



MOPAN 2015-16 Assessments

International Labour Organization

Executive Summary

Executive summary

This institutional assessment of the International Labour Organization (ILO) covers the period from 2014 to mid-2016. Applying the MOPAN 3.0 methodology, the assessment considers organisational systems, practices and behaviours, as well as the results ILO achieves. The assessment considers five performance areas: four relate to organisational effectiveness (strategic management, operational management, relationship management and performance management) and the fifth relates to development effectiveness (results). It assesses ILO's performance against a framework of key indicators and associated micro-indicators that comprise the standards that characterise an effective multilateral organisation, and gives an overall view on its performance trajectory. The last MOPAN assessment of the ILO was in 2006.

Context

ILO

- It is the only tripartite UN agency, bringing together government, employers and worker representatives
- It is comprised of three main bodies: the International Labour Conference, the Governing Body, and the International Labour Office
- It aims to promote rights at work, encourage decent employment opportunities, enhance social protection and strengthen dialogue on work-related issues
- It has maintained a zero-growth budget since 2008-2009
- It initiated an institutional reform process in late 2012 designed to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the organisation. A business process review is ongoing

Organisation at a glance

- Established 1919
- Expenditure USD 789 million (2015)
- Over 2800 staff
- 187 member states
- Over 600 projects and programmes in more than 100 countries
- Operates through:
 - Geneva headquarters
 - Over 45 field offices worldwide
 - International Training Centre of the ILO (ITCILO) which is the training arm of the ILO in Turin, Italy

Overall performance

The overall conclusion of the 2016 MOPAN assessment is that the ILO is a highly relevant and improving organisation. The ILO demonstrates a very good understanding of the contemporary challenges in the world of work, and is arguably even more relevant today than it was when established in 1919. As well as continuing to implement its mandate in the area of international labour standards, the ILO has worked to enhance its capacity to influence the international policy agenda.

The institutional reform programme initiated by the Director General in late 2012 is designed to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the organisation. Commitment to improve and reform the systems, planning and operations of the ILO remains strong and across the functional areas there are some notable improvements, whilst work in progress in others. Evidence suggests that ILO has not been using its

considerable assets and comparative advantages to maximum effect, and that there is further scope to improve efficiency. A comprehensive business process review is underway.

Available evidence suggests that impact and sustainability of results are mixed, albeit with notable examples of significant achievement in a wide range of areas. It remains difficult to assess – and, under current frameworks and systems, will continue to be difficult to assess – whether the overall impact, efficiency and sustainability of the ILO is improving over time. There remains a gap between commitment and implementation, despite a real commitment to results-based management and evaluation, and to improving the systems and operation of the organisation.

The ILO deserves credit for the openness of its review process, and for its commitment to address the challenges exposed by various reviews. Compared to bilateral assessments conducted in 2011-2012, there is evidence of improvements in organisational effectiveness. It is too early to judge whether the improvements set in train in late 2012 have led to improved development effectiveness. Improvements are required in the way in which ILO's performance is measured, reported and communicated if this progress is to be effectively managed and verified.

Key strengths and areas for improvement

Key strengths

- Relevance, strategic clarity and awareness of comparative advantages
- Tripartite constituency
- Specialist technical expertise and experience
- Integrated, systemic intervention models within five flagship programmes
- Core resource base and financial management
- Organisational and business process reform and innovations
- Commitment to results-based management

Areas for improvement

- Results-management framework and performance reporting
- Evaluation quality, synthesis and use
- Monitoring and evaluation systems and data
- Coherence and co-ordination of partnerships
- Administration and recruitment for project implementation
- Mainstreaming of gender, environment, and governance
- Additional funding sources including private sector funding