional	# National
Bilateral	24	1	1	22
Multilateral	82	11	44	25
Total	106	12	45	47
	% Projects	% Global	% Regional	% National
Bilateral	23%	8%	2%	47%
Multilateral	77%	92%	98%	53%
Total	100%	11%	42%	45%

Source: Union to Union database

In the bilateral projects, a Swedish trade union is typically cooperating with a single local trade union (sister union) in a specific country. A few of the bilateral projects are, however, of a global or regional nature. Lärarförbundet (the Swedish Teachers Union) has for instance a global programme including 14 projects around the world.

A multilateral project, where a GUF has an agreement with Union to Union and is responsible for implementation, is as mentioned the most common of the partnership models. When this model is used, Union to Union transfers funds to GUF headquarters in Europe. Several GUFs also have regional offices and some have national representation in selected countries. GUFs that have regional or national level offices

often channel their support through these offices before it reaches or is used for the direct benefit of the local level trade unions.

Whether the approach applied by a GUF is national, regional or global may depend, as discussed later on in this report, on the type of issues the project in question aims at addressing and on the preferred *modus operandi* of the GUF. IndustriAll has most of their projects as regional, while UNI has half of their projects as national and half with a regional approach.² BWI has a somewhat different set up. It has only one agreement with Union to Union, but this global agreement includes four large regional projects.

Even though they are not part of the formal agreement chain illustrated above, a Swedish member organization is always involved in the multilateral interventions. It is the Swedish member organization that formally applies and reports to Union to Union. There is an attachment to all agreements between Union to Union and the GUFs where the own contribution of the Swedish trade union is clarified. The actual involvement in project implementation of the Swedish trade union will differ from case to case, as further discussed below.

The GUFs may also play a role in the bilateral projects, even though they are not part of the agreement chain and no money is channelled through their accounts. Lärarförbundet is for example often including Education International in an advisory role in its projects.

It should be mentioned that the local trade unions that ultimately benefit from the support provided by Union to Union vary extensively in terms of size, age, capacities, and organizational set up. Many of the local trade unions are too small to have any full time staff while an organizations like SACCAWU in South Africa have around 350 staff members and over 300 000 members. Considering the radically different needs these unions will have, there is an obvious need for flexibility and variation in terms of project and programme approaches applied.

3.1.2 Attainment of Results

The Strategy for support through Swedish civil society organizations 2010-2015 focuses on capacity development of civil society organizations in order for them to contribute to the overall objective of “*a vibrant and pluralistic civil society in developing*

² Union to Union website project database, 2015-10-22

countries that, using a rights-based approach, contributes effectively to reducing poverty in all its dimensions”.

The strategy includes objectives for strengthened civil society capacity in terms of *“representative, legitimate and independent civil society actors who contribute to poverty reduction, based on their role as collective voices and organisers of services”* and ability of civil society to promote democracy and human rights of poor and discriminated/marginalised people, for instance in terms of *“proposers of ideas, watch-dogs of those in power and a counterweight to and force for democratisation vis-à-vis the state”*. According to the strategy, this implies that organizations should have enough capacity to work in accordance with their own objectives. The organisations’ internal democracy, independence and actual performance are therefore to be the focus of Sweden’s support.

The overall goals of Union to Union lie within ILOs Decent Work Agenda about worker’s rights through supporting a strong and independent trade union movement. Union to Union uses the specific sector policies and objectives from each GUF and has formulated its strategy on the basis of these. There are five strategic areas in which there are replicating indicators for all sectors: Capacity to organize, capacity to educate, capacity to negotiate, capacity to advocate, and capacity to administer.³ Important generic results attained by Union to Union in recent years include⁴:

- Increased number of members and enhanced capacity to collect membership fees in trade unions.
- Strengthened and more knowledgeable leadership in trade unions.
- Increased representation of women in leading positions in trade unions.
- Increased financial management capacity in trade unions.
- Increased cooperation among trade unions aiming at facilitating mergers leading to stronger unions; and contribution to preconditions for forming unions at national level
- Collective bargaining agreements reached.
- Creation of regional and international networks involving trade unions from different countries, leading to increased exchange of knowledge, experiences and ideas.
- Mobilization of unorganized workers.

³ Anslagsframst. Bilaga 3, Verksamheten 2014-2016, Strategi. Union to Union 2015

⁴ These have been identified through a review of project reports from the previous programme period 2010-2012, annual reports from 2014, assessment memoranda from Union to Union, and interviews with stakeholders.

- Educated and empowered trade union members that claim their rights.
- Better health and safety conditions at work places.

The results achieved are well in line with the strategic priorities of Union to Union and Sweden's strategy for support to civil society. They include results that directly affect the lives of individual workers, such as changes in terms of increased salaries, safer employment, better health and safety at work places. There are also significant results in terms of contributions to stronger organizations with enhanced capacity to represent their members and work collectively towards employers, multinational companies and governments in order to improve the living conditions of workers and their families.

A majority of the interventions reviewed by the Evaluation Team have done well in terms of attaining established objectives. Of the eighteen interventions assessed in detail, one is deemed to have reached results beyond the objectives set up. One or possibly two interventions can be classified as not having been able to reach objectives to a satisfactory extent.

Since the various projects supported by Union to Union have different objectives and approaches, with few quantifiable results, it has not been possible to make detailed assessments of results achieved on an aggregate level, or compare projects in terms of quality of results. Generally it may be said, however, that the Union to Union financed interventions are not only attaining set objectives to a satisfactory extent but it is also clear that the results attained are relevant for the trade unions as well as the trade union movement.

Multilateral interventions tend to have a stronger focus than bilateral interventions on networking activities and working towards a stronger union movement as such, usually avoiding strengthening and supporting a single organization in isolation. The regional exchange focus is also stronger than in the bilateral one-to-one projects. Hence, the results achieved in multilateral projects are more often connected to the cooperation, coordination and networking aspects, and strengthening the trade union movement as such. In contrast to bilateral projects, multilateral projects also achieves results in terms of reaching regional and global bargaining agreements. Multilateral projects also show results for individual unions, including better educated members and increased recruitment skills, due to nationally conducted trainings and workshops in specific countries.

The results achieved in bilateral projects are usually linked to the specific trade union supported, and include increased membership or stronger organizational skills. There are, however, some examples of bilateral projects that have obtained results relating to cooperation between unions.

Although goal fulfilment varies somewhat between projects, there is no obvious link to the kind of partnership model used (bilateral or multilateral partnership model, or

national/regional/global approach). Where projects have faced significant problems in terms of reaching stated goals it appears that the goals have either been unrealistic or that projects have been affected by implementation problems, such as the personal problems of key staff involved in project management (including projects with PSI in Botswana and Musikerförbundet South Africa). In relation to the latter problem, it can be expected that the larger GUFs, with their more extensive human resources, should be less vulnerable than the Swedish trade unions implementing bilateral projects.

The quality of results reporting varies between the reviewed interventions. Although there are examples of higher level results reporting, where results are measured against project objectives, it is still common with activity related reporting. According to Union to Union, there is a need for capacity development in the area of measuring and monitoring results for both GUFs and Swedish unions. There is no obvious and clear-cut difference between bilateral and multilateral partnership models when it comes to the quality of the monitoring systems. Although GUFs tend to have stronger project management capacities generally, there are examples of Swedish unions active in bilateral projects that have well developed monitoring skills.

3.1.3 Added Value

i. Added Value of Global and Regional Approaches

Through its cooperation with the GUFs, Union to Union supports global and regional mobilization of the trade union movement. The GUFs connect local level trade unions to an international movement and often play a global campaigning role. Those interviewed by the Evaluation Team claim that this international connection is of vital importance for many trade unions and can in repressive regimes contribute to enhance the security of trade union members and therefore be regarded as one of its main asset. Through global campaigns, lobbying and negotiations on the global level, the GUFs have managed to obtain agreements with multinational companies that local unions can use in their interactions with the same companies.

The GUFs core work consists of engagement in global campaigning, lobbying and negotiations, and of support and defense of the trade union movement in Europe and internationally. Programs and projects are part of this work. However, although the support from donors is a part of these global activities, the funding from Union to Union is accounted for separately and is only used for activities in, and/or support to affiliates from, DAC-listed countries. The table below shows what approximate share of total funding that for four different GUFs came from donor funding during the past five-year period.

GUF	Share of total budget financed by donor funds
BWI	50 %
Industrial	40 %
IUF	Policy decision that donor funds should not exceed 40 %
PSI	25 %

Unions participating in regional projects have generally expressed appreciation of the support received. The opportunities for exchanges of knowledge, experiences, and ideas provided through the projects bring value to them in terms of new ideas leading to concrete changes and a sense of international solidarity and belonging. Several trade unions interviewed have expressed a wish for further interaction and exchange with sister unions regionally and globally. Some larger well established unions, however, are of the view that the regional and global cooperation brings little added value and would have preferred a more targeted capacity development support.

It should also be underlined that some of the regional and global interventions exist primarily for reasons of administrative convenience and do not promote cross country cooperation of any significance. As an example, the global LO and TCO project Labour Law Development Programme (LLDP) has activities in Colombia, Guatemala and Cambodia, where the aim is to strengthen labour law nationally and there has for instance been no exchange between Cambodia and Colombia. Other regional projects, where unions from several countries participate, might have some regional activities, but focus is on issues in the respective participating countries, such as unifying the trade union movement nationally. Hence, in these cases, there is more national focus than exchange between countries.

ii. Different Actors' Added Value

The identified roles and responsibilities of the different actors in a partnership are usually described in the project documentation. However, added value is not clearly defined in relation to the different actors in the partnership or contribution chain and their added value is not formally followed up and documented.

Union to Union

According to its statutes, the role of Union to Union is to coordinate and support the member organizations' (LO, TCO, Saco) international development cooperation

work. This implies developing methods and processes for implementation and quality assurance of the cooperation, and evaluation of results.⁵

According to interviewed representatives from Swedish trade unions, Union to Union adds value in the sense that it has both trade union related experience and development cooperation knowledge and provides guidance, capacity development and support to GUFs and Swedish unions when it comes to project management as well as certain thematic issues such as gender and environment. In recent years the competence and skills set of Union to Union staff have moved from being characterized by a strong trade union focus to much more of a development cooperation focus.

To the extent that Union to Union adds non-financial value to the local level trade unions, it primarily does so indirectly through the capacity building support given to GUFs and Swedish trade unions, in order for these actors to be able to fulfil the requirements laid down in project agreements. A few local trade unions have, however, had the opportunity to attend Union to Union organized trainings. Union to Union's capacity to directly quality-assure operations in the field is limited.

Swedish Trade Unions

The Swedish unions – the member organizations of Union to Union – are the ones formally applying for project support and that have responsibility for financial and narrative reporting to Union to Union. Since Swedish unions are also members of the GUFs, they are in many ways a natural link to the GUFs in developing project ideas, applications and reports, and discuss strategies and priorities, although the GUFs, at regional and global levels, usually are the ones drafting and compiling applications and reports.

In practice, the extent to which the Swedish unions are involved in multilateral interventions varies. In some projects the Swedish organization does little more than submitting the funding application and project reports compiled by the GUF. In other cases the Swedish union is actively involved in project planning, implementation and follow up. In some GUF projects there may be several Swedish unions involved.

In bilateral projects, the Swedish trade unions involvement is usually higher than in the multilateral projects, which is largely due to the direct communication between the local and Swedish trade union. The Swedish unions have some kind of monitoring responsibilities in most projects, both bilateral and multilateral. Monitoring and travel

⁵ Union to Union Statutes, 2015

costs are allocated to the Swedish unions, although this is often part of their own contributions. The stated purpose of the monitoring visits is to see whether the project is on track, whether activities are performed, and what the results are.

In some cases, Swedish unions are also part of planning and evaluation meetings together with GUFs and local unions, where the specific added value of the Swedish union is typically the sector specific knowledge not always possessed by the GUF. By providing information about projects back to union members in Sweden it is also assumed that international solidarity and partnership will be strengthened.

When interviewed by the Evaluation Team, many local and national level trade unions, however, had difficulties identifying any non-financial value added by the Swedish unions. Some interviewees in both Latin America and Africa felt that the Swedish unions pay considerable attention to project visits and follow up, but contribute very little in terms of training or other forms of more structured sharing of experiences. Both GUFs and local level unions asked for the Swedish unions to involve more shop stewards with hands-on expertise regarding union-related issues relevant for the sector.

Some interviewees stressed the importance of the international solidarity shown through the support and the fact that Swedish unions sometimes would advocate around issues of concern to them and occasionally also raise labour rights issues relating to Swedish companies. It was also argued that the Swedish unions together with Union to Union bring in new issues and perspectives, including gender, into the cooperation.

Global Union Federations

The GUFs' ability to coordinate the global trade union movement – in political matters and in relation to projects – is often mentioned as their biggest added value. Because of the regional representation most GUFs also have local knowledge and experience, which most interviewees see as an important added value. The regional office often has an implementing role, and is the one having most contact with the participating local unions in multilateral interventions. Local unions see GUFs at the regional level as a coordinator, mediator, and coach between and for unions, who can provide various forms of support.

Although the capacity varies, many GUFs have both good project management skills and strong knowledge in union related matters. The GUFs have sometimes also been

in a position to coordinate donors and thus contribute to increased aid effectiveness, although it may be argued that the trade union donors appear to be surprisingly unable to harmonize their systems, routines and requirements.⁶

As the GUFs often work with several unions in each country, they are well placed to contribute to strengthening the trade union movement as a whole in their particular sectors. As discussed elsewhere in this report, a divided trade union movement comprising smaller unions have few possibilities of influencing working conditions and promoting the rights of its members. Increased cooperation and, eventually, mergers are in many contexts essential for the establishment of an influential trade union movement.

3.1.4 Strengths, Weaknesses and Complementarity of Partnership Models

iii. Strengths and Weaknesses of Multilateral Projects

Multilateral interventions have an advantage because of the permanent GUF presences at national or regional level. This implies more frequent contact with local unions, closer monitoring of the projects, and sound knowledge about the socio-political and economic context in which the union-related work is carried out and the projects are set. The only Swedish union with presence outside of Sweden is Transport, which has a project coordinator in Southern Africa.

The GUFs usually have, as mentioned, well developed in-house project management expertise and skills related to both development cooperation issues and union related matters. For reasons of efficiency, many Swedish unions have therefore decided to work through the GUFs rather than implementing bilateral projects.

The primary strengths of the multilateral projects are, however, their ability to focus on enhancing the capacity of the trade unions in an entire sector and their capacity to connect the trade unions to the international level. Local level unions interviewed have regularly been emphasising regional and global issues and that they appreciate the regional approach with exchanges with other unions.

As discussed below, a weakness with the multilateral projects is the fact that funds are usually transferred several times before they are eventually used to pay for expenses that actually benefit the local level unions. In comparison with bilateral projects, multilateral projects also transfer a smaller share of project funds to the local

⁶ According to interviewed GUFs

level unions. As described in further detail below, this is however not necessarily a weakness but something that often makes considerable sense.

One of the interviewed local unions argues that the multilateral projects undermine solidarity since the local unions contacts with the GUF or Swedish union in these type of projects is not as strong as in bilateral projects, implying there is a risk that the local trade union's needs and priorities are not sufficiently taken into account.

iv. Strengths and Weaknesses of Bilateral Projects

One of the major strengths of the bilateral support, according to Union to Union and Swedish unions, is the connection to Swedish union members. The potential of involving grass roots in Sweden opens up for spreading information about international projects in Sweden in a way that the multilateral projects do not. Another major strength is that one-to-one relationships between a Swedish union and a local union contribute to partnerships that can provide benefits for both parties.

Most bilateral projects rely on long-term relationships between trade unions, which increases the possibilities for effective communication about needs and priorities. Bilateral projects can also be of a smaller scale than what is normally possible through multilateral projects. Transport and Lärarförbundet have decided to work only through bilateral projects. They have taken this decision mainly because a higher percentage of total project funds are in the bilateral projects transferred to the local unions than in multilateral projects, implying there is greater financial ownership by the local unions.

Since the project management capacity within Swedish unions often is weaker than in the GUFs, bilateral projects often require more support from the Union to Union programme officers. Another weakness of bilateral projects is the reliance on individuals for effective implementation and even project survival. Although this, according to Union to Union programme officers, means that the bilateral projects have a higher risk of "failure" they generally work well and generate results according to plan.

Interviewed GUF staff are unanimously of the view that bilateral one-to-one projects risk undermining the efforts of the GUFs in building a stronger trade union movement by promoting mergers and cooperation between trade unions. Union to Union seem not to have heard of this problem previously, but states that bilateral projects should ensure alignment with the rest of the work carried out within the sector in the specific context, including projects carried out by GUFs. According to Union to Union and Swedish unions, the multilateral and bilateral projects do complement each other well; there is need for both models in the support. However, whether or not the two models complement each other is not systematically assessed and not a factor that appear to influence project design.

3.1.5 Capacity Building of Local Organizations

In late 2013, Sida raised concerns about the support to capacity development in Union to Union financed interventions, arguing that support to capacity development regarding organisational, strategic and financial issues is weak. Sida acknowledges that capacity building support is provided in relation to the unions' operational union-related work, including negotiation and education, but wants Union to Union to focus more on supporting capacity of local trade unions to work as independent organizations beyond projects.⁷

Union to Union's five strategic areas are all about strengthening different capacities, the capacity to organize, educate, negotiate, advocate and administer. All GUFs also have capacity development or organizational development of local unions as part of their priorities for international operations. The support to capacity development through the GUFs is generally less about project management and more, as pointed out by Sida, about increased knowledge and awareness among members of relevant legislation and other labour related issues, strengthening of union leadership, development of recruitment skills and enhancement of negotiation skills. However, where there has been an obvious need of developing stronger organizational and administrative systems it appears that support has also been directed towards meeting this need; although issues of project management and handling of project funds are not a particular focus of the capacity development support.

There are some differences in how bilateral and multilateral projects are approaching capacity development. The bilateral projects tend to focus more on strengthening a single union, including strengthening organizational, programmatic and financial aspects, while multilateral projects focus more on networking and unifying against regional and global challenges. However, there are many examples of organizational development in terms of strengthening organisational, programmatic and financial capacities within the organization also in multilateral projects and of bilateral projects focusing more on broader union-related work, including labour rights.

Union to Union has developed a special capacity building programme where support to project management and thematic issues such as gender and environment are important components. The overall aim of the programme is that all interventions should be of good quality and give implementing organizations opportunities to reach planned results. The programme activities are mainly directed towards Swedish unions

⁷ *Beredning av insats. BedömningsPM, LO-TCO Biståndsnämnden Syd- och Öststram 2014-2016 per 2013-12-19. Sida 2013*

and GUFs at head office and regional levels, but there are examples of trainings where representatives from local unions have participated.

3.2 EFFICIENCY

3.2.1 Allocation of Financial Resources

According to a 2014 agreement between Sida and Union to Union, the latter should increase the share of funds transferred to partner organizations in recipient countries, and make sure that the share exceeds 60 % of the total project budget by the end of the agreement period (or the share that is agreed on after this evaluation).⁸ It should be noted that the GUFs and Swedish unions interviewed in connection with this evaluation appear to not be fully aware of the requirement set out in this agreement.

Sida's current reporting format differentiates between four levels in the chain of support: Union to Union, Swedish CSOs, international cooperation partners, and local cooperation partners. The reporting format requires a specification of the amounts of funds that have been transferred to each level according to agreements. Union to Union transfers almost all funds either to the Swedish union or the GUF head office, since one of the two is the agreement partner. In certain cases, they have in turn sub-agreements with the local union and transfer funds to them.

Union to Union has in its budget and financial reporting formats five levels for which funds are specified: level 1 - Union to Union, level 2: - Swedish union (national requesting organization), level 3 - GUF head office, level 4 - GUF regional office, and level 5 - the local union (field organization). This system was elaborated in the late 1990s together with Nordic and Dutch donors to better capture the way the GUFs are working. As of today, Union to Union is the only donor that still uses the system. In its planned revision of the project management system, the organization intends to review the budget and reporting formats, including the above-mentioned levels.⁹ The division of funds according to Union to Union's current budget and financial report formats is set out below.

⁸ Underavtal mellan Styrelsen för internationellt utvecklingssamarbete (Sida) och LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd gällande Insatsen Rambidirag Syd och Öst för perioden 2014-2016

⁹ Interviews with representatives from Union to Union, November 2015

The division of bilateral and multilateral interventions according to budgets in 2014:

	# Projects	Budget
Bilateral	24	16 473 000
	23%	16%
Multilateral	82	87 388 500
	77%	84%
Total	106	103 861 500

Costs accounted for at each level according to financial reporting 2014:

	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	Total
Bilateral	1 512 432	0	233 273	9 537 575	11 283 280
	13%	0%	2%	85%	100%
Multilateral	5 529 221	14 863 006	22 622 020	36 932 995	79 947 243
	7%	19%	28%	46%	100%
Total	7 041 653	14 863 006	22 855 293	46 470 571	91 230 523
	8%	16%	25%	51%	100%

2014 costs in SEK. Note: There are no costs at level 1 in projects outside Sweden (hence field projects, not communication interventions in Sweden).

In 2014, Union to Union disbursed roughly SEK 91.2 million to bilateral and multilateral projects. Of this amount, approximately SEK 16 million, 18%, went to bilateral interventions and 75.2 million, 82%, to multilateral interventions. In the bilateral interventions, 11.7 million, or 73 % of the total amount of 16 million, is accounted for at level 5. For the multilateral projects, the share accounted for at level 5 is lower, 46%.

However, the fact that an amount is charged to accounting level 5 does not necessarily mean that the amount is actually disbursed to the account of, or in cash to, an organization at level 5. For example, assessed IndustriAll and UNI projects in Latin America do not transfer any funds to the local unions, although there are budgets and funds reported on at level 5. Hence, the formats in the Union to Union system are not showing what is actually transferred according to agreement, how funds are transferred, or how funds are used. There is no clear instruction on how to fill in the formats, and where to put each budget line or cost. Different GUFs and project managers apparently interpret and use the forms differently.

In terms of actual transfer of funds the bilateral and multilateral projects looked at use entirely different approaches. While the vast majority of funding disbursed in the bilateral projects is transferred to level 5, usually between two and four times a year, some of the GUFs transfer no money to that level. In some GUF projects, the affiliate unions are reimbursed for actual expenses after showing receipts. In some cases lim-

ited advances may be handed out, but the affiliates are generally not given larger amounts of funding on the basis of an annual budget or similar presented to the GUF. The primary advantage with the approach of not transferring funds are according to the GUFs that it serves to strengthen the trade union movement as a whole rather than an individual union. It also helps ensure that the unions do not become dependent on the GUFs for their basic operational expenses, but continues to give highest possible attention to ensuring that union members keep paying their monthly dues, which usually amounts to 1% of their salaries.

It appears that the arrangements in which funds are not transferred to the level 5 affiliates are often appreciated by the local trade unions. Many of them are fairly small and claim to still have limited capacity and resources to manage project funding of this nature, and in any case appreciate that they are not given the extra burden associated with managing donor funding. Other reasons mentioned by GUFs and Swedish unions for not transferring funds are the risk of losing control over the money and the risk of corruption.

3.2.2 Selection of Projects and Approaches

Whether a particular intervention is of a bilateral or multilateral nature is not the result of a decision or assessment made at the level of Union to Union. The organization is of the view that the implementing partners are best placed to make these types of strategic decisions. In their assessment of project or programme proposals from the Swedish unions, the project officers at Union to Union do not review or question the decision made by the Swedish union or GUF to implement the project as a bilateral or multilateral intervention, nor do they review whether a programme or project approach is most appropriate.

The priorities set at the GUF congresses guide the overall approaches for the projects. Apart from fitting into Union to Union's overall strategic priorities, which are based on the GUF priorities, Union to Union assess interventions in relation to relevance, methodology and quality, sustainability, budget and cost effectiveness, partnership/partner capacity, and risk.¹⁰ For the previous programme period 2010-2012, Union to Union could decide on a reduction of the requested budget in an application, on the basis of criteria such as cost effectiveness, if there was a poorly motivated increase in the budget compared to previous years, if reporting requirements had not been lived up to, if the project had been ongoing for an excessively long period of

¹⁰ Union to Union template for assessment memo

time, and if local ownership was not ensured.¹¹ Union to Union is currently in the process of reviewing and specifying its future assessment criteria.

Union to Union's project portfolio has been reduced from 208 projects (of which 44 were information projects) in 2009 to 143 projects (25 information projects) by 2014 as part of an action plan that was developed as a response to the 2009 System Based Audit.¹² Over the past years, there has been a shift towards more multilateral projects. People interviewed in connection with this evaluation are of the view that this shift most likely is a consequence of a professionalization of the aid bureaucracy and the increased administrative demands and workload to design and follow up a project.

Many Swedish unions are of the view that it has become overly burdensome for them to manage an intervention by themselves. Therefore many of them prefer to only work with multilateral projects in which a GUF takes on much of this burden. In many ways, this trend of a diminishing interest among Swedish unions in managing development projects is similar to the trend seen among many of the members of Sida's other framework organizations. Globalization and the fact that many of the challenges facing workers around the world require global or regional solutions is believed to be another reason why there has been a shift towards more multilateral projects.

3.2.3 Administration Costs

The OECD/DAC definition of efficiency sets inputs in relation to results. Since results from interventions financed through Union to Union are not quantifiable or comparable between projects, efficiency in line with the OECD/DAC definition has not been possible to assess in this evaluation.

In reviewing the projects and programmes selected for a detailed study in this evaluation, an attempt has been made to calculate the administrative costs and implementation-related costs for each project in order to estimate what share of total project funds that directly benefit local level trade unions. As discussed above, funds *transferred* to level 5 are not the only funds *benefitting* the local unions. In most multilateral projects, funds used at the GUF level are used for project activities for local unions. Therefore funds allocated at the GUF level, especially the regional GUF level that often coordinates and implements the project, benefit level 5 to a large extent. In addition, there are some cases where the Swedish union pays for implementation-related costs such as expert costs.

¹¹ Generella bedömningskriterier och prioriteringar för åren 2010-2012

¹² organizational assessment + Union to Union project database

The Evaluation Team have for the purpose of calculating administrative costs and implementation-related costs for bilateral respectively multilateral interventions divided expenses along the following lines:

Expenses directly benefitting local level trade unions

Costs for project activities directed to local unions

Costs related to salaries for project coordinators at field level

Administrative expenses

Costs for audit

Monitoring costs

External evaluations

Travel costs

Administration costs

Office costs

For the reviewed bilateral and multilateral projects, 87 % respectively 79 % of total expenses benefit local level trade unions. The combined average is 82 %. The higher administrative costs relating to the multilateral projects, 21 % of total expenses, relate to the larger number of actors at different levels and the higher degree of coordination required for projects of the regional or global nature characterizing most multilateral interventions. A factor that is not considered in the calculation above is that bilateral projects are more time consuming for the Union to Union programme officers to handle and thereby incur higher administrative costs at that level.

It should be noted that there in some multilateral projects are significant costs relating to bank fees and currency exchanges as funds are transferred between actors in different countries using different currencies. Funds can be transferred from Swedish krona at Union to Union to Euro or Swiss Franc or Dollars at the GUF head office to a local currency at the GUF regional office to the local union in another local currency. There are no guidelines or policies with regard to this, and the issue is not followed up at Union to Union or GUF level.

3.2.4 Union to Union Efforts to Assess Costs and Efficiency

Union to Union's guidelines for budget analysis directed to applying organisations include instructions on how to ensure effectiveness in projects and programmes.¹³ The process for assessing efficiency was according to Union to Union strengthened

¹³ http://www.uniontounion.org/pdf/Guidelines_budget_analysis.pdf, 2015-10-22

ahead of the current programme period and applicants were encouraged to reflect on how to ensure cost effectiveness and to explain budgets. The same is now applicable to reporting, where Union to Union requires narrative explanations in financial reports.

Union to Union assess efficiency in its assessment of each application, looking at issues such as coordination and monitoring costs at each level; costs for hotel, travel, and per diems; how the administrative costs are specified, and whether there are intentions to allocate costs at regional and local levels. If there are concerns about efficiency, these aspects are according to the Union to Union leadership followed up through dialogue with the partner organisation. Union to Union has also made attempts at comparing costs for similar workshops in different parts of the world, and has through different monitoring visits allegedly received an understanding of what realistic costs are.

3.3 RELEVANCE

3.3.1 In Relation to Sweden's Strategic Priorities and the Needs of Local Unions

The Strategy for support through Swedish civil society organizations 2010-2015 emphasises the need to support civil society organizations' internal democracy, independence and actual performance. As discussed in more detail above, the work of Union to Union is clearly focused on capacity development of trade union organizations and the trade union movement at large in order to ensure that they can contribute to a pluralistic civil society and promote workers' rights, decent work, and democracy.

Local level trade union representatives interviewed in connection with this evaluation are generally of the view that the support they receive is based on their own needs and priorities and that it contributes to their goals of developing their unions to become better at defending and advancing the interests of their members. It should be remembered that the support from Union to Union is channelled through existing trade union structures that would exist even without external donor support. While this is important from an ownership perspective, the work carried out by the trade unions would at the same time not have been carried out on the same scale and with the same quality without the funding provided by these donors. Thus, the trade union movement as a whole would undoubtedly have been weaker and less prepared to defend the rights and interests of its members.

There is a strong consensus among all actors at different levels of the contribution chain, from Union to Union to local trade unions, that the multilateral projects have a high degree of relevance in that activities carried out contribute to the objective of stronger and more effective trade unions. Those interviewees, especially at GUF level, who have highlighted the problems associated with bilateral projects, have argued

that the activities and outputs connected with such projects do not contribute to overarching objectives and therefore lack relevance.

The relevance of certain components or aspects of the support provided have also been questioned. The issue of excessive focus on follow up and project monitoring has for instance been discussed elsewhere in this report. As there is no direct link between excessive monitoring, usually involving the Swedish trade union, and attainment of objectives, the relevance of certain follow up structures and practices can be questioned. With a partial shift from monitoring to capacity strengthening support, project relevance can be enhanced both for bilateral and multilateral projects. Many interviewed actors have suggested that the involvement of the Swedish unions could be directed towards more of an expert role and exchanges between shop stewards rather than focusing on project administration and follow up.

3.4 SUSTAINABILITY

The sustainability of local trade unions is a primary concern of the Swedish trade unions and well as the GUFs. In comparison with most other Sida framework organizations, Union to Union works with organizations that have a reasonable capacity raise their own funds and that usually cover its basic operational expenses through these funds. Often both bilateral and multilateral projects have a strong focus on further increasing local trade unions' sustainability by enhancing their capacity to recruit members and raise fees.

The support provided by Union to Union has often been of a long term nature. In some cases, trade unions have been support has been provided for over 20 years (such as in Zimbabwe), although funding may have been put on hold for certain periods of time. Exit strategies or similar are usually not included in project planning, but is rather something that is considered before each new programme period in relation to each specific context.

The effects of a particular intervention is often more likely to be sustainable if it is characterized by a high degree of ownership or buy-in from the benefitting organization. Arguably, there is also a strong link between ownership and exercising control over financial resources. As discussed above, the financial ownership is weaker in multilateral projects compared to bilateral projects. A smaller share of the project funds are transferred to the local level, and the models of transferring funds, for instance on request in relation to single activities, may imply less responsibility, or ownership, of the funds, activities and the project as a whole. For some Swedish unions this is one of the reasons behind the choice of having bilateral projects.

Most interviewees representing Swedish unions, GUFs and local trade unions argue, however, that ownership is more than having responsibility for budgets and funds. Equally or more important is that local unions are involved in project planning and that it is ensured that the project is genuinely based on the needs and priorities of the

local union. Both Swedish unions and GUFs have procedures for ensuring ownership through involvement and participation and there are generally well functioning process of consultation.

Most current bilateral projects are the result of a long-term relationship between trade unions in Sweden and in the targeted countries. Projects are then usually the outcome of a continuous dialogue on what to do next and how this could fit into a project. New bilateral partnerships have been established in different ways, including during international conferences or by a GUF connecting unions in need of support with a Swedish member union. In either case, the project will be an outcome of the discussions between the Swedish and local union and is typically based on the local union's ideas, needs and priorities.

Multilateral projects usually start from an identified need by the GUF within a thematic area, country or union. The project will then be dependent on the GUF's global strategic priorities. The democratic GUF structure contributes to ownership since member unions around the world set priorities for the GUF and its international development cooperation work. The democratic structures of the individual unions, where leadership is elected by members and issues are collectively decided on, further increases the structural preconditions for ownership even at the grassroots and individual level.

4 Conclusions

4.1 EFFECTIVENESS

Union to Union provides support to local trade unions around the world either through so called bilateral projects (i.e. projects in which Swedish trade unions cooperate with local trade unions), or multilateral projects (i.e. projects in which GUFs' cooperate with local trade unions). To provide support through the GUFs is the more common of the two models. In 2014 nearly 80% of the funding disbursed by Union to Union concerned these so called multilateral projects.

It is also possible to distinguish between global, regional and national projects. The vast majority of all bilateral projects are of a national nature, in which a Swedish union cooperate with a local union. Among the multilateral projects, regional and global projects make up the vast majority. The differences of these partnership models and how they contribute to efficiency, added value, relevance and ownership will be discussed below.

Union to Union has identified five strategic areas around which results can be assessed: Capacity to organize, capacity to educate, capacity to negotiate, capacity to advocate, and capacity to administer. The generic results identified by the Evaluation Team are in line with these priorities, and also correspond to the priorities for Sweden's development cooperation through Swedish civil society organizations.

The results attained through a bilateral respectively multilateral partnership model vary quite considerably in nature. The bilateral projects have generally focused on strengthening the capacity of a single union. The multilateral projects have instead primarily focused on, and successfully contributed to, empowering the labour movement by supporting cooperation between individual unions and coalition building within countries and sectors. The ultimate goal of these efforts is to contribute to a unified, and thereby stronger, trade union movement.

The multilateral projects have also had a focus on connecting unions regionally and internationally and to promote labour rights through international campaigns and international agreements with multilateral companies. It should be noted that many of the GUF representatives interviewed in connection with this evaluation are of the view that the bilateral projects often undermine what they are trying to achieve and thus do more harm than good. Union to Union does not have a system for systematically assessing this concern.

The global and regional mobilization of the trade union movement has often been of utmost importance for the local unions. In many contexts, the very fact that these local unions are connected to a global movement gives them significantly increased leverage in their work on promoting rights and decent work. In contexts where trade union work is particularly hazardous and labour rights activists risk persecution, the international connections that the GUFs provide can also be of importance from a security perspective.

It should be noted that some of the Union to Union supported projects characterized as global or regional do not aim to promote regional or global cooperation and information sharing. In these cases, the regional or global characterization given to the projects are solely of importance from the perspective of project administration.

There are clear and significant differences in the roles played by the actors at the different levels of the chain of support. This does not mean, however, that the added value of the different actors is clear or that there are systems in place for effective follow up of the added value of each level of the chain of support. On the contrary, there is arguably a need to articulate in writing what value each actor in the chain of support should bring and to ensure that all actors are aware of the what they can expect from other actors in terms of their contributions to the successful implementation of a project. This could contribute to increased clarity and efficiency.

In multilateral projects the added value of the GUFs is obvious. Without the GUFs, all projects would be of a bilateral nature and focus would be on strengthening individuals unions rather than on strengthening the larger trade union movement. The added value of the Swedish unions in bilateral projects is also apparent. Without the Swedish unions, there would be no bilateral union-to-union cooperation and the project management role now played by the Swedish unions would have to be handled by Union to Union. The fact that the Swedish unions play an essential role in bilateral projects does not, however, necessarily mean that bilateral projects is a desirable form of intervention.

In the multilateral projects, the added value of the Swedish unions' contribution varies significantly. In some cases the Swedish unions play a role in project planning, contribute by sharing of experiences, or act as an expert and trainer on selected issues. In other cases, the Swedish union brings little more than its own financial contribution or focus solely on project monitoring. In the multilateral projects there are often an excessive number of actors engaged in the follow up aspect of a project, which does not necessarily lead to better control. There is thus a strong need to specify what contribution the Swedish union should make and if it should in fact have any other role than contributing to anchorage in Sweden. It should be noted that Union to Union has no internal system in place to regularly monitor what the added value of the different actors is.

As mentioned above, a particular strength of the multilateral partnership model is that it contributes to promoting cooperation between trade unions and encourages move-

ments towards fewer and larger trade unions, which is considered essential for the establishment of an influential trade union movement. It also connects the union to an international movement that can play a regional or global campaigning role – not least in relation to multinational companies – of importance at the national or local level, and give the unions international attention of importance from a security perspective.

Most of the GUFs also have much more developed structures – including human resources – for handling international development cooperation projects. For Union to Union this often means that the staff time needed to handle a GUF contribution is significantly less than for handling a bilateral contribution.

The bilateral projects' comparative strengths include the fact that they contribute to stronger anchorage in Sweden and stronger solidarity between the Swedish and the local trade unions. Arguably they also provide for stronger local ownership, as the local trade union will typically be directly responsible for implementation of project activities and management of funds. These strengths are, however, outweighed by the concern that bilateral projects may contribute to upholding a divided, and thereby weak, trade union movement.

A bilateral approach should therefore be reserved for contexts in which there to a high extent already exist a unified trade union movement that in the relevant sector is led by a single dominant actor that would benefit from support. If the bilateral support is limited to these types of contexts, the two partnership models may be described as complementing models. In practice, what determines if a project is bilateral or multilateral in nature has little to do with any strategic considerations made by Union to Union but rather by factors such as historical bonds and the project management capacity of the Swedish trade union.

Both the bilateral and the multilateral projects have a strong primary focus on building the capacity of local level trade unions to protect the rights and interests of their members and other workers, although some projects arguably also strive to more directly assist the unions in addressing the concerns of their members. An example of the latter would be interventions aiming at reaching global level of agreements. While these agreements may not necessarily lead to strengthened organizational structures at the local level, they enhance local level unions' abilities to address the concerns of workers.

The focus on increasing capacity through sharing of knowledge and experiences has been stronger in the GUF projects, while both the multilateral and bilateral interventions have contributed to enhance the strengths of the unions through for instance recruitment of members. Generally the capacity building activities supported have aimed at enhancing capacities of specific importance for trade unions. Somewhat less attention has been given to more generic issues of importance for the running of any organization. The prioritization made in this regard is logical considering that the

added value of the GUFs is trade union related issues and not organizational management issues in general.

4.2 EFFICIENCY

The budget and accounting forms that Union to Union is using are not a reliable indication of the actual amounts transferred to or used at different levels of the chain of support. The forms are in fact used and interpreted in different ways by different actors. For several projects, the forms indicate that a majority of project funds have been disbursed to local unions while in fact no money has actually been transferred.

It should also be noted that Union to Union's partners do not seem to be fully aware of the content of the agreement between Sida and Union to Union regarding the required increase in funding transferred to local level unions and the consequences this may have for them. In order to be able to live up to the intentions of the agreement, Union to Union is entirely dependent on its partners reforming or adjusting its current operational practices.

The Evaluation Team is of the view, however, that the intentions behind the agreement are misguided and that its implementation would contribute to reduce the effectiveness of the support to the trade union movement. The channelling of funds directly to individual trade unions have contributed to reducing incentives for cooperation and coalition building and for ensuring sustainability through increasing the number of financially contributing members, all of which are essential ingredients for the establishment of an influential trade union movement.

Whether a particular intervention is of a bilateral or multilateral nature is not the result of a decision or assessment made at the level of Union to Union, but made by the applying and implementing partners. The reasons behind the Swedish trade unions increasing interests in multilateral projects and decreasing interest in bilateral projects is closely linked to what is perceived as increasingly burdensome management demands and the generally superior project management capacity of the GUFs. The general advantages of a multilateral approach, as described above, are also recognized.

An absence of quantifiable results has made it impossible to carry out a strict cost effectiveness analysis, in which the relationship between inputs and results is assessed. A number of reflections can, however, be made regarding the issues of costs and how cost effectiveness is followed up by Union to Union, Swedish Unions and the GUFs. It should be noted that Union to Union has no system in place to systematically compare costs between projects, even though one-off efforts, limited in scope, have been done in this regard.

While a higher percentage of total funding is channelled to local level unions in bilateral projects, this should not be seen as an indication of a higher degree of cost effectiveness. As mentioned above, from a results perspective multilateral projects are

usually the preferred option. However, channelling of funds at several different levels in the multilateral projects is a matter of concern in some cases. These transfers are costly, partly because of currency conversions and partly because of bank fees, but also problematic from the perspective of financial predictability. It seems that it would in many cases be possible to reduce the number of times funds are transferred.

As the current budget and accounting forms Union to Union uses are interpreted and used differently by different actors, they create more confusion than clarity. It is obviously important to keep track of and understand project administration and management costs at different levels, but to monitor how funds are transferred between different GUF levels, as a way trying to understand issues of efficiency, added value and ownership, makes no sense. Focus should instead be on developing a methodology for determining and understanding how much of total funds received by a GUF – regardless of whether it is at global, regional or local level – that can in effect be regarded as having been used in a manner that directly benefits local level trade unions.

Cost effectiveness could be increased if the role and expected added value of the Swedish trade unions is clarified. This is particularly the case in multilateral projects where the Swedish unions are often primarily fulfilling a monitoring and follow up role already played by other actors. Thus the overall number of actors playing a project monitoring role is often excessive and is in effect undermining both efficiency and effectiveness. Furthermore, having responsibility for monitoring divided between many actors does not necessarily mean better follow up.

4.3 RELEVANCE AND SUSTAINABILITY

In relation to the Strategy for support through Swedish civil society organizations, the support provided by Union to Union must be regarded as highly relevant regardless of partnership model. It undoubtedly contributes to a vibrant and pluralistic civil society that improves the lives of workers and promotes democratic values and human rights.

Local trade union ownership has been strong in both the bilateral and the multilateral projects assessed. The way ownership is ensured is, however, significantly different in the two models. In the bilateral projects, ownership has often been ensured through a focus on providing additional resources to already on-going or planned interventions largely funded by the trade unions themselves or by funding new projects largely or exclusively developed and formulated at the local level. The multilateral projects all correspond to the respective GUF's broad strategic priorities adopted during the GUF's global congress or in a similar manner. While remaining within the framework of the global strategic priorities, the project ideas are then developed at regional or national level to ensure relevance for concerned local trade unions and for the trade union movement within the sector as a whole.

It should be noted that regardless of whether the projects have been bilateral or multilateral, concerned local level unions have without exception perceived that they exercise a very high degree of ownership. Consequently, the Evaluation Team does not

see any reasons for Union to Union, the Swedish unions or the GUF's to change their current approaches in this regard. It could have been argued, however, that stronger ownership would have been attained if funding was to a higher degree channelled directly to the local level unions. Although ownership is evidently very closely linked to being able to exercise control over money, the fact that such an approach undermines the cooperation and coalition building needed for the development of a strong union movement, and that it tends to undermine sustainability, makes it undesirable.

The sustainability of supported interventions has been increased thanks to the high degree of ownership exercised by the local trade unions. Often the issue of sustainability has also been given a more direct and prominent role within projects through a focus on enhancing the capacity of local trade unions to attract members and raise fees.

5 Recommendations

5.1 RECOMMENDATION TO SIDA AND UNION TO UNION

1. Make null and void the 2014 agreement between Sida and Union to Union stating the latter should increase the share of funds transferred to partner organizations in recipient countries, and make sure that the share exceeds 60 % of the total project budget by the end of the agreement period (or the share that is agreed on after this evaluation). If any agreement of a similar nature should be entered into in the future, its application should be limited to bilateral one-to-one projects and the share to be transferred could then be higher than 60 %.

5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS TO UNION TO UNION

2. The bilateral partnership model should be reserved for contexts in which the support does not risk contributing to division among trade unions and undermining attempts at establishing a more unified labour movement.
3. Ensure that all applications for support to bilateral projects are accompanied by a thorough context analysis explaining how the planned project relate to and complement other support initiatives, including multilateral partnerships.
4. Articulate in writing what role each actor in the chain of support should have, and what value they should bring, in both bilateral and multilateral projects, and establish a system for effective follow up of this. All actors should be aware of what they can expect from other actors in terms of their contributions to the successful implementation of a project or programme.
5. If Swedish trade unions should play a role in multilateral projects, it should be ensured that this is primarily a capacity building and expert role and not a follow up and monitoring role.
6. Union to Union should establish a system to compare and follow up cost effectiveness between projects, including a methodology for determining and understanding how much of total funds received by a GUF – regardless of whether it is at global, regional or local level – that benefit local level trade unions.

7. Budget and accounting forms should be reviewed and instructions should be clarified to avoid differences in their application.
8. The chain of actors through which funding is channelled before it is used for the benefit of local trade unions should whenever possible be simplified and shortened.
9. Union to Union should ensure that its partner organizations are informed of any agreements the organization has with Sida that can significantly impact the work of the partners.
10. Union to Union should strive to better harmonize processes and requirements, including financial and narrative reporting, with those of other trade union donors.
11. Union to Union should develop a stronger quality assurance role and an ability to provide strategic advice and guidance in relation to both bilateral and multilateral projects to ensure that they are well grounded in best international practice.

Annex 1: Literature

EY 2011. "Report on the review of the international control systems of framework organizations including their partner organization. LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd Malawi 2011"

EY 2013. "Report on the review of the international control systems of framework organizations including their partner organization. LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd 2013"

SDA 2015. "Project report. Union to Union Programme approach.SDA.20151020"

Sida 2013. "Beredning av insatsbedömningsPM, LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd Syd- och öst 2014-2016 per 2013-12-19" (Assessment memo)

Sida 2014. "Avtal om allmänna villkor för Sidas bidrag till LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd" (Agreement Sida-Union to Union)

Sida 2014. "Underavtal mellan Sida och LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd gällande Insatsen Ram-bidrag Syd och Öst" (Agreement Sida-Union to Union)

SIPU International 2013. "Final Report of Organisational Assessment of LO-TCO"

Union to Union 2014. "Riskregister LOTCO 2014"

Union to Union 2013. "Bilaga 2, LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd" (Annex to application)

Union to Union 2013. "Bilaga 3 -Decent work - Decent life, programmet per sektor 2014" (Annex to application)

Union to Union 2013. "Bilaga 3, Verksamheten 2014-2016, Strategi" (Annex to application)

Union to Union 2013. "Bilaga 5, Riskregister" (Annex to application)

Union to Union 2013. "Generella bedömningskriterier och prioriteringar för ansökan 2013" (Assessment Criteria)

Union to Union 2013. "LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd Ramansökan Syd-Öst 2014-2016" (Application to Sida)

Union to Union 2013. "Projekt och program underlag 2014-2016 - bilaga 4" (Annex to application)

Union to Union 2014. "Verksamhetsberättelse LOTCO 2014" (Annual Report)

Union to Union 2014. "Årsredovisning LOTCO 2014" (Annual Report)

Union to Union 2015. "Kap utv programrapport PM 2014" (Programme report Capacity Development Programme)

Union to Union 2015. "Kapacitetsutvecklingsprogrammet aktivitetsplaner 2015" (Activity Plan Capacity Development Programme)

Travel Reports from Sida 2011-2015 regarding Union to Union

Project documents for projects reviewed (see list in annex III)

End of project reports 2010-2012

Applications 2014-2016

Annual reports 2014

Union to Union assessment memos

Union to Union travel reports

Annex 2: Persons Consulted

Name	Organization	Position	Place	Date
Adriana Hurtado	FECOLPER (IFJ partner)	President	Bogota	Oct 2
Adriana Rosenzvaig	UNI	Regional Secretary Regional Office	Montevideo	Oct 5
Alex Nicolau Garcia	LO	Legal Counsellor and Programme Coordinator, LLDP	Stockholm	Sep 24
Alex Ramahu	NUMSA (IF Metall partner)	Former project coordinator	Johannesburg	Oct 8
Alvaro Espino	IndustriALL	Administrative assistant Regional Office	Montevideo	Oct 4
Anita Vahlberg	SJF	Senior Advisor	Telephone	Nov 3
Ann-Katrin Koskinen Dolium	Union to Union	Program officer UNI	Stockholm	Sep 10
Anna Gustafsson	TCO	International Secretary	Stockholm	Sep 24
Anner Fernandez	Sintracarbon (IndusriALL affiliate)	Fiscal dala sacconal albania	Bogota	Oct 1
Annette Persson Sunje	Union to Union	Financial officer	Stockholm	Sep 10, Nov 6
Awoa Sakyi	IUF	Regional women's project coordinator	Skype	Oct 19
Barbro Budin	IUF	Gender Equality and Projects Officer	Geneva	Oct 8
Bertha Rey Castelblanco	FECODE (Lärarförbundet partner)		Bogota	Sep 29
Birgit Birgersson Brorsson	IF Metall	Ombudsman	Telephone	Nov 13
Carina Söderbjörn	Union to Union	Program officer ITUC och IFJ	Stockholm	Sep 11
Carla Méndez	Gremio de la industria de la vestimenta		Montevideo	4 Oct
Carlos Bustos Patiño	IndustriALL	Project coordinator Colombia office	Bogota	Oct 1
Carlos Ramirez	FECODE (Lärarförbundet partner)		Bogota	Sep 29
Catholice Moraba	FAWU (IUF affiliate)	Organizer	Johannesburg	Oct 8
Crecentia	BWI	Regional Representative	Johannes-	Oct 2

ANNEX 2: PERSONS CONSULTED

Mofokeng		Regional Office	burg	
Diogenes Orjuela	CUT (LO-TCO partner)	Director for international relations	Bogota	Sep 29
Donald Mkhari	SANA-U (Musikerförbundet partner)	Project Coordinator	Skype	Oct 12
Dosso Ndessomin	BWI	Regional Finance Officer Regional Office	Johannesburg	Oct 2
Eduardo Burgos	Gremio metalúrgico UNTM-RA (Unión Nacional de Trabajadores Metalúrgicos y Ramas Afines)	Secretario de Relaciones para América Latina y el Caribe	Montevideo	Oct 4
Elena Roksmann	Sida	Programme officer Program-ansvarig med inriktning intern styrning och kontroll	Stockholm	Sep 21
Elisabet Brandberg	Sida	Programme officer	Stockholm	Sep 21
Elsinah Botsalo	Manual Workers (PSI affiliate)	Coordinator Women's Desk, Deputy Chief Executive	Gaborone	Oct 6
Enrique Seveso	Organización del gremio de la industria del cuero UOC (Unión de Obreros Curtidores)	Secretario	Montevideo	Oct 4
Eva Elmstedt Frisk	Lärarförbundet	International Secretary		Sep 22
Fabian Nkomo	IndustriALL	Regional Secretary Regional Office	Johannesburg	Oct 2
Felipe Diaz Chavez	IndustriALL	Assistant to project coordinator Colombia office	Bogota	Oct 1
Ferdinando Rodriguez	Sintrapulcar (UNI affiliate)	CEO Bogota	Bogota	Sep 28
Fons Vannieuwenhuysse	IndustriALL	Head of Brussels Project Office	Geneva	Oct 9
Francisco Maltes	CUT (LO-TCO partner)	Director investigations and projects	Bogota	Sep 29
Frida Karlsson	HRF		Telephone	Nov 3
Gaebepe Moladi	BRAWU (Transport partner)	Chairperson	Gaborone	Oct 5
Garikanai Shoko	BWI	Project coordinator Regional Office	Johannesburg	Oct 2
Gerardo Iglesias	IUF	Regional Secretary Regional Office	Montevideo	Oct 5
Géza Polónyi	Musikerförbundet	Ombudsman	Stockholm	Oct 29
Gittan Arwén	Union to Union	Program officer FIM, FIA och UNI-MEI	Stockholm	Sep 10
Göran Larsson	Transport	International secretary	Stockholm	Sep 21
Héctor Castellano	IndustriALL	Project coordinator Regional Office	Montevideo	Oct 4
Heidi Lampinen	Union to Union	Program officer IndustriAll	Stockholm	Sep 11

ANNEX 2: PERSONS CONSULTED

		och IUF		
Henry Perez	FECODE (Lärarförbundet partner)		Bogota	Sep 29
Hernando Guzman	Union Familia Sancela (UNI affiliate)	Secretary	Bogota	Sep 28
Hlokoza Motau	NUMSA (IF Metall partner)	International Officer	Johannesburg	Oct 8
Igor Diza Lopez	Sintracarb—n/IndustriALL National Council	Education Secretary/Member	Bogota	Oct 1
Ina Eriksson	Lärarförbundet	International Secretary	Stockholm	Sep 22
Irma Gomez	FECODE (Lärarförbundet partner)		Bogota	Sep 29
Ivonne Rodriquez	CUT (LO-TCO partner)		Bogota	Sep 29
Jasmin Redzepovic	BWI	Assistant Education Secretary head office	Stockholm	Sep 30
Jasper Goss	PSI		Skype	Sep 30
Joacim Carlson	Sida	Deputy Head of Unit	Stockholm	Sep 21
Johan Schmidt	LO	Project manager	Stockholm	Sep 24
Johnson P. Motshwarakgole	Manual Workers (PSI affiliate)	National Organising Secretary	Gaborone	Oct 6
Jorge Agudelo	Sintracarcol (UNI affiliate)	Claims commissioner	Bogota	Sep 28
Jorge Almeida	IndustriALL	Regional secretary Regional Office	Montevideo	Oct 4
Juan Alberto Parma	Sintrapulcar (UNI affiliate)	CEO National	Bogota	Sep 28
Kenneth Mogane	IndustriALL	Project coordinator Regional Office	Johannesburg	Oct 8
Kristina Henschen	Union to Union	Secretary general	Stockholm	Nov 6
Kristina Olsson	Kommunal	Former International Secretary	Telephone	Oct 20
Lasse Wählstedt	Pappers		Telephone	Nov 11
Lebogang Keabetswe	BOBEU (UNI affiliate)	General Secretary	Gaborone	Oct 5
Leif Isaksson	LO	National Officer	Stockholm	Sep 24
Ligia Mateus	FECODE (Lärarförbundet partner)		Bogota	Sep 29
Lorena Gallego	IndustriALL	Finance assistant Regional Office	Montevideo	Oct 4
Lucia Mmaophala Mokgosi	Manual Workers (PSI affiliate)	General Secretary	Gaborone	Oct 6
Luis Alejandro Pedraza	CUT/IUF Latin America	President/Vice President	Bogota	Sep 27
Magnus Andersson	Vision		Telephone	Oct 19
Marego Gwapela	BDWU (IndustriALL affili-	Administrative Officer	Gaborone	Oct 5

ANNEX 2: PERSONS CONSULTED

	ate)			
Maria Eugenia Londono	FECODE (Lärarförbundet partner)		Bogota	Sep 29
Mattias Qvarsell	Musikerförbundet	Ombudsman	Stockholm	Oct 29
Max Correa	FECODE (Lärarförbundet partner)		Bogota	Sep 29
Mery Laura Perdamo	CUT (LO-TCO partner)	Lawyer	Bogota	Sep 29
Miryam C. Nieto	CUT (LO-TCO partner)	Technical secretary	Bogota	Sep 29
Modime Joe Kokela	SASBO (UNI affiliate)	President	Johannesburg	Oct 7
Modiri Bontshetse	BDWU (IndustriALL affiliate)	Executive Secretary	Gaborone	Oct 5
Mopholosi Morokong	IUF	Project coordinator	Johannesburg	Oct 2
Mpho Keatshabe	BRAWU (Transport partner)	Treasurer	Gaborone	Oct 5
Nathalie Lucasson	Union to Union	Program officer EI, ICN och ITF	Stockholm	Sep 10
Niklas Enström	Elektrikerna	International secretary	Telephone	Nov 3
Nina Larrea	Union to Union	Head of programmes	Stockholm	Nov 5
Nomvula Mary Nxumalo	CEPPAWU (BWI affiliate)	National Gender/HIV Coordinator	Johannesburg	Oct 6
Olga Lucia Omacho Barrera	Sintraelecol Meta (IndustriALL affiliate)	General secretary	Bogota	Oct 1
Oliver Money-Kyrle	IFJ		Skype	Oct 14
Order Mafoka	BOBEU (UNI affiliate)	Chairman	Gaborone	Oct 5
Patricia Nyman	SACCAWU (IUF affiliate)	National project coordinator	Johannesburg	Oct 7
Patrik Bergwall	Union to Union	Program officer IUF	Stockholm	Sep 15
Paula Engwall	Lärarförbundet	Head of International Unit		Sep 22
Per Olof Sjöo	Union to Union board	Chairman	Stockholm	Oct 22
Percy Masuku	PSI sub-regional office	Project coordinator	Skype	Oct 13
Rafael Molano	CUT (LO-TCO partner)	Vice president	Bogota	Sep 29
Robert Eriksson	GS-facket	Former head of finance at Union to Union	Stockholm	Nov 5
Rosario Franco	FECODE (Lärarförbundet partner)		Bogota	Sep 29
Rosmarie Strasky	Union to Union	Financial manager	Stockholm	Sep 10, Nov 6
Ruby Toro	FECODE (Lärarförbundet partner)		Bogota	Sep 29
Sigrid Bergfeldt	Union to Union	Methods officer	Stockholm	Sep 11

ANNEX 2: PERSONS CONSULTED

Simon Keraetsw Kgaoganang	Manual Workers (PSI affiliate)	National Chairman	Gaborone	Oct 6
Simon Strannard	Union to Union	Program officer PSI och BWI	Stockholm	Sep 10
Staynass Mahowa	FAWU (IUF affiliate)	Shop Steward	Johannesburg	Oct 8
Steeve Latte	IndustriALL	Finance Officer Head Office	Geneva	Oct 9
Suraya Jawoodeen	NUMSA (IF Metall partner)	Secretariat HoD	Johannesburg	Oct 8
Suzanna Miller	IndustriALL	Projects and Rights Officer Head Office	Geneva	Oct 9
Tos Annouevo	BWI	Education Secretary head office	Stockholm	Sep 30
Tsenang Bathu Nfila	BRAWU (Transport partner)	Project coordinator	Gaborone	Oct 5
Tshepo Lekote	BOBEU (UNI affiliate)	Deputy General Secretary	Gaborone	Oct 5
Vicente Brayan	FECODE (Lärarförbundet partner)		Bogota	Sep 29
William Baron	FECODE (Lärarförbundet partner)		Bogota	Sep 29
Wilman Nyate	Transport	Local coordinator	Gaborone	Oct 5
Yuli Higuear	Sindicato de Claro (UNI affiliate)	National President	Bogota	Sep 28
Åke Wickberg	Union to Union	Controller	Stockholm	Sep 10

Annex 3: Interventions Reviewed

Project id	Model	Swe org	GUF	Budget 2014 in SEK	Budget 2015 in SEK	Budget 2016 in SEK	Region
60089	Multilateral global program	GS, Byggnads	BWI	14 097 000	15 190 000	15 094 000	Global
60081	Multilateral reg project	Kommunal	IUF	706 000	706 000	706 000	Africa
60075	Multilateral reg project	Kommunal	IUF	1 943 000	1 943 000	1 943 000	Africa
60066	Multilateral reg project	Finansförbundet	UNI	601 000	785 000	795 000	Africa
60004	Multilateral reg project	IF Metall	IndustriALL	1 516 000	1 516 000	1 669 000	Africa
60048	Multilateral nat project	Vision	PSI	413 000	400 000	418 000	Africa
60003	Bilateral project	IF Metall		809 000	807 000	854 000	Africa
60047	Bilateral project	Musikerförbundet	FIM	717 000	256 000	256 000	Africa
60016	Bilateral project	Transport		314 000	321 000	337 000	Africa
40082	Multilateral reg project	HRF	IUF	467 000	592 000	604 000	Latin America
60084	Multilateral nat project	Pappers	IndustriALL	255 000	268 000	282 000	Latin America
60057	Multilateral nat project	IF Metall	IndustriALL	1 156 000	1 156 000	1 156 000	Latin America
60088	Multilateral reg project	GS	UNI	509 000	526 000	544 000	Latin America
60089	G Multilateral UF reg project	SEKO	UNI	14 097 000	15 190 000	15 094 000	Global
60019	Bilateral program	Läraryrket	EI	6 666 000	6 618 000	6 119 000	Global
60027	Multilateral project	SFJ	IFJ	474 000	474 000	474 000	Latin America
60037	Bilateral global project	LO TCO		2 980 000	2 890 000	2 791 000	Global
60008	Bilateral project	LO TCO		590 000	590 000	590 000	Latin America

Annex 4: Inception Report

Introduction

SIPU International, represented by Henrik Alffram, Lisa Curman and Viktoria Hildenwall, have been engaged by Sida to conduct the evaluation of Union to Union (*Utvärdering av LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd: Modeller för fackligt utvecklingssamarbete som är relevanta, kostnadseffektiva samt främjar ett lokalt ägarskap*).

According to the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the assignment SIPU should submit this Inception report, which presents its understanding of the assignment and its requirements, the methodology to be used, the type of documents to be reviewed, the interviews to be conducted, and a preliminary report outline and a work plan.

It is expected that this Inception report, once approved by Sida, will regulate the scope, focus and methodological approach of the assignment.

Purpose and scope of the assignment

Union to Union is a sub-granting framework organization that channels its support through Swedish trade unions or Global Union Federations (GUFs) that in turn cooperate with national or local trade unions. The ToR underlines the importance of identifying the relevance and added value of each actor and level in the chain of support and that these are considered in relation to cost effectiveness, local ownership and the ability to attain results or change.

Sida expects an increase in the share of Union to Union's total budget that is disbursed to local partner organizations, as indicated in the current framework agreement between Sida and Union to Union. The agreement also indicates that the present evaluation should provide information helping to determine the size of this share.

The explicit purpose of the evaluation, as set out in the ToR is to map and analyse:

- the relevance of Union to Union's operations in relation to the Strategy for support through Swedish civil society organizations 2010-2015;
- the added value, ownership and efficiency – including conditions for sub-granting Sida's support to local partners – of Union to Union's operations in relation to its objectives and the partnership models applied; and
- the results attained in relation to Union to Union's objectives and the partnership models applied.

The ToR also stresses the importance of assessing if Union to Union to a higher degree can enhance the capacity of its local partners as civil society organizations "in their own right", by for instance strengthening their administrative and financial ca-

capacity. The evaluation may discuss this issue in light of Sweden's civil society policy as well as the issue of value added.

Limitations

The quality of the Evaluation Team's assessment of "results attained in relation to the Council's objectives and the partnership models applied" and the level of results assessed will be directly related to the availability and quality of Union to Union's internal project and programme monitoring reports. The Evaluation Team will review result reports and in connection with country visits verify the content of such reports and look for unreported results.

Assessments of efficiency will also be affected by the quality of the information generated through the internal monitoring and financial systems. Efficiency will be assessed through both quantitative and qualitative methods, but we expect that it will not be possible to make exact and detailed comparisons of costs per unit between partnership models due to the great variety that exist in the external environment in which projects are implemented.

Methodology

The Evaluation Team finds the methodological advice and instructions set out in the ToR to be appropriate. Thus, the methodology sketched out below is closely based on the guidance provided in the ToR as well as on discussions held with Sida and Union to Union during the inception period. It is our understanding that the primary focus of this real-time evaluation should be on learning.

In order to structure the evaluation and describe how the evaluation questions relate to the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, a division of the questions (sometimes slightly revised from the ToR) under the different criteria is set out in the table below.

Evaluation Criterion	Questions from the ToR	Method
Efficiency	How are interventions divided and financial resources allocated between the different partnership models?	Interviews with staff and board members at Union to Union regarding financial priorities and strategic decision making. Review of budgets and actual expenses.
	How, and on the basis of what criteria, are decisions made regarding number of initiatives, as well as size of budget, for each partnership model?	Interviews with staff and board members at Union to Union regarding financial priorities and strategic decision making. Review of budgets and actual expenses.
	Are the different partnership models cost effective? Why or why not?	Budget analysis Assess strengths and weaknesses of partnership models (aspects to consider: programme officers' time allocated for different partnership models, results achieved, costs, type of support)

	Are there differences in the degree to which the different partnership models ensure cost effectiveness?	Key informant interview at all levels of the contribution chain and with external observers, including former staff and donor representatives. Budget analysis
	How can the different models ensure a higher degree of cost effectiveness?	Key informant interview at all levels of the contribution chain and with external observers including former staff and donor representatives. Budget analysis
Effectiveness	What do Union to Union's different partnership models look like?	Literature review and key informant interviews at Union to Union focusing on obtaining specifics about the two contribution chains or overarching partnership models.
	What are the results attained by the different partnership models in relation to Union to Union's established goals and in relation to the Strategy for support through Swedish civil society organizations 2010-2015?	Review of presented results in Union to Union's reporting. Review of result reports from sample projects (selection relating to country visits). Verification of selected reported results through interviews with key informants in countries visited. Review of Union to Union's established goals. Review of Sweden's cso-strategy.
	What are the reasons behind identified differences in attainment of results?	Review of findings relating to results (see above). Key informant interview at all levels of the contribution chain
	In relation to organizations in the South, what is the added value (of different levels) of the support to global and regional organization/mobilization of the trade union movement?	Key informant interviews at all levels of the support chain regarding different actors' contribution to results.
	Is value added defined in relation to all levels of the chain of support? If yes, what do they look like and how are they followed up? ¹⁴	Review of project and policy documents. Key informant interviews at all levels of the chain of support and partnership regarding own organization's and other actors' contribution to results. Special focus on reviewing capacity building efforts aiming at strengthening local unions in their "own right".

¹⁴ Questions of value added and relevance should not least be seen in light of capacity building efforts aiming at strengthening local unions in their own right.

	What are the strengths and weaknesses of the different partnership models?	Key informant interviews.
	Are the different partnership models complementing each other and, if so, how?	Key informant interviews.
	How and in which fields are efforts made, within the different partnership models, to enhance the capacity of local organizations?	Review of project and policy documents. Key informant interviews at all levels of the chain of support and partnership regarding own organization's and other actors' contribution to results. Special focus on reviewing capacity building efforts aiming at strengthening local unions in their "own right".
Relevance	What is the relevance of the different partnership models in relation to the Strategy for support through Swedish civil society organizations 2010-2015?	Review and analysis of strategy, policy and project documents. Key informant interviews
	Are there differences in the degree to which the different partnership models ensures relevance or value added. How can the different models better ensure relevance or value added?	Review and analysis of strategy, policy and project documents. Key informant interviews at all levels of the contribution chain.
Sustainability	Are there differences to which degree the different partnership models promote ownership? How can the different models better promote ownership?	Review and analysis of strategy, policy and project documents. Key informant interviews at all levels of the contribution chain. Assess the degree to which Union to Union's overall funding is channelled to Swedish MOs, GUFs (at central and regional level) and to local partner organizations respectively. Assess the degree to which the support is aligned with partner organization's priorities. Compare partners' strategies with project documents. Ask representatives from local partner organizations regarding perception of ownership. Assess degree to which capacity building priorities are determined by the Union to Union/GUFs, Swedish MOs or local partner organizations. Assess to what extent transfer of competence to local staff members has been successful.

The Evaluation Team understands that efficiency, added value, relevance and ownership should be assessed in relation to actors or levels in the support chain and in relation to different partnership models. While there as mentioned below can be a range of differences in exactly how the support is organized, all support from Union to Un-

ion to the final beneficiaries follows one of the following two overarching agreement chains:



The primary actors with which this evaluation is concerned are thus:

Union to Union: Union to Union was established in 1976 as the LO-TCO Council and currently has three member organizations, LO (the Swedish Trade Union Confederation), Saco (the Swedish Confederation of Professional Associations) and TCO (the Swedish Confederation of Professional Employees). It describes itself as a non-partisan non-profit organization that "works in favour of democracy, the fair distribution of resources, and sustainable development" and that "promote human rights at work and support the creation and organisation of unions, with the goal to increase the possibility to lead a decent life." Union to Union channels support from Sida to Swedish trade unions or GUFs that in turn cooperate with national or local trade unions in some 80 countries around the world. It also implements a number of communication and information projects in Sweden. Its total budget amounts for 2015 to roughly SEK 130 million.

Swedish trade unions: The Swedish trade unions federations LO, TCO and Saco and their members unions can seek funding from Union to Union for support to local trade unions.

GUFs: A GUF is an "international federation of national trade unions organizing in specific industry sector or occupational groups". Union to Union cooperates with about a dozen GUFs, which in turn provides support to local trade unions. Most GUFs have an organizational structure with a Europe-based central offices and several regional offices or representations around the world. Many of them represent hundreds of trade unions and millions of workers.

Local Trade Unions: While Union to Union currently supports roughly 100 projects, the number of local trade unions benefitting from its interventions is considerably higher. Many of the projects implemented by the GUFs are of a regional or global character, which means that each project targets several trade unions in different countries. In terms of size, strength, capacity and operational environment, the differences between the local trade unions are considerable.

Within each of the contribution chains, or partnerships models, illustrated above there are a number of variables. A GUF may for instance disburse funding directly to local trade unions or through a GUF's regional presence. A GUF may also provide its support as part of an individual project support to an individual trade union, or as part of a support targeting several trade unions in several different countries. A GUF is sometimes involved in projects or programmes implemented by a Swedish trade union, although there is no funding channelled through the GUF in these cases. While the Team will take these and other types of variations into account throughout the evaluation, primary attention will be paid to the two overarching contribution chains, or partnership models, illustrated above.

As mentioned above, and made clear by the evaluation questions, *efficiency*, *ownership* and *added value* are central concepts guiding the evaluation. Even though these concepts may be reviewed and discussed throughout the evaluation, it would be useful if Union to Union, Sida and the Evaluation Team from the onset of the evaluation can agree on basic definitions of the three concepts. The Team suggests the following definitions:

Efficiency (or cost effectiveness) is, in line with the OECD/DAC definition, a measurement of outputs in relation to inputs. The costs associated with different partnership models for achieving the same benefits should thus be compared to the extent possible. Other aspects of whether or not value for money is attained will also be assessed, including the costs for particular items and timely attainment of objectives. The fact that clear limitations exist as to the extent that efficiency can be assessed in interventions of the nature concerned is mentioned above under 2.1 Limitations.

In line with how the concept of ownership is commonly defined in the aid effectiveness discourse, *ownership* should in this study concern the degree to which Union to Union's support is aligned with its developing country partner organizations' own priorities and strategies and the degree to which Union to Union contributes to enhance the partner organizations' capacity to develop and implement their strategies. When assessing the concept, the Team will also relate to how the evaluation stakeholders define it.

Added value concerns the advantages for a developing country partner organization of a particular partnership model or actor in comparison with other models and in comparison with the absence of any partnership. In order to capture how different actors in the chain of support sees added value, SIPU intends to do a perception study mapping different actors opinions about the value they and others add to the results attained.

SIPU is committed to ensuring that the evaluation to the highest extent possible is relevant to Sida's future management of its support to Union to Union and to strengthening Union to Union's internal systems and procedures. It is envisaged that

Sida and Union to Union are engaged and given opportunities to provide input during all main stages of the evaluation and that evaluation findings and conclusions are discussed and validated with them and that in-depth discussions are held on what actions they may usefully result in.

Data Collection

It is proposed that the Data Collection phase of the evaluation starts as soon as the Inception Report has been approved. The Evaluation Team will during this phase collect information through a desk review of relevant documents and statistical information, and through interviews with stakeholders and key informants relating to the specific evaluation questions described above. The evaluation will focus around analysing interventions in the four (or five) countries visited, but all current Union to Union-projects will when possible be used for statistical purposes

Development of data collection strategy

During the Inception Phase this Inception Report has been developed through consultations with Sida and Union to Union. Once approved, it is envisaged that the Inception Report will serve as the overall strategy for data collection and in all other aspects guide the evaluation process. There are currently remaining details to decide upon regarding timing of country visits and interview details.

Desk study

The desk study will comprise a broad review of documents from Union to Union and its partners that are identified by the Evaluation Team, Sida and Union to Union as relevant for the evaluation, including applications, assessments of applications, narrative and financial project and programme reports, planning and strategy documents and any external evaluations carried out. In relation to project documentation, primary focus will be placed on documentation related to interventions in the countries visited. The Evaluation Team will also review Sida's assessment memos and minutes from follow-up meetings. It will also study Sweden's *Strategi för stöd genom svenska organisationer i det civila samhället 2010-2015* and SIPU International's *Organisational Assessments of Civil Society Organisations (CSO) in view of possible qualification as Sida's framework and/or strategic partner organisations*.

Interviews

Interviews will be conducted with representatives of Sida, Union to Union, Swedish member unions, GUFs' headquarters, GUFs' regional offices and local partner organizations. All interviews will be semi-structured and adapted to reflect the respondent's expected area of experience and knowledge. While it is assumed that most interviews will be conducted face-to-face, additional interviews may be carried out over Skype or telephone with informants in organizations not visited.

The country visits, selected during the Inception Phase, should contribute to the data collection and to validate observations made in connection with the desk review and the interviews carried out in Sweden and by telephone or Skype. In order to ensure that evaluation conclusions are based on a reasonably representative sample of Union to Union's interventions and that the usefulness of the country visits are maximized, the Team has taken into account the following factors in selecting countries to visit and projects to examine in greater detail:

Financial and time constraints: The Team has taken into consideration the limited time and financial means available for country visits. While trying to ensure diversity, the Team has also looked at issues such as travel costs and the possibilities of visiting neighbouring countries.

Comparability: In order to be able to compare, at least to some extent, the efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of different partnership models and approaches, we have in the selection process strived to identify projects that have similar goals. The Team has thus taken project objectives, rather than particular unions or GUFs as the starting point for identifying suitable country visits. A common goal for many projects is organizational development, including the capacity of supported unions to increase their membership base. Special attention has in the selection process been paid to this particular goal.

Number of projects in the country: In order to ensure that evaluation findings and conclusions are based on a reasonably high and representative number of projects, an important factor for the Team has been the possibility of visiting and assessing all aspects, including the results, of a fairly high number of comparative interventions in each country.

Mix of bilateral and multilateral projects: The Team has looked for countries in which there are examples of projects funded directly through a Swedish union and projects in which the funding has been channelled through a GUF.

Mix of country focused, regional and global projects: The Team has strived to obtain a mixture of projects focusing only on one country and those of a regional or global nature.

Diversity in terms of thematic sectors: The Team has aimed to ensure that the projects assessed relate to several different sectors (as presented in LO-TCO's 2014-2016 project document).

Inclusion of both local unions and GUFs: As the Team wants to be able to follow all steps in the contribution chain from Sida to the local unions, the Team has in the country selection taken into consideration both the presence of local unions and of regional GUF offices/representations. The Team has considered the possibility of

visiting several GUF headquarters on one and the same trip, and has thus taken into consideration where the headquarters of the GUFs working on the projects assessed are based.

Geographical diversity: The Team has strived to ensure that at least two different continents are visited.

Taking the above factors and consultations with Sida and Union to Union into consideration, the Team plans to visit Colombia and Uruguay and South Africa and Botswana. There are about 25 projects in total in these countries and a majority of them have a focus on organizational development. In Colombia and Uruguay there are several multilateral and bilateral projects and three of the GUFs' regional offices are placed in Montevideo. There is a mix of multilateral and bilateral projects in South Africa and Botswana as well, and three regional GUF offices are placed in Johannesburg. There is also a mix of projects focusing on country, regional and global levels respectively in these countries. A broad range of sectors are covered.

The GUFs involved in projects the Team expects to look into are:

- IUF
- UNI
- BWI
- IFJ
- PSI
- IndustriALL

The headquarters of these GUFs are all placed in or nearby Geneva, except for IFJ (hq in Brussels).

Swedish Trade Unions involved in interventions in the proposed countries include:

Bilateral projects/programmes

- Musikerförbundet
- IF Metall
- Pappers
- Transport
- Lärarförbundet
- LO
- TCO

Multilateral projects

- Vision
- GS
- SFJ
- Kommunal
- SEKO
- HRF
- Finansförbundet

The Team expects to interview representatives of these Swedish trade unions and to visit the IUF, BWI, PSI and IndustriALL headquarters.

The table below includes a list of informants to interview. Names of GUF and local trade union representatives in the countries visited have not yet been include, but will be identified in cooperation with relevant Union to Union programme officers.

Name	Organization	Position	Place
Kristina Henschen	Union to Union	Kanslichef	Stockholm
Nina Larrea	Union to Union	Programchef, utvecklingsverksamheten	Stockholm
Rosmarie Strasky	Union to Union	Ekonomichef	Stockholm
Robert Eriksson	Tidigare Union to Union	f.d. Ekonomichef	Stockholm
Marie Ende	Union to Union	Programansvarig, informationsanslaget och kommunikatör	Stockholm
Gittan Arwén	Union to Union	Handläggare	Stockholm
Nathalie Lucasson	Union to Union	Handläggare	Stockholm
Simon Strannard	Union to Union	Handläggare	Stockholm
Heidi Lampinen	Union to Union	Handläggare	Stockholm
Ann-Katrin Koskinen Dolium	Union to Union	Handläggare	Stockholm
Carina Söderbjörn	Union to Union	Handläggare	Stockholm
Sigrid Bergfeldt	Union to Union	Metodsamordnare	Stockholm
Géza Polónyi	Musikerförbundet		Stockholm
	Kommunal		Stockholm
	IF Metall		Stockholm
Dan Nielsen	Vision		Stockholm
Magnus Falk	Transport		Stockholm
	Läraryrket		Stockholm
	LO		Stockholm
	TCO		Stockholm
Elena Roksmann	Sida	Programansvarig med inriktning intern styrning och kontroll	Stockholm
Elisabet Brandberg	Sida	Programme officer	Stockholm
Joacim Carlson	Sida	Deputy Head of Unit	Stockholm

	IUF hq		Geneva
	BWI hq		Geneva
	PSI hq		Geneva
	IndustryALL hq		Geneva
	IUF regional office		Montevideo
	IndustriALL regional office		Montevideo
	UNI regional office		Montevideo
	BWI regional office		Johannesburg
	PSI regional office		Johannesburg
	IndustriALL regional office		Johannesburg
	UNI regional office		Johannesburg
	IUF national representative		Johannesburg
	Trade unions in Botswana		Botswana
	Trade unions in South Africa		South Africa
	Trade unions in Uruguay		Uruguay
	Trade unions in Colombia		Colombia

Analysis and report writing

During the analysis and reporting phase, assessment findings will be categorized in order to help provide evidence-based answers to the evaluation questions. Structured around these questions and the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, an English language draft report presenting findings, conclusions and recommendations will be produced. The report will not exceed 30 pages and will be characterized by clarity, brevity, and the avoidance of unnecessary technical language. It will be submitted to Sida no later than on 6 November. The submission will be followed by a one-week comment period during which Sida will have the opportunity to comment on the draft and Union to Union the chance to raise any factual errors identified.

The final report will be submitted to Sida no later than on 20 November. It will reflect any verbal and written feedback received on the draft report. Any omissions or factual errors will be corrected and any substantive disagreements will be acknowledged. The Evaluation Team will prepare a response matrix in order to ensure that each comment

received is duly considered and that information about how it has been handled is clearly presented. This matrix, which will be submitted to Sida together with the final report, will list all comments received, state the Evaluation Team's responses to each comment and explain what changes, if any, have been made in the final report. It must be noted that the Evaluation Team remains independent and will make final judgements on the relevance of stakeholders' comments. The aim is not to reach consensus between the Evaluation Team and the stakeholders involved, i.e. Union to Union and Sida, but to ensure that the evaluation report becomes relevant and useable to stakeholders and is factually correct.

The assignment will, as required by the ToR, end with a debriefing session at Sida. It is envisaged that this will be an opportunity for Sida, Union to Union and the Evaluation Team to discuss how effective use can best be made of evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations. It is suggested that the debriefing takes place on 25 November.

Report structure

The report will be structured around the evaluation questions. Tentatively it will have the following outline:

- Executive summary
- Table of content
- Acronyms and abbreviations
- Introduction
- The assignment
- Methodology
- Limitations
- The evaluated intervention
- Findings
- Effectiveness
- Efficiency
- Relevance
- Sustainability
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Annex I: List of people interviewed
- Annex II: List of documents reviewed
- Annex III: Terms of Reference
- Annex IV: Inception report

Quality Assurance

The Consortium regards rigorous and robust quality assurance of our services as a key service to Sida and Swedish Embassies.

In this respect, Viktoria Hildenwall has been selected as quality assurer for the assignment. Hildenwall will review the draft of the inception report and the draft final report, making sure that the documents correspond to Sida standards. The draft final report will be reviewed against Sida's Check list for draft reports (App. 2.6 of the Tender documents; Sida Framework Agreement for Evaluations, reviews and advisory services on Results Frameworks) before being submitted to Sida and stakeholders. Sida's Check list is based on OECD/DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation.

Annex 5: Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference Utvärdering av LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd: Modeller för fackligt utvecklingssamarbete som är relevanta, kostnadseffektiva samt främjar ett lokalt ägarskap.

Date: 2015-04-07

Case number: 15/000518

1. Background

Sida stödjer ett antal svenska organisationer och deras utvecklingssamarbete genom fleråriga avtal om rambidrag inom ramen för Strategin för stöd genom svenska organisationer i det civila samhället 2010-2015. Samarbetet mellan Sida och de organisationer myndigheten ingår avtal om rambidrag med är långsiktigt. Idag har Sida samarbete med 18 ramorganisationer (varav två innehar utfasningsstöd). De får bidrag för sin egen verksamhet och genomför utvecklingssamarbetet på eget initiativ och ansvar, inom de riktlinjer som angetts av Sida.

Målet med att stödja svenska organisationer i civilsamhället är: att de i sin tur stärker kapaciteten hos det civila samhällets aktörer i utvecklingsländer, att civila samhället tillsammans arbetar rättighetsbaserat i sina roller som röstbärare och organisatör av tjänster, samt en stärkt demokratisering och ökad respekt för fattiga och diskriminerade människors mänskliga rättigheter.

Sida har under de senaste åren tagit fram kriterier som ska uppfyllas för att vara ramorganisation samt gjort en bedömning av varje organisation utifrån dessa kriterier. LO TCOs Biståndsnämnd genomgick 2013 en granskning utifrån dessa kriterier och Sida beslutade att bevilja organisationen fortsatt status som ramorganisation till Sida. LO TCOs Biståndsnämnd har ett pågående bidragsavtal med Sida Civsam för perioden 2014-2016. I avtalet för bidraget skrivs att denna utvärdering ska genomföras under perioden.

LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd är LO:s och TCO:s samarbetsorgan för internationellt fackligt utvecklingssamarbete, och har funnits sedan 1977. Organisationen är partipolitiskt obunden. Den stödjer uppbyggnaden av fria, demokratiska och jämställda fackliga rörelser i världen. Grundtanken handlar om utbildning för att människor ska bli medvetna om sina rättigheter och själva kräva bättre villkor. LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd övergripande mål för utvecklingssamarbetet under 2014-2016 är att utrota världens fattigdom utifrån Millenniemålen och ILOs Decent Work Agenda om rättigheter i arbetslivet.

LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd har en roll som vidareförmedlare av bidrag och utvecklings-samarbetet genomförs genom olika samarbetsmodeller via svenska fackförbund och/eller via globala fackförbund (Global Union Federations, GUF) vilka i sin tur samarbetar med regionala, nationella och lokala fackförbund. Verksamheten finansierar ca 100 stycken insatser per år i mer än 80 länder.

Styrkedjan är upplagd som de flesta andra ramorganisationerna. LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd har avtal med en samarbetspart som i sin tur har underavtal. Styrkedjan med flera aktörer i många led är komplex och innebär höga krav på rutiner och uppföljning. Utifrån fackföreningsrörelsens strukturer på global, regional och nationell nivå antas varje aktör tillföra relevans och mervärde till respektive samarbete.

En viktig aspekt som framhålls av LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd är att fackförbunden inte skall göras biståndsberoende, då det fackliga arbetet syftar till en stärkt organisering av arbetstagarna, och att fackförbundet därigenom kan inhämta medlemsavgifter och uppnå den finansiella hållbarhet som krävs för att säkerställa ett fritt och demokratiskt fack.

Sida ser det som viktigt att relevans och mervärde hos respektive aktör och nivå i styrkedjan identifieras och vägs mot kostnadseffektivitet samt ett starkt ägarskap på lokal nivå och möjligheten att uppnå resultat/förändring.

Enligt LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd ansökan till Sida för 2014-2016 når uppskattningsvis ca 48% av verksamhetsbudgeten för Syd 2014 de lokala partnerorganisationerna, 38 % hamnar hos GUF:ar inklusive deras regionkontor samt 11% hos de svenska fackförbunden.

GUF:arnas regionalkontor återfinns i Syd, och är en del av LO-TCO Biståndsnämnds kapacitetsutveckling. Målet för verksamheten är också påverkan på global nivå vad gäller de mänskliga rättigheterna.

Sida har i avtalet för stöd till LO-TCOs Biståndsnämnd för 2014-2016 specificerat ett avtalsvillkor att andelen bidrag som vidareförmedlas till lokal partner ska rapporteras i slutet av perioden och ska vara minst 60% eller den procentandel som Sida och LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd enas om efter denna utvärdering har genomförts.

Sida bedömer att det är av intresse att se över hur LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd i högre utsträckning kan stärka lokala partners inom ”vad”, det vill säga som civilsamhällesorganisationer i sin egen rätt, till exempel genom stöd till att utveckla organisation, administrativ och finansiell kapacitet och stärka organisationen i sin helhet. Kapacitetsutvecklingen av lokala partners fokuserar idag på ”hur” lokala partners verkar som fackliga organisationer. Sida har i bedömningar av ansökningar, rapporter och vid uppföljningsbesök bedömt att relevans, mervärde, ägarskap och kostnadseffektivitet är kritiska områden av hög relevans att utreda djupare i dialog med LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd samt genom denna utvärdering.

2. Evaluation Purpose and Objective

Syftet med utvärderingen är att kartlägga, analysera och lämna rekommendationer gällande följande aspekter av LO-TCOs Biståndsnämnds verksamhet:

- Relevans i relation till Strategin för stöd genom svenska organisationer i det civila samhället 2010-2014.
- Mervärde, ägarskap och kostnadseffektivitet inklusive förutsättningar att vidarefördmedla SIDA-bidrag till lokala partner i relation till verksamhetens mål och utifrån de olika samarbetsmodeller LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd använder.
- Vilka resultat som uppnåtts i relation till verksamhetens mål och utifrån de olika samarbetsmodeller LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd använder.

Utvärderingens rekommendationer ska bidra till att LO-TCO Biståndsnämnds verksamhet kan utvecklas och förbättras inom ovannämnda aspekter.

Sida förväntar sig att utvärderingens slutsatser och rekommendationer ska komma till användning för Sidas fortsatta handläggning av LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd i egenskap av ramorganisation till Sida, samt för LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd egna interna processer med att utveckla och förbättra sin verksamhet.

3. Scope and Delimitations

Utvärderingens fokus är LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd samarbetsmodeller för vidareförmedling, via svenska fackförbund och via globala fackförbund, sk GUFar.

Utvärderingen avser inte att utvärdera LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd som organisation eller att utvärdera dess system för intern styrning och kontroll i avtalskedjan.

Utvärderingen av resultat ska uteslutande fokusera på ett urval av insatser där idag pågående projekt kan betraktas som en fortsättning på en i anslutning tidigare genomförd insats.

Alla LO-TCO Biståndsnämnds pågående insatser ska utgöra underlag för utvärderingen och en statistisk kartläggning, medan endast ett mindre urval insatser ska granskas mer utförligt via fältbesök.

Urval för organisationer för fältbesök och insatser för resultatuppföljning beslutas i dialog med Sida i samband med uppstartsmöte där även LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd deltar.

4. Organisation, Management and Stakeholders

En kontinuerlig dialog med LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd är relevant under hela utvärderingsprocessen. LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd ska beredas möjlighet att ge input till såväl Terms of Reference som till Inception Report. LO TCOs Biståndsnämnd ska även beredas tid och möjlighet att kommentera fakta- fel på utkast till slutrapport.

Från Sida Civsam kommer två handläggare, varav en med inriktning på intern styrning och kontroll att vara huvudansvariga för utvärderingsprocessen och utgöra Sidas arbetsgrupp för utvärderingen.

Konsulterna ska inkomma med management response till Sida för hur Sidas och LO-TCO Biståndsnämnds kommentarer på Inception Report och utkast till slutrapport föreslås hanteras.

5. Evaluation Questions and Criteria

Utvärderingens mål är att få fördjupad kunskap och rekommendationer för utveckling och förbättring om:

- Relevans i relation till Strategin för stöd genom svenska organisationer i det civila samhället 2010-2015.
- Mervärde, ägarskap och kostnadseffektivitet i relation till verksamhetens mål och utifrån de olika samarbetsmodeller LO TCOs Biståndsnämnd använder.
- Vilka resultat som uppnåtts i relation till verksamhetens mål och utifrån de olika samarbetsmodeller LO TCOs Biståndsnämnd använder.

Utvärderingsfrågor:

- Hur ser LO-TCO Biståndsnämnds olika samarbetsmodeller för verksamhet ut?
- Vilket mervärde tillför stödet till global och regional organisering av den fackliga rörelsen i utvecklingen av fackliga rättigheter på andra områden än i lokala fackförbund samt på globala förhållanden. Definiera de olika nivåernas (1-5) mervärde (1-5) vs SYD, och klarlägg den verksamhet som förläggs i SYD utöver budget.
- Hur fördelar sig insatser och budget mellan de olika modellerna?
- Hur, utifrån vilka kriterier, beslutas hur många insatser/storlek på budget som ska genomföras via respektive modell?
- Vilka styrkor och svagheter finns med respektive modell?
- Kompletterar modellerna varandra, i så fall på vilket sätt?
- Finns relevans och/eller mervärde definierade för alla nivåer i styrkedjorna, Om ja, hur ser dessa ut och hur följs de upp?
- Är de olika modellerna kostnadseffektiva, varför? Är någon modell mer kostnadseffektiv än andra?
- Hur och inom vilka områden arbetar man inom de olika modellerna för att kapacitetsstärka de lokala organisationerna?
- Finns det tydligt mervärde, relevans, ägarskap och kostnadseffektivitet inom de olika samarbetsmodellerna? Skiljer det sig åt mellan respektive modell? Hur kan det öka inom respektive samarbetsmodell?
- Vilka resultat i relation till uppsatta mål och CSO-strategin har uppnåtts inom respektive modell?
- Vad finns det för orsaker till eventuella skillnader gällande resultat- och måluppfyllelsen mellan olika modeller?

Utvärderingen ska använda sig av DACs utvärderingskriterier. Denna utvärdering fokuserar huvudsakligen på tre av DACs utvärderingskriterier: relevans, kostnadseffektivitet och mervärde.

fektivitet och effekt. De övriga kriterierna effektivitet och hållbarhet ingår delvis genom att studera lokalt ägarskap och mervärde hos lokala fackförbund.

6. Conclusions, Recommendation and Lessons Learned

Utvärderingen ska innehålla slutsatser utifrån analys och rekommendationer för utveckling och förbättring inom alla områden i syftet.

7. Approach and Methodology

Utvärderarna ska studera dokumentation hos LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd samt hos partner i efterföljande led.

Dokumentation ska omfatta dokument som är relevanta för uppdragets genomförande vilket bland annat inkluderar ansökningar och rapporter från partners samt LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd bedömningar av dessa. Även LO TCOs Biståndsnämnds planerings- och strategidokument liksom Sidas dokumenterade bedömningar ska omfattas.

Dokumentstudier ska kompletteras med besök och intervjuer med relevanta personer på LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd, partnerorganisationer i alla led samt vid behov på Sida. Metod och ansats, inklusive hur utvärderarna förhåller sig till begreppen mervärde, ägarskap och kostnadseffektivitet ska utvecklas i offert och Inception Report och godkännas av Sida.

Arbetet ska inledas med ett uppstartsmöte med Sidas arbetsgrupp för utvärderingen för att stämma av det exakta uppdraget och dess upplägg.

8. Time Schedule and resources

Uppdraget ska genomföras under september-november 2015. För uppdraget kan konsulterna totalt debitera ett arvode motsvarande högst 60 arbetsdagar à 8 tim, dock högst 500 000 SEK samt högst 75 000 SEK för ersättningsgilla omkostnader, inklusive resekostnader.

Offert ska innehålla förslag till tidsplan för genomförandet och omfatta bland annat datum för: uppstartsmöte; inlämnande av utkast och slutversion av Inception Report; genomförande av fältbesök; samt inlämnade av utkast och slutversion till slutrapport. Tid för LO-TCO Biståndsnämnd och Sida att kommentera utkast till Inception Report och utkast till slutrapport ska ingå i tidsplanen.

Sida kan besluta att förlänga tidsplanen om oväntade faktorer skulle påverka tidsplanen eller om Sida identifierar behov av någon ytterligare uppföljning inom ramen för uppdraget.

Uppdraget avslutas med en muntlig presentation av utvärderingen på Sida.

9. Reporting and Communication

Arbetet ska resultera i en rapport på engelska på max 30 sidor, exklusive bilagor. Valda metoder, metodologiska avvägningar samt uppdragets begränsningar ska klart framgå i rapporten. Uppdragets utformning och tidsplan ska beskrivas i en Inception Report vilken ska godkännas av Sida. Kontinuerlig rapportering av uppdraget görs till Sidas arbetsgrupp samt LO TCO Biståndsnämnd.

10. Evaluation Team Qualification

Konsulten ska ha gedigen och dokumenterad erfarenhet av utvärdering och av organisationsbedömning inom utvecklingssamarbete, inklusive erfarenhet av sådant arbete i Sidas samarbetsländer. Uppdraget kräver god kännedom om Sveriges och Sidas biståndsverksamhet, inklusive god kännedom om Sidas stöd till svenska civilsamhällesorganisationer.

Uppdraget kräver erfarenhet av bedömningar av resultat, relevans och kostnadseffektivitet. Konsulten ska ha kompetens motsvarande lägst Kategori II enligt ramavtalet. Konsulterna ska ha dokumenterad erfarenhet av att uttrycka sig väl i skrift på engelska och svenska samt ha en gedigen analytisk förmåga. Konsulterna ska ha goda kunskaper i engelska.

11. References

Strategi för stöd genom svenska organisationer i det civila samhället 2010-2015.
Organisational Assessments of Civil Society Organisations (CSO) in view of possible qualification as Sida's framework and/or strategic partner organisations 2013.



Evaluation of Union to Union

This report shares the findings and recommendations from an evaluation of Union to Union.

The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the relevance, added-value, effectiveness and ownership of Union to Union's operations as well as the results attained in relation to Union to Union's objectives and the partnership models applied. The evaluation focused on the support to local trade unions around the world through either bilateral or multilateral projects.

Analysis of the documentation and statistics as well as semi-structured interviews with stakeholders and key informants were used in the evaluation. Special focus was placed on analysing interventions in four project countries (Botswana, Colombia, South Africa and Uruguay), but all current Union to Union interventions were, when possible, used for statistical purposes.