



International
Labour
Organization

► Evaluation Office



i-eval Discovery



Accelerating Progress towards an Integrated and Modernized Social Protection System for All in Thailand (United Nations Joint Programme on Social Protection for All in Thailand)

ILO DC/SYMBOL: [THA/19/50/UND]

Type of Evaluation: Joint

Evaluation timing: Final

Evaluation nature: Independent

Project countries: Thailand

P&B Outcome(s): ILO-P&B 2020-21 Outcome 8; Thailand UNPAF Outcome Strategy 1.

SDG(s): SDG's 1.3, 10.1 and 2.2

Date when the evaluation was completed by the evaluator: 31 May 2022

Date when evaluation was approved by EVAL: 30 June 2022

ILO Administrative Office: ILO ROAP, Bangkok

ILO Technical Office(s): ILO DWT - Bangkok

Joint evaluation agencies: ILO, IOM, UNICEF, and UN Women

Project duration: 1 January 2020 – 30 June 2022

Donor and budget: United Nations Joint SDG Fund: US \$ 1,999,815 plus Co-funding by four Partner UN Organisations US \$ 662,000; Total Budget: US \$ 2,661,815

Name of consultant(s): Theo van der Loop (Team Leader/International) and Napapan der Kinderen (National)

Name of Evaluation Manager: Ms. Rattaporn Pongpattana, M&E Officer, ILO ROAP, Bangkok

Evaluation Office oversight: Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka, Regional Evaluation Officer, ILO ROAP; oversight is also provided by the Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC) and the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG).

Evaluation budget: US\$

Key Words: Social Protection, Social Security, Integrated policy solutions, Child Support, Domestic workers, including women and migrants; Thailand; Asia [Use the ILO Thesaurus](#)

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	ii
List of Tables	iv
List of Abbreviations	v
Executive Summary	viii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose of the Joint Programme Evaluation	1
1.2 Scope of the evaluation	2
1.3 Methodology and approach to the evaluation.....	3
1.4 Contents of Report.....	9
2 Country Context and UN Joint Programme	10
2.1 Country context.....	10
2.2 UN Joint Programme	11
3 Overall Findings	14
3.1 Relevance	14
3.2 Validity of Design	16
3.3 Coherence	18
3.4 Effectiveness.....	20
3.5 Efficiency of Resource Use.....	25
3.6 Impact	27
3.7 Sustainability	30
3.8 Cross-cutting Issues	31
4 Conclusions and Recommendations	33
4.1 Conclusions	33
4.2 Recommendations	37
5 Lessons Learned and Good Practices	40
ANNEXES	42
Annex 1: Terms of Reference (TOR)	43
Annex 2: Data Collection Worksheet	69
Annex 3: List of Stakeholders Interviewed	72
Annex 4: Results as per JP Programmatic Results Framework	74

Annex 5: Risk Management Matrix	81
Annex 6: Set of Recommendations by the JP to the RTG	83
Annex 7: Attendees at Stakeholder Workshop	84
Annex 8: Evaluation Work Plan	85
Annex 9: Lessons Learned (LL) and Good Practices (GP)	86
Annex 10: Documents Consulted	91

List of Tables

Tables:

1	Outcomes, Outputs and Responsible PUNOs of the UNJP	12
2	Funding and Co-Funding of the UNJP Thailand	25
3	The Categories of the original Budget by PUNOs in percentage	26

List of Abbreviations

AA	Administrative Agent
ABND	Assessment-Based National Dialogue
ACT/EMP	(ILO) Bureau on Employers' Activities
ACTRAV	(ILO) Bureau on Workers' Activities
ADB	Asian Development Bank
APEC	Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
BAAC	Bank for Agriculture and Agricultural Cooperatives
BB	Budget Bureau
BKK	Bangkok
CCA	Common Country Assessment
CO	Country Office
CODI	Community Organisations Development Institute
CPO	Country Program Outcome
CSG	Child Support Grant
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
CTA	Chief Technical Adviser
CWF	Community Welfare Fund
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DCY	Department of Children and Youth (MSDHS)
DEPD	Department of the Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities
DG	Directorate General
DLA	Department of Local Administration
DOP	Department of Older Persons
DOPA	Department of Provincial Administration
DPM	Deputy Prime Minister
DSDW	Department of Social Development and Welfare
DW	Domestic Workers
DWAFFD	Department of Women's Affairs and Family Development
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
DWT	ILO Decent Work Team
EA	Evaluability Assessment
EC	European Commission
ECOT	Employers Federation of Thailand
EEF	Equitable Education Fund
EM	Evaluation Manager
EO	Employers' Organisation
ERG	Evaluation Reference Group
ESCAP	Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific Foreign Policy Instrument
EU	European Union
FCD	Foundation for Children Development
FPO	Fiscal Policy Office (MoF)
FPRW	Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work

FSCC	Foundation for Slum Child Care
GCDIMC	Government Central Database Integration and Mobilization Committee
GPF	Government Pension Fund
GSB	Government Savings Bank
HQ	Headquarters
HRDF	Human Rights and Development Foundation
ILO	International Labour Organization
ILS	International Labour Standards
IOM	International Organization for Migration
ITC	International Training Center (ILO)
JEC	Joint Evaluation Committee
JP	Joint Programme
KII	Key informant interview
LCT	Labour Congress of Thailand
LEC	Local Education Center
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDES	Ministry of Digital Economy and Society
MIS	Management Information System
MoE	Ministry of Education
MoF	Ministry of Finance
Mol	Ministry of Interior
MoJ	Ministry of Justice
MoL	Ministry of Labour
MoPH	Ministry of Public Health
MoT	Ministry of Transport
MPTF	Multi-Partner Trust Fund
MSDHS	Ministry of Social Development and Human Security
MWG	Migrant Working Group
NCPE	National Congress of Private Industrial Employees
NESDC	Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NHSO	National Health Security Office
NSC	National Steering Committee
NSF	National Savings Fund
NSO	National Statistical Office
NSWC	National Social Welfare Committee
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OPM	Oxford Policy Management
OSH	Occupational Safety and Health
P&B	Programme & Budget
PARDEV	Partnerships and Field Support
PIER	Puey Ungphakorn Institute of Economic Research
PRODOC	Project Document
PUNO	Partner UN Organizations
PWDs	People with disabilities
QA	Quality Assurance
RCO	UN Resident Coordinator's Office
ROAP	Regional Office for Asia and Pacific
RTG	Royal Thai Government

SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SERC	State Enterprises Workers' Relations Confederation
SES	Socio-Economic Survey
SP	Social Protection
SPDR	Social Protection Diagnostic Review
SPF	Social Protection Floor
SPDR	Social Protection Diagnostic Review
SPSR	Social Protection System Review
SSF	Social Security Fund
SSO	Social Security Office (MoL)
SWC	State Welfare Card
TDRI	Thailand Development Research Institute
THB	Thai Baht
THPF	Thai Health Promotion Foundation
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
TTUC	Thai Trade Union Congress
TWC	Technical Working Committee
UN	United Nations
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks
UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNJP	United Nations Joint Programme
UNPAF	United Nations Partnership Agreement Framework
UNSDCF	United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework
UN Women	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
USD	United States Dollars
WB	World Bank
WEP	Women Empowerment Principles (UN Women)
WHO	World Health Organization

Executive Summary

Background and project description

The present report presents the findings of the Final Joint Independent Evaluation of the programme entitled *Accelerating Progress towards an Integrated and Modernized Social Protection System for All in Thailand (United Nations Joint Programme on Social Protection for All in Thailand)*. It is implemented in Thailand by four Partner UN Organizations (PUNO), notable ILO, IOM, UNICEF and UN Women, and funded by the UN Joint SDG Fund (US\$ 1,999,815) as well as Co-funding by the PUNOs (US\$ 662,000). The JP has a total duration of 30 months including a no-cost extension from 1 January 2020 until 30 June 2022. The **overall objective** of the JP is to enhance and integrate Thailand's social protection system, and reach those being left behind, especially the more vulnerable groups, such as children, elders, informal workers, migrant workers, and people with disabilities.

Purpose, Scope and Methodology of the Evaluation

The main *purpose* of this evaluation is to promote accountability to key stakeholders, including the Government of Thailand and the donor and to enhance learning within the four PUNO and other key stakeholders. The *scope* of the Evaluation covers all three Outcomes of the JP, as well as the entire programme period from 1 January 2020 to 30 June 2022. The geographical scope of the programme covers the country of Thailand. The *main clients* include the four PUNOs, the Government Counterparts (MSDHS, MoL, NESDC, MoF and others), Social Partners, Civil Society Organizations, Research Institutes and the UN Joint SDG Fund. The *methodology* includes a desk study of the relevant documents, primary data collection through interviews with 33 stakeholders which were all conducted online due to the COVID-19 pandemic, data analysis and reporting. It also includes a critical reflection process by the key stakeholders in particular through two online stakeholders' workshops and the inputs by stakeholders to the draft report. Key deliverables are the inception report, the preliminary presentation of findings at two virtual stakeholders' workshops, the draft report, and the final report taking into consideration the feedback on the draft report.

Findings

The conclusions of the present evaluation are below categorized according to the seven evaluation criteria used throughout this report as well as the cross-cutting issues. With respect to the first evaluation criteria, **Relevance**, the present Evaluation found that the UN Joint Programme (JP) is highly **Relevant** and that its objectives respond to the needs of key stakeholders in Thailand. In addition, all stakeholders interviewed underlined that the JP was very **timely**, as almost simultaneously COVID increased attention for Social Protection (SP), the National Economic and Social Development Council (NESDC) was developing the 13th National Economic and Social Development Plan (2023 – 2027), and the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (MSDHS) was in need of enhancing the Management Information System (MIS) for the Child Support Grant (CSG) due to the policy expansion in 2019. The alignment of the JP to the priorities of the **Thai Government** was very clear, in particular with the new **13th Plan** (Milestone 9), and with the policies of the MSDHS (including DCY) and the Ministry of Labour (including SSO). Alignment was much less clear in the case of the Employers' and Workers' Organisations in Thailand. It was further found that the JP was clearly relevant to the country programmes of the four Partner UN Organizations (PUNOs) as well as for the UN as a whole in Thailand, through its UNSDCF (2022-2026). The JP certainly remained or even became more *relevant* after the COVID-19 pandemic started.

On the *Validity of Design*, it was found that strategies of the UNJP were adequate to enhance Thailand's social protection system, and to reach certain population groups who are being left behind. The need for a Diagnostic Review on SP (SPDR) arose through the long-standing dialogue between UNICEF and MSDHS, while ILO had been working on the Social Protection Floor (SPF). The *Joint Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Fund* provided an opportunity to propose a joint project. For the design consultations were held with the MSDHS, but not with many other stakeholders because there was only a relatively short time to develop the PRODOC. The program's logic included in the Theory of Change and the Outcome Statement with three Outcomes and 10 Outputs are straightforward and logical in itself (Table 1). The three Outcomes themselves are quite diverse, but the logic behind that is rationalised by aiming for an enhanced **evidence-base** needed for a system review (Outcome 1) as well as targeting certain **gaps** in the system, in particular those left behind (Outcome 2 on the CSG and Outcome 3 on domestic workers). The *Programmatic Results Framework* of the JP is clear and measurable with three Outcome-indicators and 34 Output-indicators and a summary of the results achieved by the JP until 31 December 2021 is given in Annex 4). The original *timeframe* of just two years (2020-2021) was not realistic to push for a complete social protection system reform, nor to complete all the deliverables identified especially also due to the delays caused by the pandemic.

With respect to *Coherence*, it was found that the cooperation between the four PUNOs coordinated by ILO as the lead agency was effective to achieve the expected results including the support from the UN Resident Coordinator Office (RCO). The cooperation with *government organisations* was particularly close with the MSDHS, MoL and NESDC, while for certain activities it was extended to other Ministries. The engagement with the Employers' and Workers Organisations was more incidental, and that with CSOs (e.g. HomeNet and MWG) was directed at specific activities where they could play a complementary role. The JP lastly cooperated closely with two research institutes, TDRI and PIER. By its very nature the JP implemented by four PUNOs contributed to UN reforms including UN Country Team (UNCT) coherence by acting as a kind of platform within the UN to advocate for social protection which demonstrated how the UN can offer integrated policy advice to the government. Lastly, coherence with other interventions implemented by the four PUNOs in Thailand and in South-East Asia contributed also to the JP.

The *Effectiveness* of the JP will be more than satisfactory at the end of June 2022 as the interventions are expected to achieve most of its expected results and outputs. Nevertheless, in part due to the COVID-19 pandemic, a number of activities were delayed, and a few activities were abandoned. Several *key achievements* for the programme as a whole were highlighted, such as the substantial awareness raising and exchange of information on social protection among many stakeholders, the extension of the evidence-base, and the formulation of proposals for solutions of problems and gaps in the social protection system. With respect to **Outcome 1**, the Thailand Social Protection Diagnostic Review (SPDR) based on six background studies and a series of workshops with many stakeholders is a major achievement and significantly provided inputs to the 13th Plan. In addition, technical notes were developed, training courses held, and policy dialogue and public advocacy conducted. The indicator for **Outcome 2**, scale up of CSG coverage to 2 million by end 2021, was substantially *surpassed*, with 2.35 million children (48.6% girls) registered in April 2022. The JP/UNICEF provided technical assistance to the DCY to improve the capacity of the Management Information System (MIS) of the CSG, and to enhance the design of the CSG grant itself. In addition, the implementation and scaling-up of the CSG and the Disability Grant, was supported and programme communication improved. The indicator for **Outcome 3** is to design/test policy options to ensure a more effective coverage of domestic workers, including migrants, which is still a work in progress, and includes the National Policy Review by UN Women and ILO on social protection for Domestic Workers and the implementation

of a Communication strategy on that by IOM. The visibility of domestic workers among stakeholders has substantially increased as a result of such JP activities.

A number of **challenges** have been identified by the evaluation which were encountered by the JP during its implementation, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, the particularly large number of stakeholders to be coordinated, the great diversity in types of workers, perceptions on migrant workers, and some minor coordination issues among PUNOs. The main **success factors** which contributed to achieve the progress described in the above include the timeliness of the JP, the solid engagement from the beginning with the MSDHS, the constructive role played by MoL/SSO, the strong networking activities, the combined legitimacy and credibility of the four PUNOs, and the high commitment of the Programme Team of the four PUNOs and of the NPC. The **management arrangements** also contributed to that, including the meetings of the PSC, the meetings called by the RCO in the inception phase, and the many ad hoc meetings of PUNO staff often coordinated by the NPC. The stakeholders interviewed were quite satisfied with the quality of the tools, advice, workshops and trainings delivered by the project, and the JP was much valued for bringing in the international perspective and attention for vulnerable groups. The timeframe was limited to measure concrete contributions to the SDGs, but there were some potential impacts on several of them (SDG 1, 3, 5, 8 and 10).

The **Efficiency of Resource Use** was satisfactory to achieve the results of the JP. The original project period of two years was relatively short, though, for the intended outcomes, and the resources from the Joint SDG Fund to be divided over four UN agencies were relatively modest with a total of almost USD 2 million. The budget was enlarged with co-funding by the four PUNOs in the form of staff expertise (in total USD 662,000). The largest amount of the original budget (Joint SDG Fund plus Co-funding) was allotted to the activities per se (contractual services and transfers/grants to counterparts) amounting to almost 50%, followed by staff costs (35%). Overall spending has been slow in the first 1.5 years due to the pandemic and the fact that the NPC started in May 2020 but picked up rapidly in 2022. By the end of April 2022, the Expenditures for Outcomes 1 and 3 amounted to just over 90% of their respective budgets and for Outcome 2 it was about 50%; most of the balance has already been committed or scheduled to be spent before the end of June. There was only one dedicated staff member in the project (the NPC) and most stakeholders underlined that it would have been more efficient to have a larger dedicated project team, possibly including a CTA and admin/finance staff. Due to the delays mentioned, a no-cost extension of six months was granted by the donor until 30 June 2022. Reporting was efficient and timely including a comprehensive Risk Management Matrix.

With respect to **Impact**, it was found that in order to change the entire social protection system of a country would take many more years, but the JP has made several important steps into such a direction. The JP has done very substantial work on background and diagnostic studies creating a solid evidence-base for potential policy reforms. For the future, Milestone 9 of the 13th Plan is crucial, and significantly the JP provides a set of Recommendations (Annex 6) as well as practical steps to support the implementation of this Plan's targets and objectives. An increase in the actual coverage of social protection schemes is difficult to measure and it principally depends on the Thai Government for approving the extensions of such schemes. With respect to Outcome 2, the increase in the CSG coverage to 2.35 million may not be directly attributable to the JP itself, but the long-standing partnership between MSDHS and UNICEF certainly contributed to it. In addition, advocacy for CSG was enhanced, and the available fiscal space investigated. The further increase to Universal Coverage of the CSG is already endorsed by the National Child and Youth Committee, and the JP developed policy options to implement it. Concerning Outcome 3, the MoL/SSO is investigating the inclusion of domestic workers in the Social Security Act; the

UNJP is contributing to that through the study on Domestic Workers. The JP had a kind of positive impact on the perception of migrant workers among parts of the Thai population through the advocacy and communication activities of IOM in collaboration with the Ministry of Labour and the CSO Community.

A significant impact of the JP is the enhanced networking among the different stakeholders through workshops and training courses, advocacy and communication. The JP also had an impact on certain specific issues that received attention in the news, in particular the policy brief on the COVID-19 Response, the advocacy of UNICEF with the MSDHS leading to top-ups of several grants, the review of the new National Pension Fund proposed by the MoF, and the review of the proposal by the MoL on the SSF. Institutional attitudes and mindset have also been influenced by the JP through the different activities undertaken in the areas of social dialogue, awareness raising and capacity development at the MSDHS and the SSO/MoL, as well as through the diagnostic studies presented. Mindsets with respect to certain vulnerable groups have also been changed, in particular domestic and migrant workers, and the JP led to an increased consciousness among government organisations of social protection related to women and children's advancement.

The project support was for certain elements institutionalised by government agencies, for example the diagnostic review was used for the 13th National Economic and Social Development Plan, concerning the CSG the support from UNICEF and the UNJP has been institutionalised in the MSDHS. In addition, the cabinet approval on the extension to Universal Coverage of the CSG is pending and this was based on the policy options developed by the JP. Concerning Outcome 3 it is more difficult to arrive at conclusions on institutionalisation as some work is still going on; however, the MoL/SSO is using some of the JP work to investigate the inclusion of domestic workers in the Social Security Act. Upscaling will principally depend on the implementation of the 13th Plan, while the scaling up to universal coverage of the CSG awaits cabinet approval. Replication of the JP *design* could be done in other similar Middle-Income Countries, and significantly, the MSDHS has already requested UNICEF's support with the replication of the MIS of CSG to their other programmes. In this sense the JP was certainly catalytic in setting in motion other developments whereby the government brought in their own funding.

On **Sustainability**, it was found that there are some activities, results and effects that are expected to continue after the programme has ended on 30 June 2022. Crucially, social protection has now been included in the 13th Plan and therefore it will be prioritised by the Royal Thai Government for implementation in the coming years. In addition, networks and informal groupings among key national stakeholders and among individual staff members have been established and have the potential to sustain. It is foreseen that the four PUNOs in Bangkok will continue to work with the relevant Government Organisations, considering that the next implementation steps do not require heavy funding but especially the time of the experts involved and the organisation of (high-level) political events, and in particular UNICEF and ILO have made budget reservations for that. A specific example of sustainability is that the NESDC has requested budget from the Budget Bureau of the PM Office to continue the training in social budgeting initiated by the JP.

The evaluation further found that *ownership* differs per outcome and among the key stakeholders involved in the JP. The MSDHS has clearly taken ownership of parts of the JP but does not yet *own* the Social Protection Diagnostic Review (SPDR) and its Recommendations in particular because they still need to be formally launched in June 2022, and because some of these recommendations have budget implications. With respect to the CSG, the DCY/MSDHS clearly has ownership of it for many years already and UNICEF has a long-standing close alliance with

this department. Ownership of the JP has not developed as much in the MoL although the SSO does indeed *own* the activities related to pensions, while NESDC has engaged increasingly over the course of the implementation period of the JP. Ownership among CSOs and employers' and workers' organisations has not developed as they generally attended workshops as informants.

With respect to the *Cross-cutting Issues*, it was found that *tripartite dialogue* was not specifically targeted, although it has been enhanced somewhat by inviting employers' and workers' organisations to several meetings. To be sure, these organisations were already deeply involved in a different project funded by SSO and implemented by the ILO on actuarial Issues for pension reform (2019-2023). The attention for *Gender Equality* cuts across the three Outcomes of the JP and was included in all reports and notes produced. The UNJP has contributed to gender-equality in a few specific areas through a few targeted activities (e.g. the Gender-Impact assessment, the National Policy Review on social protection for Domestic Workers and the GRB-trainings). The four PUNOs have mainstreamed gender issues into their regular programmes, and the Programme Team is clearly gender sensitive. However, several stakeholders indicated that attention for gender-inequality could have been more systematic, for example through a comprehensive gender strategy with dedicated resources developed at the outset of the programme. The project has also contributed to *non-discrimination* in one particular area as the advocacy work and communication strategy of the JP/IOM in cooperation with MoL and the CSO Community has led to a more positive perception vis-a-vis migrant workers among parts of the Thai population. While *disability inclusion* was not part of the *design* of the JP, it is one of the elements in the Social Protection System, and JP/UNICEF has undertaken several activities in this area (e.g. on the Disability Grant and on Children with Disabilities liaising with the National Committee on Disability).

Recommendations

The Recommendations formulated on the basis of the findings of the present evaluation are:

- 1. Establish a Pathway to keep the momentum of the UN Joint Programme (JP) going** and to differentiate between **Short-term urgent priorities** (Recommendations 2 and 3 below), and the **medium/longer-term** recommendations, such as the integration of coverage. The pathway should cover all seven Recommendations of the SPDR (Annex 6).
- 2. Set-up an Independent Coordination Body or Mechanism for social protection, for example an Inter-Ministerial Body**, to coordinate all 23 government agencies now involved in social protection schemes, which can also serve as platform for communication and Knowledge Management and sharing. Include in this process as much as possible also the relevant social partners and CSOs. It might be useful to investigate in how far the National Social Welfare Committee (NSCW) could be revitalized to serve as such a coordinating body with respect to social protection issues.
- 3. Extend Coverage to Workers in all Sectors**, and pay specific attention to SMEs, informal sector, Domestic and Migrant Workers (especially Portability of benefits), Elderly people, and Workers aged between 55 to 60 years old, and their retirement plans. Examine thereby if increasing social protection and portability of benefits will enhance the use of more regular channels by migrant workers in other words in how far it is a tool to reduce irregular migration.
- 4. Raise awareness of and educate the workers** through advocacy campaigns and communication strategies on issues around social protection (e.g. Pension), and in particular explain clearly the benefits under the Social Security Fund to them.
- 5. Involve Workers' and Employers' Organisations (EO/WO) and CSOs more systematically** in future interventions, possibly including a **CSO Coalition**, and arrange for **Capacity building** of the staff from EO and WO on social protection.

6. **Develop a Gender Equality Strategy** in any follow-up intervention and allocate dedicated resources to this strategy. Take into consideration Gender-Responsive Budgeting (GRB), increasing gender-disaggregated data, Domestic work, and Care economy. In addition, engage gender *focal points* in different ministries so they can be supported to undertake gender advocacy on social protection issues across an entire ministry.
7. **Conduct the Launch of the Synthesis Report of the Social Protection Diagnostic Review (SPDR) before the end of the project in June** in order to consolidate the achievements of the JP and to solidify the networking around social protection issues with government, EO/WO, CSOs, academic institutions, donors and UN agencies.
8. **Discuss with the Joint SDG Fund** the possibility for a *new* Joint Programme on social protection in Thailand, considering the catalytic nature of the present programme, which resulted for example in the RTG bringing in their own funding for the MIS of the CSG.
9. **The UNCT should consider a separate Working Group (WG) on social protection co-led by ILO and UNICEF**, whereby this JP can serve as an example, as it has operated as a *de facto* Working Group, and has cooperated well with the Thai Government which has referred to it as “*the latest flagship partnership*”.

Lessons Learned and Good Practices

This report has identified two lessons learned (LL) and two good practices (GP) from the experience gained by the present evaluation:

- **LL1** – *The potential for impact and sustainability of an intervention are substantially enhanced if they are developed and implemented simultaneously with the development of national or sectoral economic and/or social development plans.*
- **LL2** – *Extensive networking through workshops, meetings, trainings, advocacy, informal app groups, etc. leads to incremental changes in mindsets of the stakeholders.*
- **GP1** – *The implementation of the JP by four Partner UN Organisations (PUNOs) was a Good Practice in particular because the JP could piggyback on long-standing partnerships between PUNOs and Government and other National Stakeholders and because the combined legitimacy and credibility of these PUNOs convinced the national stakeholders to be involved actively in social protection.*
- **GP2** – *The comprehensive process of the Diagnostic Review of the JP is a Good Practice involving a combination of background studies, workshops to discuss research findings, the formulation of recommendations, technical meetings to review these recommendations, and a synthesis report launched at a final programme event.*

1 Introduction

The present report presents the findings of the Final Joint Independent Evaluation of the programme entitled “*Accelerating Progress towards an Integrated and Modernized Social Protection System for All in Thailand (United Nations Joint Programme on Social Protection for All in Thailand)*”. This evaluation is based on the Terms of Reference (ToR) for this evaluation, which **prescribes a Table of Contents** for the present report which has been followed as much as possible (see Annex 2 of the ToR in Annex 1).

1.1 Purpose of the Joint Programme Evaluation

The main purpose of this final joint independent evaluation is to promote accountability to key stakeholders, including the Government of Thailand and the donor, the UN Joint SDG fund, and to enhance learning within the four Partner UN Organizations (PUNO), i.e. ILO, IOM, UNICEF and UN Women, and key stakeholders. Knowledge and information (including lessons learned, good practices, challenges, etc.) obtained from this evaluation, will be used to help inform the design and implementation of similar interventions in the area.

The ToR and the Inception Report have specified nine specific objectives for the evaluation:

- Assess the coherence, relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness of the project interventions, while identifying the supporting factors and constraints that have led to them, including strategies and implementation modalities chosen, and partnership arrangements;
- Assess the extent to which the project management and coordination mechanisms adequately addressed the needs and implementation challenges and how effectively the project management monitored project performance and results;
- Provide insights on (i) the contribution to improving the situation of vulnerable groups identified in the JP document (ProDoc), with a focus on disability, (ii) contribution to SDG acceleration, and (iii) contribution to UN reforms, including, UNCT coherence;
- Identify lessons learned, good practices, and recommendations on the design and implementation of similar interventions in the area;
- Assess project impact (including where the project’s support has been most/least effective and why), including the extent to which the RTG’s capacity has been strengthened, and the benefits of the project’s contribution to improvement of social protection system;
- Assess contributions and results of the interventions (both expected and unexpected, both positive and negative changes) and examine how and why the changes were caused by the intervention and measure the size of the effect caused by that intervention or tactic;
- Assess the project’s contribution to COVID-19 immediate responses and recovery;
- Assess the extent to which the Project outcomes will be sustainable, and;
- Assess the extent to which the Project promote gender equality and non-discrimination and disability inclusiveness.

These specific objectives have been included in the complete set of 26 Evaluation Questions which will be discussed in Section 1.3 below.

This evaluation has applied the OECD/DAC criteria of Relevance, Validity of design, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability. The evaluation has also addressed the relevant cross-cutting issues, such as Gender equality and non-discrimination, disability inclusion, promotion of international labour standards, tripartite processes and constituent capacity development and environmental issues. Overall, the evaluation complies with the United Nations Evaluation Guidelines (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016)¹, and with the ILO Evaluation Policy Guidelines (4th edition, 2020).²

1.2 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation covers all the three Components/Outcomes of the UN Joint Programme (UNJP) on Social Protection for All in Thailand which are described in detail in Chapter 2. The evaluation further covers the entire programme period, from 1 January 2020 to 30 June 2022, including the no-cost extension from January to June 2022. The geographical scope of the programme covers the country of Thailand, and the evaluation was conducted at the national level only. The main users of this independent evaluation and their intended use of the evaluation are as follows:

User	Intended Use
Partner UN Organizations (PUNOs): ILO, UNICEF, IOM, and UN Women.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide accountability and learning from the JP, to inform the design and implementation of future SP/JP interventions. • Inform decision-making for the UNCT in terms of programmatic design and resource allocation based on assessment of performance. • Inform UNCT on how to most effectively support the RTG and key stakeholders to improve SP.
Government Counterparts: Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (Permanent Secretary Office, Department of Children and Youth, Department of Women’s Affair and Family Development, Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities, Department of Social Welfare and Development), Ministry of Labour (Social Security Office, Bureau of International Coordination, Department of Employment and Department of Labour Protection and Welfare), Ministry of Finance (Fiscal Policy Office), Ministry of Public Health, Ministry of Interior, and Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council (NESDC), and Equitable Education Fund (EEF).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide accountability on achievements of the initiative • Inform on UNCT’s commitment to continue improving its programming in support SP in Thailand • Reflect on evaluation findings in as much as they also relate to jointly implemented interventions • Engage together with UNCT in the response to the evaluation recommendations • Provide the necessary information for potential scale up of the interventions.
Social Partners, Civil Society Organizations, and other organizations: Migrant Working Group (MWG), Employers Confederation of Thailand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflect on evaluation findings in as much as they also relate to jointly implemented interventions

¹ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2787>

² See: https://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS_571339/lang--en/index.htm

User	Intended Use
(ECOT), Labour Congress of Thailand (LCT), Thai Trade Union Congress (TTUC), National Congress Private Industrial of Employees (NCPE), and State Enterprises Workers Relations Confederation (SERC), Thailand Development Research Institute (TDRI), Thai Health Promotion Foundation, Puey Ungphakorn Institute of Economic Research (PIER), Foundation for Children Development (FCD), Foundation for Slum Child Care (FSCC), HomeNet Foundation, and Human Rights and Development Foundation (HRDF).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide accountability on achievements of the initiative • Inform on areas that need support and improvements to better support results for SDGs and SP
Joint SDG Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide accountability and learning from the JP • Inform on areas that need support and improvements to better support results for SDGs and SP that can be used in funding decisions • Provide objective evidence on UNCT's commitment to learning and improving social protection in Thailand

The evaluation has integrated the gender dimension, disability inclusion and other non-discrimination issues as cross-cutting concerns throughout the methodology, deliverables, and final report of the evaluation. In terms of this evaluation, both men and women were involved in the consultation, evaluation analysis and evaluation team. Moreover, the evaluators reviewed data and information that was disaggregated by sex and gender and assessed the relevance and effectiveness of gender related strategies and outcomes to improve the lives of women and men.

1.3 Methodology and approach to the evaluation

The present evaluation addresses the seven OECD/DAC *Evaluation Criteria* plus the cross-cutting issues, which have been identified in the Terms of Reference as follows (Annex 1):

A. Relevance	B. Validity of Design
C. Coherence	D. Effectiveness, including of the management response
E. Efficiency	F. Impact
G. Sustainability	H. Cross-Cutting Issues

For each of these seven Evaluation Criteria as well as for the cross-cutting issues, a series of *Evaluation Questions* have been identified in the ToR, and they are provided in the *Evaluation Matrix*, or in ILO terminology, *Data Collection Worksheet* in Annex 2. This matrix describes the way in which the identified Sources of Data, Stakeholder Interviews and Specific Methods used are supporting each of the 26 evaluation questions. Annex 2 will specifically also be used as the interview guide.

Evaluation Criteria and the corresponding Evaluation Questions

A. Relevance

- 1) To what extent the JP has responded to the need of the tripartite constituents, beneficiaries and recipients?

- 2) Do the JP activities (i.e. awareness raising, advocacy, and policy capacity building interventions) meet the needs and priorities of the RTG and other key stakeholders?
- 3) How important is the JP's intervention for the target beneficiaries and to what extent does it address their needs and interests? Merge with Evaluation Question (EQ) 1, as they address the same needs/interests.
- 4) How relevant is the JP to the partners' respective country programmes of the four PUNOs in Thailand?
- 5) To what extent was the project able to remain relevant and adapt in response to the COVID-19 crisis as well as the local context?

B. Validity of Design

- 6) Is the Theory of Change for programme components adequately described and is there clarity of logic across the results levels?
- 7) To what extent are results, indicators, and activities measurable?

C. Coherence

- 8) To what extent does the JP work effectively between the PUNOs agencies, and with other organizations to achieve expected results?
- 9) To what extent the JP contributed to UN reforms, including UNCT coherence?
- 10) To what extent does the JP work effectively to promote social protection consistently with other initiatives in this area?

D. Effectiveness

- 11) To what extent have the interventions achieved its expected results and outputs?
- 12) What factors were crucial for the achievement or failure to achieve the expected results? What key challenges have detracted from the effectiveness of activities?
- 13) To what extent has the project management, monitoring systems and coordination mechanisms effectively addressed the needs and implementation challenges?
- 14) Were the RTG and partners satisfied with the quality of tools, technical advice, training, and other activities delivered by the project?
- 15) To what extent the JP contribute to acceleration toward the relevant SDGs?

E. Efficiency

- 16) Has the allocation of financial, human, institutional and technical resources been optimal for achieving the results?
- 17) Have the project activities been completed on-time /according to the project document and adjusted to take into account COVID-19? If not, what factors have hindered timely delivery and what counter-measures have been taken to address them?

F. Impact

- 18) How has the project impacted on the social protection systems? Has the JP contributed to improved social protection systems/schemes? How?
- 19) Have institutional attitudes and mindset been changed as a result of the JP/JP activities? How?
- 20) To what extent has the government agencies institutionalized the support provided by the project? Who uses the JP knowledge materials and outputs? Are they likely to be catalysts for change?
- 21) What approaches have potential for further upscaling and/or replication through future work by the UN agencies and its partners?

G. Sustainability

- 22) To what extent will activities, results and effects be expected to continue after project activities have ended? How will this be ensured? What are the strong evidences that they would be continued?
- 23) To what extent have constituents/relevant stakeholders been involved in the implementation of the project? To what extent has the project identified and engaged with the right stakeholders to achieve its objectives?

H. Cross-Cutting Issues

- 24) To what extent did the project facilitate and strengthen social dialogue to achieve its expected results? To what extent are the JP management and implementation guided by tripartite dialogue?

- 25) To what extent are the target beneficiaries reached? Did the project ensure gender balance and inclusion of people with disability in the beneficiary outreach? To what extent have persons with disabilities been consulted through their representative organizations?
- 26) To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality and non-discrimination and disability inclusiveness?

Ethical Considerations

The Evaluation Team, consisting of an international and a national evaluator, has conformed to guidelines and standards set by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016), UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system (2008), UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (2020), UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator (2018), and UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation (2014).

Implementation of Methodology in three Phases

The evaluation has applied an appropriate mix of qualitative and quantitative methods to gather data and information in order to offer a diverse perspective to the evaluation and to promote engagement of key stakeholders of the project at all levels during the design, field work, validation and reporting stages. The data gathered through those methods have been triangulated to increase the validity and rigor of the evaluation findings. The methodology for the collection of evidences has been implemented in **three phases**:

1) Inception Phase

In this first phase, initial discussions were held with the ILO Evaluation Manager and the ILO JP Team. Upon reviewing several key documents, including the ToR, the PRODOC, Annual Progress Reports (APR), the LogFrame and the Theory of Change, an **Inception Report** (dated 11 April 2022) was prepared following the special Checklist in the ToR (Annex 1).

2) Data Collection Phase

In this phase the full list of project support **documents** including correspondence, JP Documents and Reports published, UNPAF/UNSDCF, SDG relevant documents, PUNO Country programmes (incl. ILO-DWCP), Joint SDG Fund policy, communication and awareness campaign materials, financial data, project website, etc., were further investigated (see Annex 10).

Most primary data were collected through a series of **Key Informant Interviews** with JP staff and relevant specialists of PUNOs, Government agencies/service providers, tripartite constituents, civil society organizations, research institutions and representatives of the donor and members of the Project Steering Committee. A list of relevant stakeholders was developed initially by the evaluator with the support of the JP ILO Team and the Evaluation Manager, and in total **33 stakeholders** were interviewed of which two-thirds were female (see Annex 3). The criteria for selecting these stakeholders for interviews is based on purposive sampling based on the degree of engagement in the project. The questions to be asked to these stakeholders relate to all of the eight Evaluation Criteria discussed above, whereby the 26 Evaluation Questions (listed in Annex 2) will be used as a checklist for these interviews.

The COVID-19 restrictions on travel prevented the evaluation consultants from traveling to or within Thailand. Therefore, the interviews undertaken were conducted online jointly by the international and national evaluator, where necessary with the support of simultaneous translation.

Focus Group Discussions (FGD) with beneficiaries and an online survey were also considered and discussed with the Evaluation Manager and the ILO JP Team, but it was decided that their usefulness will be quite limited because the UNJP was implemented more at the macro level involving many discussions and interactions at the *national* policy level, without concrete interventions in the field; therefore, many (potential) beneficiaries and recipients are not aware of the programme and/or have no knowledge about the JP's activities.

The **quantitative** methods employed by the evaluation included the investigation of the quantitative indicators used in the programme, as well as of the Annual Progress Reports (APR), for example to arrive at a quantification of the achievements (see Annex 4). Furthermore, it included a quantitative analysis of the financial data (see EQ 16 & 17 in the above).

At the end of the data collection phase the Evaluation Team presented the *preliminary findings* virtually to the representatives of the four PUNO's on Thursday 19 May 2022 to discuss the findings and to improve the PowerPoint. The revised version was subsequently presented on Thursday 26 May 2022 in a virtual **Stakeholders' Workshop** with simultaneous translation in Thai to discuss, validate and refine the findings and fill information gaps. The feedback provided at this workshop was included in the evaluation report (see below under 'Deliverables').

3) *Data analysis and reporting phase*

The third and final phase includes the data analysis and the preparation of a draft report and final report (for details see below under 'Deliverables').

To the extent possible, the data collection, analysis and presentation were responsive to and included issues relating to gender equality, diversity and non-discrimination, including disability issues. **Gender concerns** were addressed in accordance with ILO Guidance note 4: "Considering gender in the monitoring and evaluation of programmes". **Disability inclusion** was addressed in accordance with Annex 4 of the ToR (cf. Annex 1) and in line with the Leaving No One Behind principle and the obligations stemming from the Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities, as well as with the *Joint statement on inclusive social protection system for full and effective participation and inclusion of persons with disabilities*.³

Main Deliverables

- a) The **Inception Report** followed the report structure detailed in Annex 1 of the ToR (see Annex 1). This report was approved by the Evaluation Manager in consultation with the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) of the PUNOs.
- b) **Two PowerPoint Presentations** provided the preliminary evaluation findings and recommendations at the end of the field work phase, which were presented at two virtual workshops, first with the PUNOs only, and subsequently with all key stakeholders; the list of the 30 participants in the latter workshop is included in Annex 7.
- c) **First draft of Evaluation Report**. The ToR for this evaluation provided a suggested report structure in its Annex 2 (see Annex 1). The draft report was circulated by the Evaluation Manager to key stakeholders, who were requested to return their comments within a specified period of time.

³ <https://www.social-protection.org/gimi/gess/RessourcePDF.action?ressource.ressourceId=55473>

- d) **Final version of the evaluation report (both in Thai and English)** incorporates the comments received (or a specific justification for not integrating a comment). The quality of the report was assessed against the ILO EVAL Checklist 6 taking into account the specific measures for quality assurance taken for this joint programme (cf. Section 4.4). The final version was subjected to final approval by the ILO Evaluation Office (after initial approval by the evaluation manager, ERG and Regional Evaluation Officer). ***The joint evaluation report will be translated into Thai.***
- e) A stand-alone **Executive Summary** and **Lessons Learned and Good Practices** in the respective ILO templates.

Management Arrangements

The UNJP programme is subject to a final joint independent evaluation with established arrangements for managing it. The evaluation was led by ILO and managed jointly by the partner agencies (PUNOs) through a joint evaluation management team, the **Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)**. The evaluation report was submitted to the ILO Evaluation Office for its evaluation repository.⁴ Ms. Rattanaorn Pongpattana, M&E Officer from ILO ROAP, was the **Evaluation Manager**. The evaluation Team Leader reports to the evaluation manager. The evaluation manager is responsible for completing a series of specific tasks listed in the ToR (Annex 1).

The **ILO**, as lead agency in the JP, handled administrative and contractual arrangements with the evaluators and provided logistical and other assistance as required.

A **Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC)** was set up as the main decision-making structure. It is chaired by RC and composed by in-country PUNO M&E specialists who had no prior involvement in the project implementation. Primary responsibilities of the JEC include:

- Approving ToRs, endorsing the overall evaluation framework and the release of the evaluation products;
- Providing oversight of the evaluation and being accountable for its robustness; and
- Reviewing and approving all deliverables including the evaluation reports.

The **Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)** was set up and comprised of a small group of key UN internal stakeholders, i.e. project staff of ILO, UNICEF, IOM, and UN Women. The ERG provided comments and substantive feedback to ensure the quality – from a technical point of view – of key evaluation deliverables. Its primary responsibilities include:

- Provide comments on the development of the ToRs;
- Providing project documents and materials to the ILO National Project Coordinator and Evaluation Manager;
- Providing list of interviewees and their contact details;
- Helping schedule interviews/consultations when needed;
- Being on hand and available to provide information, written inputs, and face to face interviews as requested;
- Participating in the stakeholders' workshop;
- Contributing to quality assurance through comments and feedback on draft deliverables; reviewing and providing feedback on the terms of reference, inception report, draft and final evaluation report; and
- Develop the Evaluation Management Response in consultation with stakeholders.

⁴ See UNEG Resource Pack on Joint evaluation for more details: <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1620>

The evaluation was conducted with the support of a team of consultants, an international and a national consultant. This **Evaluation Team** has the final responsibility for the evaluation report and ensure the quality of data (validity, reliability, consistency, and accuracy) throughout the analytical and reporting phases. The Team reports to ILO's Evaluation Manager.

All **stakeholders**, particularly the four PUNOs, the donor, The Royal Thai Government, the Workers' and Employers' organizations, NGOs/CSOs and other key partners were consulted throughout the process and were engaged at different stages during the process. They were given the opportunity to provide inputs to the TOR and were invited to provide comments to the draft evaluation report.

Quality Assurance

Quality assurance was undertaken throughout the entire evaluation process by ILO in close consultation with the ERG, which is leading on quality assurance of all deliverables. ILO/ERG provided quality assurance in line with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines and other relevant procedures checking that the evaluation methodologies, findings and conclusions are relevant, and recommendations are implementable, and contributed to the dissemination of the evaluation findings and follow-up on the management response.

ILO/ERG reviewed the initial deliverables (such as draft inception report, first draft of the final report) and worked with the Evaluation Team on necessary revisions to ensure the deliverables meet minimum quality standards. The Evaluation Manager then requested feedback from stakeholders, consolidating all comments from the ERG and other key stakeholders on a response matrix and requested the Evaluation Team to indicate actions taken against each comment in the production of the penultimate, and final draft.

ERG provided comments and substantive feedback to ensure the quality – from a technical point of view – of key evaluation deliverables including the inception report and draft report, while ILO is responsible for final quality assurance checking and final sign off on all deliverables of the evaluation

The **Risk Assessment** in Annex 3 of the ToR (see Annex 1) sets out selected risks based on previous evaluation experiences, and possible mitigation measures. As far as applicable, these have all been addressed in the above, as follows:

- Covid-19 situation: See Section 1.3.
- Over-ambitious scope: Realistic design in methodology (cf. Section 1.3).
- Insufficient time and attention paid to the evaluation at critical points in the process: Well-balanced division of time and attention (see Sections 1.3 and Annex 8).
- Major crisis in the country: Not applicable.
- Poor performance by the Evaluation Team: Not applicable.

Limitations

The Evaluation assignment is clearly laid out in the ToR (Annex 1) and the list of stakeholders to be interviewed is quite comprehensive and is representative of the main stakeholders (see Annex 3). The travel restrictions laid out by Thailand as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic prevented the evaluators from undertaking field missions to/within the country. This did not lead to any gaps in the evidence generated as good care was taken to interview *all* relevant stakeholders (see

Annex 3) providing simultaneous translation services where required. In this regard, the evaluation drew on internal ILO guidance, in particular the document: *Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO: An internal guide on adapting to the situation*⁵ and its update of 19 August 2021.⁶ The **mitigation strategy** was to focus on conducting virtual interviews with project stakeholders through online means of communication.

Work Plan

The duration of this evaluation fell in the period March - June 2022. The level of efforts included 30 working days for the Team Leader/International Evaluator (IE) and 15 working days for the National Evaluator (NE). The work plan was arrived at after consultations with the Evaluation Manager and the JP ILO Team and is provided in Annex 8. It indicates the timing of the key steps and of the deliverables for the evaluation, and at the same time outlines the responsibilities of each member of the evaluation team and the level of effort for each step.

1.4 Contents of Report

The present Evaluation Report provides in the next chapter the country context and an overview of the UN Joint Programme. In Chapter 3 the findings are presented for each of the seven evaluation criteria identified and for the cross-cutting issues. The Conclusions and Recommendations are presented in Chapter 4, while the final Chapter (5) presents the Lessons Learned and Good Practices identified.

⁵ See: http://www.ilo.ch/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_741206.pdf, and www.ilo.ch/eval/WCMS_744068/lang--en/index.htm

⁶ https://www.ilo.org/eval/WCMS_817079/lang--en/index.htm

2 Country Context and UN Joint Programme

2.1 Country context

Thailand has been internationally recognized for its continuous development in the past decades, transitioning from a low-income country to a middle-income country in 2011. This reflects that Thailand's efforts to reduce poverty as part of its policies to improve the quality of life of its people can be considered successful. This success can be partly explained by the Royal Thai Government's (RTG) relatively comprehensive social protection system. There are **44 government welfare programmes** that take care of people in all age ranges. These programs are owned by **11 ministries**, comprised of 27 cash welfare programmes owned by the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (MSDHS), the Ministry of Interior, the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, and the Ministry of Education, and 17 non-cash welfare programs, such as subsidies for utilities cost, supports of land use rights, moratorium of loan repayment, provision of loans, and trainings. The non-contributory welfare programmes are complemented by a comprehensive social insurance scheme managed by the Social Security Office, including several branches such as pension; invalidity; working injury; family, health, sickness and maternity benefits.⁷

However, Thailand's economic growth has **not been inclusive**. Growth has been concentrated only in some areas, giving rise to geographical inequality and income inequality. Even though the government has continuously attempted to resolve these issues, circumstances have not significantly changed for the better as reflected in a slight decrease in the Gini Coefficient from 0.487 in 1988 to 0.445 in 2015. The joint Programme Document (PRODOC) identified four significant "last mile" **challenges**:

- 1) Policies are not integrated as there is no comprehensive programmatic approach to social protection.
- 2) There are gaps in coverage for vulnerable groups, particularly migrant and domestic workers.
- 3) The poverty reduction impact of existing social protection benefits is limited.
- 4) Ensuring the financial sustainability of the welfare system, in particular because Thailand is going through a quick process of *ageing*.

In terms of **Gender analysis**, Thailand has an increasingly progressive society when it comes to gender roles. Nevertheless, women are still under-represented in public and private sectors, including in the parliament, government, judiciary and administration both at national and local levels. In addition, protection from gender-based violence against women leaves much to be desired and so does equal pay to men with the same work. The challenges impact particularly on certain groups including domestic workers and migrant women, and in certain geographical regions e.g. the southern border provinces of Thailand.

⁷ Based on the Joint Programme Document (PRODOC) for the United Nations Joint Programme on Social Protection for All in Thailand (Revised, 27 August 2021).

During the period being covered by the evaluation two **key changes** can be identified in the context. Firstly, the COVID-19 Pandemic starting in March 2020 impacted on the planned activities resulting in delays and necessitated a complete review in planning and implementation modalities. Secondly, the political crisis in Myanmar may have an impact in terms of the number of Migrant Workers and/or displaced persons entering Thailand.

2.2 UN Joint Programme

Context of UN response

The United Nations Joint Programme (UNJP) on Social Protection for All in Thailand is a joint ILO, IOM, UNICEF and UN Women project. It is funded by the **Joint SDG Fund** which is an innovative instrument to incentivize the transformative policy shifts and stimulate the strategic investments required to get the world *back on track* to meet the SDGs. The UN Secretary-General sees the Joint SDG Fund as a key part of the reform of the UN's development work by providing the "muscle" for a new generation of Resident Coordinators (RCs) and UN Country Teams (UNCTs) to really *accelerate SDG implementation*. The UNJP targets two relevant Outcomes of the Joint SDG Fund: 1) Integrated multi-sectoral policies to accelerate SDG achievement implemented with greater scope and scale; and 2) Additional financing leveraged to accelerate SDG achievement.

The Joint Programme (JP) is further aligned to the Thailand **United Nations Partnership Agreement Framework (UNPAF)** 2017-2021, in particular its Outcome Strategy 1: "Collaborate at national and sub-national levels to strengthen systems, structures and processes for effective, inclusive and sustainable policymaking and implementation". It is also aligned to the new **United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF)** 2022 – 2025, especially to Outcome 2 to improve human capital needed for social and inclusive development through strengthening institutions, partnerships and the empowerment of people, and to Outcome 3 to enable people living in Thailand, especially those at risk of being left furthest behind, to participate in and benefit from development, free from all forms of discrimination.

With regards to the **National SDG Framework**, the 20-year national strategy (2018–2037) is Thailand's first national long-term strategy developed pursuant to the Constitution. Social protection relates to two of the six key strategies: (i) Development of human capital and (ii) Social equality and equity.

Programme strategy, objectives, goals, reach and achievements

The UNJP **aims** to enhance and integrate Thailand's social protection system, and reach those being left behind, especially for the more vulnerable groups, such as children, elders, informal workers, migrant workers, and people with disabilities. Under this project, the Child Support Grant will be scaled up from supporting 700,000 children to 2 million by the end of 2021, as a result of the strengthened integrated social protection systems. Policy changes to the existing social security schemes will be designed and tested, to allow for more effective coverage of domestic workers, including women and migrants. The **long-term vision** of the JP is to increase the social protection coverage towards **universality**, including for children and specific vulnerable groups (including domestic workers and migrant workers), through sustainable social protection systems, including floors, contributing to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda in Thailand. The overall intended **result** of the JP is that the government's social protection system is reformed in a way

to ensure effective and efficient implementation of policies for all populations, including migrants and children.

The **Intervention Logic** of the JP is given in the Results Framework (cf. PRODOC 2021: 40-44) which includes the outcome statement, indicators, targets and means of verification. The JP outcome statement identified **3 Outcomes** and **10 Outputs** which are listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Outcomes, Outputs and Responsible PUNOs of the UNJP.

Outcome statement	Responsible PUNO
<p>Outcome 1: Integrated policy solutions developed following a review of the social protection system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Output 1.1:</u> Policy dialogue to foster dialogue on strategic directions for social protection in Thailand • <u>Output 1.2:</u> Public Advocacy on the importance of social protection is increased, including among the public opinion and decision makers • <u>Output 1.3:</u> A comprehensive review of the social protection system developed and followed by policy recommendations for a more inclusive, integrated and coherent system • <u>Output 1.4:</u> National Social Protection Policy Framework and a National Social Protection Monitoring Framework 	<p>ILO, UNICEF, IOM, UN WOMEN</p>
<p>Outcome 2: Scale up of coverage of the Child Support Grant from 700,000 children to 2 million by end of 2021 because of strengthened integrated social protection systems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Output 2.1:</u> Improved capacity of the national identification system to register and monitor through the MIS the registration of new beneficiaries • <u>Output 2.2:</u> National policy consultations on integration of the cash/non-cash under the Child support grant with transformative programs for ECD in place for maximizing the potential of the grant to all children • <u>Output 2.3:</u> Evidence generation for the impact of the grant on young children in Thailand to inform further policy expansions towards UCSG • <u>Output 2.4:</u> Improved public and programme communication 	<p>UNICEF</p>
<p>Outcome 3: Provide policy options to ensure a more effective coverage of domestic workers, including migrants, within the existing social security schemes, are designed and tested</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Output 3.1:</u> Policy assessment and design of innovative program solutions to eliminate the barriers for the coverage of domestic workers developed and discussed • <u>Output 3.2:</u> Pre-test of suggested policy options with targeted domestic workers completed, and assessed 	<p>IOM, UN WOMEN ILO</p>

The **Theory of Change** (ToC) consists of three straightforward “If...then ...”-statements, one for each of the three outcomes, and these are included in the ToR (Annex 1).

The **funding** of the Joint SDG Fund amounts to USD 1,999,815, while the co-funding by the four PUNOs is USD 662,000, making a total of USD 2,661,815 of which 75% is provided by the Joint SDG Fund. The joint programme is using a pass-through fund management modality where the UNDP Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) Office acts as the Administrative Agent (AA) under which the funds are channelled through the AA. Each PUNO receiving funds through the pass-through has signed a standard MoU with the AA. Each PUNO shall assume full programmatic and financial accountability for the funds disbursed to it by the AA, and funds will thus be administered by each UN Agency in accordance with its own regulations, rules, directives and procedures.

The **Target groups** of the project include children and informal and migrant workers (often women who are domestic workers) and the elder. This joint programme aims to address geographical and age coverage, improvement of the governance system for social protection, including implementation and improved fiscal space, and improved methods for capturing the poor and invisible such as migrants, preferably through a better focus on universal schemes and specific provisions for groups hard to cover such as migrant and domestic workers. Beyond the traditional

life-cycle approach, particular attention will be given to groups such as homeless people and people with disabilities.

An overview of most of the **Achievements** until January 2022 is listed in the Annual Progress Report for 2021 in terms of results against the JP Programmatic Results Framework and these results are summarized in Annex 4. These interim results as well as the expected *final* targets were discussed with the stakeholders during the interviews, and analysed in comparison to the planned outcomes, outputs and indicators (cf. Section 3.4).

Programme Implementation

The **National Social Welfare Committee (NSWC)**, chaired by the Deputy Prime Minister (DPM), is the main decision-making body engaged at the policy level, with the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (MSDHS) as the Secretariat and other key government agencies participating such as the National Economic and Social Development Council (NESDC). The Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO) engages at this level representing the PUNOs. With the Secretariat to the Committee based within MSDHS, this provides the main channel for ongoing engagement with the Committee.

In the implementation arrangements between partner UN organizations the **RCO** plays a central role in coordinating the work of the UN Agencies and leading the political dialogue, ensuring the UN delivers a harmonized message at different policy levels, including the high-level policy dialogue. **ILO** is the lead UN entity on the overall system diagnostic due to their active technical and advisory role on social protection in Thailand, as well as global role and expertise. **UNICEF** will take the lead role on the component associated with Child Sensitive Social Protection in particular the Child Support Grant given its technical strength on policy and implementation in the past decade whilst **IOM and UN Women** will jointly co-lead the development of solutions for the extension of coverage for domestic workers and for the inclusion of migrant workers, in technical collaboration with the ILO.

A joint, annual **Project Steering Committee (PSC)** has been established co-chaired by the Permanent Secretary of the MSDHS and the UNRC in Thailand. The PSC members include high-level representatives of relevant ministries and government agencies (i.e., MSDHS, MOL, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Public Health, NESDC, etc.) as well as members of the academia. The objective of the PSC is to ensure that all related government agencies are aware of the project's objectives and implementation, and to review the programme's progress and activities.

3 Overall Findings

For the present Final Joint Independent Evaluation of the **United Nations Joint Programme on Social Protection for All in Thailand** seven evaluation criteria have been identified in the previous chapter which will be discussed in depth in the present chapter as well as the Cross-Cutting Issues (Sections 3.1 – 3.8). These criteria have been analysed with the help of the 26 Evaluation Questions identified in Section 1.3 above (see also Annex 2).

3.1 Relevance

The present Evaluation found that the UN Joint Programme (JP) is highly **Relevant** and that its objectives respond to the needs of key stakeholders in Thailand. In addition, all stakeholders interviewed underlined that the JP was very **timely**, in particular for three reasons:

- As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, the attention for Social Protection (SP) increased substantially and the relevance of the JP had even further increased; certain groups were specifically affected (e.g. informal, platform and migrant workers), and many groups requested assistance from the government.
- The JP started when the National Economic and Social Development Council (NESDC) was developing its 13th National Economic and Social Development Plan (2023 – 2027).
- The Department of Children and Youth (DCY) of the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (MSDHS) had identified the need to enhance the Management Information System (MIS) for the Child Support Grant (CSG) due to the last expansion in 2019, and at the start of the JP, the DCY did not secure the Government budget yet.

Needs and priorities of the target beneficiaries and recipients

The JP clearly responded to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries and recipients, but it differed among types of stakeholders. The alignment to the priorities of the **Thai Government** was very clear. Social protection is referred to in the 20-years National Strategy of Thailand, while it is extensively covered in the new **13th Plan** through Milestone 9: *“Thailand to successfully reduce the poverty across generations and all Thai people have access to adequate social protection.”* In this Plan, three dimensions are identified with respect to social protection each with a set of very clear and concrete indicators as follows:

- Dimension 1: Social protection for children: Access to childcare services for those aged 0 -2 are increased by no less than 50%.
- Dimension 2: Social protection for working age: At least 60% of the total labour force are insured under the Social Security System; The number of people in the voluntary retirement saving fund is increased by no less than 100%; and: All workers under all types of employment are protected under the labour laws.
- Dimension 3: Social protection for elderly: The proportion of the elderly in poverty is reduced to no more than 4%; and: The proportion of dependent elderly who are treated in a long-term care under the Universal Health Care is increased more than 70%.

The strategies to reach such goals are: 1) to enhance social protection coverage for all age groups; 2) to develop an effective social protection system; and 3) to integrate database to reduce generational poverty and provide social protection.

The JP was well received by the MSDHS as it is aligned with their policies, and the Ministry is key for Outcomes 1 and 2 of the JP. For Outcome 2, the work on the CSG was also closely aligned to the DCY's priorities. The Ministry of Labour (MoL) is the official tripartite constituent from the government side of the ILO, and the JP is very relevant to its policy on social protection as it fills some of the gaps, especially related to Outcomes 1 and 3. The Social Security Fund (SSF) is managed by the Social Security Office (SSO) of the MoL, and this ministry further has the specific expertise for Outcome 3 on domestic workers. The MoL underlined during interviews that the JP is very beneficial to Workers.

Lastly, because ageing of the population in Thailand is considered as a crucial national policy issue for the coming years, and because there is a public concern around the adequacy of the benefits and the sustainability of the existing pension schemes, the government is interested in big reforms in this area reducing the number of organisations and ministries handling different elements of pension schemes.

With respect to the needs and priorities of the social partners it was found that the JP did not respond directly to those of the Employers' and Workers' Organisations in Thailand. These organisations are also challenged in their capacities with respect to social protection. They were included in the JP in a passive role to provide inputs when requested. They are board members of the SS Fund (SSO).

Relevance of the JP to the country programmes of the four PUNOs in Thailand

The JP was clearly relevant to the country programmes of the four Partner UN Organizations (PUNOs) implementing the programme. For the UN as a whole in Thailand, social protection is included in the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) 2022-2026 as *one element* in the broader Outcome 3 on 'Leaving No One Behind'.

The JP is aligned to the Thailand- **ILO** Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) 2019 – 2021 through Priority 1 'Promote an enabling environment for the growth of decent and productive employment' in particular the Outcome 1.3 on Enhanced effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the social security system. It is also aligned to ILO's Programme and Budget (P&B) 2020-2021, especially Outcome 8: Comprehensive and sustainable social protection for all, as well as to ILO's Flagship Programme on Social Protection Floors (SPF).

The JP is further clearly aligned to the previous as well as the current **UNICEF** Country Programmes (2017-21 and 2022-26). Social Protection was regarded as a programme outcome in the 2017-2021 document and it focused on improving policy and implementation of child sensitive social protection policies, while the new country programme includes integrated social protection as part of the Social Policy Outcome. Moreover, the activities related to the CSG and the Disability Grant were included in the biennium workplan between UNICEF and MSDHS, respectively with the DCY and the Department of the Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (DEPD).

In the new **IOM** Strategy for Thailand (2022–2026) IOM will assist the RTG in COVID recovery, including to improve access to social protection, support services and assistance for migrant workers. Social protection is further included in IOM's Regional Programme. In addition, the JP is also very relevant to the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM). Thailand stands out as a leader in Asia in championing the integration of international migrants in social protection mechanisms (e.g. access to services and portability of benefits across countries).

Lastly, the JP is aligned to **UN Women's** Regional Programme, and to its Thailand country strategy which has four key priorities: 1) gender equality and female empowerment, 2) anti-violence against women, 3) women economic empowerment, and 4) women, peace and security.

Response to the changing situation as a result of the COVID-19 Pandemic

The JP certainly remained *relevant* after the COVID-19 pandemic started, in fact, as we saw in the above the relevance only *increased*. However, the JP needed some time to adjust to the changing situation, switching to online meetings, trainings, etc., and this resulted in delays. Delays were further enhanced as a result of the fact that partners were urgently focusing on responding to negative effects of the pandemic, instead of on the reforms itself.

3.2 Validity of Design

The present evaluation found that the design and strategies of the UNJP were adequate to enhance Thailand's social protection system, and to reach certain population groups who are being left behind. The PRODOC was a joint effort in particular of ILO and UNICEF, while IOM and UN Women joined in a bit later. The need for a Diagnostic Review on SP (SPDR) arose through the dialogue between UNICEF and MSDHS taking place for well over a decade. Simultaneously ILO had been working on the Social Protection Floor (SPF) through the Assessment-Based National Dialogue (ABND).

The **Joint Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Fund** provided an opportunity to propose a joint project. This global Fund is an innovative instrument to incentivize the transformative policy shifts and stimulate the strategic investments required to get the world back on track to meet the SDGs. The UN Secretary-General sees the Joint SDG Fund as a key part of the reform of the UN's development work by providing the "muscle" for a new generation of Resident Coordinators (RCs) and UN Country Teams (UNCTs) to really accelerate SDG implementation. To date it has funded 101 joint programmes focused on *integrated social protection* or *SDG finance*, it has stimulated over 1,000+ partnerships working together alongside the UN to support the SDGs and it has tested over 200 innovative solutions to accelerate the 2030 Agenda. Globally, this Fund disburses about US\$ 250 million intended for 3 years and for many countries, e.g. now it is operational in 63 countries.

In order to arrive at the design and at the PRODOC, the JP conducted **consultations** with the MSDHS, in particular with the PS Office and DCY, but much less with the Department of Social Development and Welfare (DSDW) or the Department of Women's Affairs and Family Development (DWAFD). The JP did not, however, consult many other stakeholders than the MSDHS because there was only a relatively short time to develop the PRODOC. An official launch of the JP was planned to introduce the broader stakeholder community to the JP but was delayed (and finally abandoned) because of COVID as it was judged to be more useful if held on a face-to-face basis. Now the first meeting of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) in August 2020 could be seen as the JP's launch. In itself, the conducting of this meeting can be considered as an important success in the midst of the pandemic, actually bringing together a large number of staff from a series of ministries, selected experts and members from the UNCT. However, the participants did not include CSOs, the social partners or the wider donor community. The involvement of donors was a condition of the Joint SDG Fund, in fact, an annual donor meeting

was to be held, and the last opportunity for their involvement will be the final Launch of the project in June 2022.

Theory of Change and Outcome Statement

The program's logic included in the **Theory of Change** (see Annex 1, page 5) described the programme components adequately through three (*If..., then...*) statements and these correspond to the three Outcomes listed in the **Outcome Statement** (see Table 1). These outcomes are straightforward and logical in itself, and, similarly, the ten outputs are logically deduced from the three respective Outcomes (Table 1). However, the three Outcomes themselves seem, at first sight, rather diverse.

- **Outcome 1** is fully directed at the *national policy level* aiming for system reform and *Universality* of social protection.
- **Outcome 2** *targets* the Child Support Grant (CSG), and in particular its Management Information System (MIS) as well as evidence generation and advocacy for its expansion and policy implementation.
- **Outcome 3** has again a different focus *targeting domestic workers* (Migrants and Thai nationals, in particular women).

The logic behind having such a three-pronged approach is rationalised by aiming for an enhanced **evidence-base** needed for a system review as well as targeting certain **gaps** in the system, in particular those left behind.

Various stakeholders commented on the design of the JP, and some of the feedback included:

- The design could have included a greater focus on youth and elderly ("*cover all groups*"), as well as on Informal workers (for example, platform and agricultural workers).
- Many stakeholders considered it an important idea to include Domestic Workers (often Migrant workers/women) in the JP design, and their clear employer-employee relationship could be useful to replicate the work for other groups.
- ILO could have been more involved in Outcome 3 in view of ILO's extensive experience with Domestic Workers.
- From a CSO network perspective, the JP should not only focus on studies but also on real action, including advocacy work, for moving social protection forward.

As we will see in Section 3.4 on achievements, the JP has contributed to most of these suggestions to some extent; for example, the JP developed reports on some of the groups mentioned (e.g. informal employment), or conducted activities such as work on elderly/pensions and advocacy. Certain stakeholders would have preferred more focus on these issues.

Results and Indicators

The *Programmatic Results Framework* of the JP is clear and measurable with three Outcome-indicators and 34 Output-indicators. Annex 4 provides a summary of the results achieved by the JP until 31 December 2021 (based on the JP Annual Progress Report over 2021; pages 14-20). This summary includes the 2021 results, the reasons for variance from the planned targets, as well as the expected final target by the end of June 2022. It clearly demonstrates the measurability of the indicators.

The original *timeframe* of just two years (January 2020 – December 2021) was not realistic to push for a complete social protection policy and system reform, nor to complete all the deliverables identified; in addition, the start of the COVID-19 pandemic was almost simultaneous with the start of the JP and has resulted in substantial delays.

3.3 Coherence

Cooperation between the PUNOs

The cooperation between the four PUNOs was effective to achieve the expected results. Coordinated by ILO as the lead agency (cf. ToR), the profiles of the four are clearly different but complementary, and they already had experience in cooperating with each other. The UN Resident Coordinator Office (RCO) has also been active, especially also in the relations with the Royal Thai Government (RTG). The flexibility of the JP, of ILO as the lead and of the Joint SDG Fund as the donor was also appreciated, for example for budget re-allocations, for modifications in scheduled activities during COVID, and for the no-cost extension of six months.

The JP involved lots of work at the technical level, but it could have been good to engage the Heads of Agencies somewhat more often. This differed by organization as ILO and UNICEF were involved in most aspects of the JP and had many ad hoc meetings among themselves, while IOM and UN Women joined such meetings only when it concerned their specific work, mainly for Outcome 3: on migration issues for IOM and on gender issues/domestic workers for UN Women. The expertise in women empowerment and other gender issues of UN Women was important for that, while their experience with research into Domestic Workers was less extensive, and combined with COVID and some interim staff changes, this resulted in some delays of the work, in particular of the survey among domestic workers which is currently ongoing. In the end, all four PUNOs and the RCO underlined that they have appreciated the very good cooperation among all of them.

Cooperation with other stakeholders

The cooperation with *government organisations* was particularly close with the MSDHS, MoL and NESDC, while for certain activities it was extended to other Ministries, e.g. Finance (MoF), Interior (MoI), Foreign Affairs (MoFA) and Education (MoE). This will be further illustrated in the next section on Effectiveness (Section 3.4).

The engagement with the *Employers' and Workers Organisations* (EO and WO), which form jointly with the MoL the official tripartite constituents of the ILO, was more incidental. The Employers Federation of Thailand (ECOT), the State Enterprises Workers' Relations Confederation (SERC) and the National Congress of Private Industrial Employees (NCPE) participated in several workshops and provided their recommendations, in particular during the technical meetings in April 2022 on the SPDR. The ECOT further has a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with IOM on migrant workers issues. The NCPE and SERC liaise mainly with the ILO and both appreciated the JP as it raises awareness among workers on social protection. The SERC has experience in working with domestic workers.

The engagement with *Civil Society Organisations* (CSO) was directed at specific activities where they could play a complementary role. HomeNet has worked for over 20 years on labour protection for informal workers, including women domestic workers, and all four PUNOs engaged with HomeNet in specific activities, e.g. support the survey on domestic workers to identify and contact the workers, support communication strategy on domestic workers, act as a committee member on CSG Advocacy, etc. IOM engaged with the Migrant Working Group (MWG) on the background study under Outcome 1. Overall, CSOs were involved in the technical meetings in April 2022 on the SPDR.

The PRODOC (p. 50) had, in fact, proposed to form a *National CSO Coalition on Social Protection*, but it turned out to be too ambitious to achieve during the project timeframe and the COVID pandemic prevented actual meetings. It would have also needed proper preparation to define what will be the exact advocacy target of the coalition. UNICEF did provide technical support jointly with the Thailand Development and Research Institute (TDRI) to an earlier CSO coalition, the Coalition on Universal Child Grant.⁸

The JP also cooperated with several *Research institutes*. The TDRI is a well-known research institution that has conducted research and advocacy for improved social protection in Thailand. It has been a crucial partner for UNICEF in advocating for the Universal Child Grant even before the adoption of the CSG in 2015, and it was engaged with UNICEF in several assessments aiming to improve the CSG. They further developed background papers on financing within the framework of the JP and were also closely involved in developing the SPDR recommendations. The Puey Ungphakorn Institute of Economic Research (PIER) is a semi-autonomous agency established by the Bank of Thailand (BoT), which has an MoU with the Social Security Office (SSO) of the MoL and was involved in the pension reform activities; within the JP it provided a comprehensive overview of the rather fragmented pension system.

Contribution to UN reforms, including UNCT coherence

By its very nature the JP contributed to UN reforms including UN Country Team (UNCT) coherence since it concerns a programme implemented by four UN agencies who are active members in the UNCT. The JP is also a flagship programme for the UNCT, which demonstrated how the UN can offer integrated policy advice to the government on the issue that directly impacts equality and the ones who are left behind; this is one of the pillars of the UNSDCF in which social protection is included. The UN RC's Office also played a key role in particular at high-level engagements with the Thai Government and in political leverage. With respect to the topic of social protection, the JP acted as a kind of platform within the UN to advocate for social protection (especially after the pandemic started). Furthermore, the JP helped the PUNOs in Thailand to work more closely together, while there are not so many other donor funded programmes and projects in this middle-income country than in various other countries in South-East Asia.

Coherence with other interventions

The JP cooperated with several *other* interventions in Thailand and in South-East Asia. The **ILO** is implementing the project 'Strengthening Social Security Office Capacities in Policy Design with a Focus on Research and Actuarial Services' funded by the SSO in Thailand. This project dealing with pension reform contributed to the JP, for example to the various activities related to pensions and to the informal economy report. ILO is also implementing the regional programme TRIANGLE in ASEAN which conducted a regional study on Domestic Workers using JP's findings, while the new ILO CARE project will carry on work on domestic workers after the JP has ended. **UNICEF** has been working with the MSDHS for well over a decade on the CSG which was initially implemented in 2015, as well as on the other two social protection schemes: The Disability Grant and the State Welfare Card. UNICEF also funds many other activities with the DCY/MSDHS from its own core budget, e.g. capacity building of DCY's staff, a complaint system, evidence generation, public and policy advocacy, etc. **IOM** coordinates with the programme entitled

⁸ This coalition comprises more than 100 NGOs working on children, disability, informal sector workers, women, formal sector workers, state-owned enterprises. It received funding from the Thai Health Promotion Foundation (ThaiHealth) and UNICEF and TDRI have been working closely with them in 2016-2019 in providing updated evidence and advocacy messages that have been used to advocate for the Universal CSG. This coalition has an interest in also advocating integrated social protection in Thailand.

‘Poverty Reduction through Safe Migration, Skills Development and Enhanced Job Placement in Cambodia, LAO PDR, Myanmar and Thailand’ (PROMISE; 2nd phase), which for example also involves domestic workers. IOM also works on Ethical recruitment. **UN Women** is implementing jointly with the ILO the EU-funded regional programme entitled ‘Safe and Fair: Realising women migrant workers’ rights and opportunities in the ASEAN region project’.

3.4 Effectiveness

Achievements of JP’s expected results and outputs

On the whole, the Effectiveness of the JP will be more than satisfactory at the end of June 2022 as the interventions are expected to achieve most of its expected results and outputs. Nevertheless, in part due to the COVID-19 pandemic, a number of activities have been *delayed*: the 2021-Progress report indicated that about *half* of the 34 activities (cf. indicators) were not yet (fully) completed as per 31 December 2021. In addition, a few activities were abandoned mostly as a result of COVID-19, such as the policy advocacy events to be run by the CSO Coalition, and the liaising with the Global Universal social protection Coalition (both are indicators under Output 1.2 in the JP’s Results Framework). On the other hand, a large number of activities are completed or are scheduled to be undertaken in the year 2022 until the project ends on 30 June 2022.

For the **overall** programme, several *key achievements* need to be highlighted as they were mentioned by several different interviewees:

- 1) The JP has raised the awareness and exchange of information on social protection among many stakeholders by bringing them together enhancing networking, including a significant consideration of vulnerable groups.
- 2) The JP has substantially extended the evidence-base on social protection through a dozen or so independent studies and reports.
- 3) The JP has formulated diversified proposals for solutions of problems and gaps in the social protection system.

For each of the three outcomes of the JP more specific progress was made as follows. With respect to **Outcome 1**, i.e. “Integrated policy solutions developed following a review of the social protection system”, it was found that such a review has been undertaken by means of the Thailand Social Protection Diagnostic Review (SPDR) which is a comprehensive study and analysis of the country’s social protection system, currently in its final stages. It is actually something that each country ought to do every 5 to 10 years. Significantly, the SPDR provided inputs to the 13th National Economic and Social Development Plan (2023 – 2027) of the NESDC. This can be illustrated by a quote from the speech of the Secretary General of the NESDC on 18 May 2022 to ECOSOC: “*The situation analysis from the diagnostic review is one of valuable resource as an input for drafting the 13th National Economic and Social Development Plan (2023 – 2027) especially in a social protection milestone we would like to achieve in the next 5 years.*”

In order to arrive at this SPDR no less than six Background Studies were conducted:

- 1) Thailand social protection mapping and vulnerability analysis.
- 2) Child-sensitive social protection in Thailand.
- 3) Expanding access to social security for all workers in Thailand (focus particularly on the extension of coverage to workers in informal employment).
- 4) Review of the pension system in Thailand.

- 5) Social protection for migrant workers and their families in Thailand.
- 6) Social protection gender-impact assessment.

In addition, a technical note was developed on the Sustainability Financing of social protection. The SPDR and these studies were discussed in eight Workshops/Meetings in the period between November 2020 and February 2022. This was followed by a 'Visioning Workshop' in March 2022 with representatives from government agencies (NESDC, MSDHS, MOL, SSO, FPO, BOT, and others), NGOs/CSOS, and academics. Thereafter, a series of seven technical focus group meetings were conducted in April 2022 with NESDC's technical team, academics and experts, representatives from NGOs/CSOs, employers and workers' organizations, and representatives from MSDHS' different departments (DCY, DEPD, DWAFD, DSDW) to discuss the proposed Policy Options and how to implement these options in practice. The quality of the meetings and of the proposed policy solutions were valued very positively by the stakeholders, and many underlined that their realisation has become much more likely now that the 13th National Economic and Social Development Plan (NESDP) includes as a comprehensive target on social protection; however, key stakeholders underlined that actual implementation now depends on the priorities of the government and the allocation of sufficient financial resources.

The JP also conducted under Outcome 1 a 12-weeks training course on Social Budgeting jointly with the ILO International Training centre (ICT) in Turin and the Asian Development Bank (ADB) in late 2020 to train government staff. This was considered to be very beneficial, and the inclusion of vulnerable groups was seen as an important element; generally, stakeholders indicated that it was a bit long, and that it could in future be divided in two parts, one for management and one for technical staff. Lastly, activities were also undertaken related to policy dialogue, public advocacy, and a National Social Protection Policy and Monitoring Framework (for more details see Annex 4).

The indicator for **Outcome 2** is "Scale up of coverage of the CSG from 700,000 children to 2 million by end 2021 as a result of strengthened integrated SP systems" and this target has been substantially *surpassed*, and as of late April 2022 no less than *2.35 million* children were registered of which 48.6% were girls.

Some of the activities under this outcome include as follows (see Annex 4 for further details):

- 1) The JP/UNICEF provided technical assistance to the DCY to improve the capacity of the Management Information System (MIS) of the CSG; assessments had established that there were a lot of errors in the MIS along the registration, enrolment, and payment processes due to the lack of the authentication of data and the linkage of CSG with other related databases. These errors led to the delay of payments and the limitation of entitled children accessing the scheme. The support provided included commissioning international and national consultants to review and analyse the existing MIS and arriving at recommendations and a roadmap to improve the System. The enhanced CSG MIS includes all modules required for such a system, such as registration and enrolment, eligibility verification, eligibility change, beneficiary management, payment, reporting, and grievance/complaint. In addition, the Quality Assurance process was improved, and capacity building was provided to the DCY staff on the MIS. Currently, only few activities remain to be done until the end of June 2022 on the MIS, such as the development of manuals and a video clip for the public.

- 2) The design of the CSG grant itself was enhanced through such activities by UNICEF as evidence-base preparation and several assessments jointly with TDRI (including the expansion of CSG to pregnant women).
- 3) The provision of support to the implementation of CSG as well as of the Disability Grant, and of technical advice to the government on the Scaling-up of these grants.
- 4) Support was provided to improve public and programme communication.

The indicator for **Outcome 3** is “Policy options to ensure a more effective coverage of domestic workers, including migrants, within the existing social security schemes, are designed and tested”. The provision of such policy options is still a work in progress, and such options are still being designed and tested. The two main groups of activities under this outcome are:

- a) The National Policy Review by UN Women and ILO on social protection for Domestic Workers which includes many migrant workers and a majority of women. In order to expand the evidence-base a survey is currently being conducted by UN Women among 400 domestic workers and 200 employers.
- b) Communication strategy on social protection for Domestic Workers by IOM which included the finalisation of a report reviewing the existing policy, schemes and barriers and proposing solutions to reduce barriers and increase access of domestic workers to social protection jointly with SSO, as well as four workshops organized to discuss design solutions, and a technical note detailing final scheme design proposal, including administrative elements.

Although the implementation of certain activities under Outcome 3 is a bit delayed, the visibility of domestic workers among stakeholders has substantially increased.

Main challenges

The main challenges encountered during the implementation of the UNJP are as follows:

- 1) As a result of the COVID-19 pandemic delays occurred in various activities as the JP staff and the stakeholders needed time to adjust to the new ways of operating which mainly consisted in conducting meetings and consultations online. Research activities, including data collection and interviewing were particularly delayed, while the lack of face-to-face meetings for almost two years reduced the incidences of small talk, informal follow-up gatherings and the formation of app groups.
- 2) Another challenge was the coordination of the particularly large number of government and other stakeholders involved. This is caused by the fact that social protection is quite a fragmented area involving schemes in some 23 government agencies. This makes it difficult to overcome *Silo's* and to achieve integrated policy reform. The JP has done a good job in this respect by bringing in such large numbers of stakeholders in the Workshops and technical meetings in particular for the SPDR.
- 3) By law the MSDHS is assigned as the technical lead in social protection issues, but it needs to engage also such key Ministries as MoL, MoF, MoFA, NESDC, Mol, to whom the Prime Minister listens with priority. One of the main challenges for the MSDHS thereby is financial sustainability and the difficulty to explain to the other government organisations that social protection concerns an *investment*. The JP has proposed to mitigate this challenge by establishing an (inter-ministerial) coordinating body (further elaborated in Section 3.6).
- 4) The great diversity in types of workers (e.g. informal, platform, agriculture, SMEs, etc.) makes the extension of coverage to workers in **all** sectors complex. Their ability to regularly pay social security contributions also needs to be considered. The JP has made contributions to

the inclusion of some of these types of workers through the background papers discussed in the above.

- 5) The challenge with respect to Migrant Workers was, firstly, that the perception of them among the Thai population was quite negative at the start of the pandemic blaming them for spreading COVID-19, and secondly, that it is particularly complex to extend coverage to migrant workers especially to those who are undocumented. To counter this perception IOM developed a communication campaign to raise awareness on the migrant workers' contributions to the Thai economy and developed for example Human Stories of Migrant Domestic Workers. The background study on migrant workers investigated ways to extend coverage of social protection to them.
- 6) The expansion of the CSG policy to become Universal was difficult in the midst of the pandemic as it depends on the national budget allocation. UNICEF continued to maintain communication on this topic with the MSDHS throughout the programme period.
- 7) For Outcome 2 the planned activities needed to be adjusted as the MSDHS was able to source government resources to fund the MIS system (US\$ 380,000).⁹ This resulted in delays as activities had to be redesigned to complement those under the Government budget by providing technical assistance from international and national consultants, by developing the grievance module that the government budget could not cover, and by supporting the procurement of the necessary hardware to make the enhanced CSG MIS function well.
- 8) Delays also occurred because some work in Outcome 3 could be started only *after* certain preparatory work (including research) had been completed for Outcome 1.
- 9) Some minor challenges in cooperation between PUNOs occurred as well. The programme team staff members all have *other* responsibilities beyond the UNJP, and there was only one dedicated staff member: the NPC. Various staff changes occurred within PUNOs especially at IOM and UN Women. Lastly, to finalize reports takes time, since drafts need to be commented on by partners and experts, followed by re-drafting, etc.

Success factors

The main success factors during the implementation of the UNJP which contributed to achieve the progress described in the above include:

- 1) The timeliness of the programme was an important factor (as described in the above).
- 2) The solid engagement with the RTG *from the beginning* at all levels with the MSDHS as the key focal point and with support from the UN RCO.
- 3) The COVID-19 pandemic turned out to be an opportunity as well since everybody was now writing and talking about social protection because the pandemic had clearly demonstrated its paramount importance for people and especially for the vulnerable population.
- 4) The serious and sustained commitment from the MSDHS to Social Protection, and the constructive partnership with this Ministry as the co-chair of the JP's Project Steering Committee (PSC).
- 5) The MoL was involved as part of the PSC and in particular in Outcome 3 on domestic workers and in Outcome 1 through the SSO on pensions.
- 6) The *combined* legitimacy and credibility of the four PUNOs convinced the national stakeholders to be involved actively in social protection.
- 7) High commitment of the Programme Team of the four PUNOs and of the NPC.
- 8) Last, but not least, the strong networking activities of the JP and its four PUNOs bringing together multi-stakeholders to exchange views, and enhancing and extending several long-

⁹ In fact, requests for funding were submitted simultaneously to the RTG and to the Joint SDG Fund, but at that time it could not be guaranteed if either proposal would be granted. It turned out that both proposals were approved.

standing partnerships, such as UNICEF – MSDHS (including DCY); ILO – MoL (including SSO); IOM – MoFA; UN Women - DWAFFD/MSDHS; ILO – Social Partners; UNICEF – TDRI; ILO – HomeNet; and IOM - MWG.

Management Arrangements

The management, monitoring systems and coordination mechanisms of the JP have mostly effectively addressed the needs and implementation challenges. The organisation of the meetings of the **Project Steering Committee** (PSC) was challenging during the pandemic and it was a real accomplishment that the first one was indeed held face-to-face at the MSDHS in August 2020. The second one was held a year later in August 2021, and a third one is scheduled for June 2022. The PSC meetings were chaired by the Permanent Secretary of the MSDHS and the UN Resident Coordinator in Thailand. The PSC members comprised high-level representatives of relevant ministries and government agencies (i.e., MSDHS, MOL, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Public Health, NESDC, etc.) as well as members of the academia. The meeting objective was to ensure that all related government agencies were aware of the project's objectives and implementation, and to review the programme's progress and activities. Ideally it could be better to conduct the PSC meetings every half year; for example, it took one year between the first and the second meeting precisely at the time that a series of adjustments had to be made in the design of the programme as discussed in the above; it took longer to organize than anticipated mainly due to COVID and the changing of key government staff. However, the fact that these meetings were held at all (during COVID) is proof of how much the JP was valued by the key stakeholders and of how well it was managed.

Other management arrangements included the meetings called by the RCO in the inception phase, while many ad hoc meetings were held during the entire implementation period with key stakeholders being in constant virtual contact coordinated through the NPC. Despite some 'meeting fatigue', some PUNOs indicated that joint bi-monthly management meetings to update each other on the progress concerning each Outcome could have been useful.

The fact that most UN agencies have their regional offices in Bangkok was sometimes considered as a challenge and sometimes as an opportunity. The regional offices are expected to service the entire South East Asian region spreading especially human resources thinly. At the same time the JP benefited from the cooperation and presence of the regional staff members, in particular because travel outside Thailand was not possible due to the travel restrictions of the pandemic. On balance, it seems to have turned out particularly beneficial for the JP.

The PRODOC (p.30) underlined the importance of the **National Social Welfare Committee** (NSCW) as the main decision-making body engaged at the policy level chaired by the Deputy Prime Minister with key government agencies participating (incl. NESDC) and MSDHS as the secretariat. The RCO was foreseen as engaging at this level representing the PUNOs. The NSCW was already in place well before the project started and has at certain times been very active, especially when the Prime Minister was serving as the Chair. It might be useful to investigate in how far this committee could be revitalized to serve as a coordinating body with respect to social protection issues.

Assessment by stakeholders of the quality of the JP's deliverables

With respect to the tools, technical advice, training, etc. delivered by the project, the stakeholders interviewed underlined that they were satisfied with the quality provided. Workshops were

considered to be important because different types of stakeholders, including government organisations, CSOs, the private sector, academics and others can share their ideas among each other. In some cases, stakeholders even preferred to have somewhat more room for discussions among participants themselves, at the cost of time for presentations. This can in part be caused by the pandemic as the JP had to redesign activities originally intended to be face-to-face. The JP was further very much valued for bringing in the international perspective, and some also appreciated the specific attention for vulnerable groups.

Contribution to the relevant SDGs

Concerning the contribution to Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), the timeframe was quite limited to measure concrete results, but there were clearly potential impacts on Reducing Poverty (SDG 1), Well-being for All (3), Gender Equality (5), Decent Work (8), and Reducing inequalities and ensuring no one is left behind (10). With respect to selected SDG Targets, the JP is likely to have made a concrete contribution to Target 2.2 through the expansion of the Child Support Grant which is expected to contribute to reducing malnutrition. There was also progress in Target 1.3 as the proportion of the population covered by social protection benefits is likely to have expanded particularly for families with children. Lastly, SDG Target 10.1 on the income of the bottom 40% of the population will be enhanced by a more effective social protection system. A lot will depend on the sustainability of the JP which we will discuss in Section 3.7.

3.5 Efficiency of Resource Use

The allocation of resources (financial, human, institutional and technical) was satisfactory to achieve the results of the JP. The original project period of two years was relatively short for the intended outcomes, and the resources from the Joint SDG Fund to be divided over four UN agencies were relatively modest with a total of almost USD 2 million. In addition to that the four PUNOs each contributed Co-funding to a total amount of USD 662,000. The original budget is presented in Table 2 below which shows that the Joint SDG Fund provides three-quarters of the total budget. The size of the allocations between PUNOs reflect the requirements per output.

Table 2: Funding and Co-Funding of the UNJP Thailand.

Funding	Funding in USD	%
Joint SDG Fund	1,999,815	75.1
Co-funding ILO	240,000	9.0
Co-funding UNICEF	230,000	8.6
Co-funding UN Women	100,000	3.8
Co-funding IOM	92,000	3.5
TOTAL	2,661,815	100.0

Source: UNJP PRODOC 2021.

The co-funding by the PUNOs was in the form of staff expertise. This kind of expenditures is hard to monitor for an evaluation as only on the *completion* of the project overviews are made of the time spent by regular staff members (including specialists from Regional Offices and Headquarters or colleagues from other projects). This is therefore up to the discretion of each organization, and usually this meets or exceeds the co-funding commitment. Co-funding can also put pressure on an organisation because many other responsibilities must be taken care of as well.

The overview of the **original** Budget Categories in Table 3 indicates that the largest amount was allotted to the activities per se as given by the Budget Categories 4 and 6, jointly amounting to almost 50% of the total budget. The second largest amount (35%) was budgeted for staff costs which includes the Co-funding as it was intended for staffing only. The difference in budgets between the four PUNOs are caused in particular by the specific types of activities conducted by each organisation for the JP, as well as by their specific ways of operating as each agency manages its own budget within the JP. The funds for the NPC were included in the ILO budget.

Table 3: The Categories of the original Budget by PUNOs in percentage.

BUDGET CATEGORIES OF THE ORIGINAL BUDGET	ILO	UNICEF	IOM	UN WOMEN	TOTAL
Staff Programme Team/Co-funding	26.6%	21.7%	27.0%	27.8%	24.9%
1. Staff/Other personnel/SDG Fund	17.7%	2.4%	24.7%	0.0%	10.4%
2. Supplies, Commodities, Materials	1.1%	0.0%	6.3%	8.1%	2.3%
3. Equipment, Vehicles and Furniture	0.3%	0.0%	3.7%	33.8%	4.8%
4. Contractual services	31.5%	57.6%	12.4%	25.6%	38.5%
5. Travel	0.9%	0.0%	15.0%	0.0%	2.4%
6. Transfers and Grants to Counterparts	16.4%	13.2%	2.2%	0.0%	11.1%
7. General Operating/Other Direct Costs	0.7%	0.0%	4.0%	0.0%	0.8%
8. Indirect Support Costs	4.8%	5.1%	4.8%	4.7%	4.9%
TOTAL Costs %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
TOTAL Costs in US\$	900,565	1,059,250	371,054	330,947	2,661,815

Source: UNJP PRODOC 2021.

Overall spending has been slow in the first year (2020) because the NPC started in May of that year and because the pandemic had its effect in that year as well as in the second project year (2021.) As a result, at the end of the *original* project period (31 December 2021) only about *half* of the budget of the Joint SDG Fund was spent (i.e. USD 987,868 or 49.4%), while an additional 12.9 % was committed (USD 257,927). Thus, in total 62.3% was either spent or committed at that time (cf. Progress Report on 2021).

By the end of April 2022, the Expenditures for Outcomes 1 and 3 amounted to just over 90% of their respective budgets. In contrast, for Outcome 2 almost 50% was still remaining because of the delays due to COVID-19 and due to the re-design of the MIS support activities in order to complement those under the Government budget. Nevertheless, most of the balance has already been committed or scheduled to be spent before the end of June. Substantial amounts have been spent on consultations and on research as this was requested by the RTG, while for Outcome 2 equal amounts of the budget were spent on the support to the MIS for the CSG and on evidence generation and advocacy.

Project Staff

From the project budget only one position was funded (the NPC) which weighed on the ILO budget. The NPC started in May 2020, and most of his time was spent on Outcome 1 followed by overall coordination, Outcome 3 and admin work (and some support in reporting for Outcome 2). Most stakeholders underlined that it would have been more efficient to have a larger dedicated project team, but opinions differed on whether to have an international Programme Manager (CTA) at P4 level in addition to the NPC. Most stakeholders indicated that a CTA would have been useful, while a few maintained that the engagement with the government of Thailand can just as well be done by a national expert. With respect to administrative/finance issues, most

stakeholders agreed that having dedicated staff would have been beneficial. The lack of a project team put pressure on the staffing of the PUNOs, as their (social protection) experts now provided substantial technical inputs, and overall inputs often seem to have surpassed the amount allocated as co-funding.

On-time completion and Reporting

The project was delayed by the necessary adjustments in the way of operating resulting from the restrictions imposed as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. The start of the NPC in May 2020 did also contribute to that. Due to these factors, a no-cost extension of six months was granted by the donor. Reporting was efficient and timely with quarterly checks, half-yearly updates and comprehensive annual reports. The 2021 JP Progress Report also includes a clear and comprehensive updated Risk Management Matrix which takes Contextual, Programmatic, Institutional and Fiduciary risks into account (see Annex 5).

3.6 Impact

Impact on the social protection systems

In order to change the entire social protection system of a country would take many more years and would have to include time-consuming changes of laws and regulations, but the evaluation found that the JP has made several important steps into such a direction. The JP has done very substantial work on background and diagnostic studies creating a solid evidence-base for potential policy reforms. As one Government Organisation underlined: *“We are reaping the benefits of the research and that makes our policy more effective.”*

For the future it is essential that Milestone 9 of the 13th National Economic and Social Development Plan (NESDP) includes as a target that “all Thai people have access to adequate social protection” after the five-year period. The JP significantly provides a set of Recommendations (see Annex 6) as well as practical steps to support the implementation of this Plan’s targets and objectives to be conducted by different government organisations including in particular the relevant Line Ministries. An increase in the actual coverage of social protection schemes is difficult to measure; it principally depends on the Royal Thai Government for approving the integration and the extensions of such schemes. The JP did indeed provide ideas and support moving towards such an objective.

With respect to Outcome 2, the increase in the CSG coverage from 700,000 children in 2019, to 2.35 million in April 2022 may not be directly attributable to the JP itself, but the long-standing partnership between MSDHS and UNICEF certainly contributed to it. This important CSG-expansion is also often considered as a *Global Best Practice*. In addition, the JP itself did indeed support the Ministry to arrive at that coverage through the activities discussed above under *Effectiveness*. The background study on social protection for children has been used effectively to enhance advocacy for CSG, and the technical note on Sustainability Financing of social protection was used to investigate the available fiscal space.

The further increase to Universal Coverage, which is currently about 4 million Children, is already endorsed by the National Child and Youth Committee, and several policy options to implement this were developed by the JP. Currently, the cabinet approval on this extension is pending. In

addition, the DCY is going to implement in 2022 the communication strategy revised through inputs from the JP.

Concerning Outcome 3, the MoL/SSO is investigating the inclusion of domestic workers in the Social Security Act (Article 33: Definition of Insured Persons) and it welcomes evidence-based studies to support such a decision. The UNJP is contributing to that through the study on Domestic Workers currently being conducted by UN Women. Some stakeholders indicated that the JP had a kind of positive impact on the perception of migrant workers among parts of the Thai population through the advocacy and communication activities of IOM in collaboration with national partners, including the MoL the CSO Community, in particular the MWG and HomeNet. At the start of the COVID-19 pandemic migrant workers were blamed for its rapid spread, but the production of communication materials, including the distribution of human stories of domestic workers, and the implementation of advocacy campaigns in the past two years contributed to a more positive sentiment towards migrant workers.

A significant impact of the JP is the enhanced networking among the different stakeholders, public and private. Several training courses of the JP led participants of different organisations to coordinate closely among themselves during the course thereby exchanging contact details, sharing information and files, and thus building an informal network. This happened, for example, during the training course on Social Budgeting where the participants of the technical teams of NESDC, MSDHS, MoL/SSO, Bank of Thailand, FPO, MoF, and others met for the first time and gradually started to coordinate more closely. In addition, various partnerships between PUNOs and national organisations were solidified and extended during the JP. For some work undertaken by the JP, it is too early to assess the impact; for example, the impact of the series of technical workshops on financing social protection with mid-level government officials depends on the extent to which they will be able to convey the message to their superiors.

Lastly, the JP also had an impact on certain specific issues that received attention in the news, in particular:

- ❖ The technical recommendation in the Policy Brief on the COVID-19 Response submitted to RTG in March 2021 and the update in May 2021 were well received.
- ❖ The Policy Brief developed jointly by PUNOs (led by ILO and UNICEF) was submitted to the Government in March 2020 and the subsequent advocacy with the MSDHS led to top-ups of the CSG, Disability Grant, and Old Age Allowance later that year.
- ❖ The new National Pension Fund proposed by the MoF in March 2021 was reviewed by ILO jointly with SSO and the Bank of Thailand and proposals were made for a possible revision.
- ❖ Regarding the SSF system of SSO/MoL, the JP jointly with other partners (MoF, Bank of Thailand, etc.) advocated in early 2022 for protecting this system. Workers had requested the MoL for COVID-support but withdrawing money from the Fund without interest would effectively collapse it, and as a result, workers would be left without pensions. Very recently, the Cabinet has approved MoL's proposal, and now it is up to the National Assembly.

Impact on institutional attitudes and mindset

Institutional attitudes and mindset have also been influenced by the JP through the different activities undertaken in the areas of social dialogue, awareness raising, networking and capacity development at the MSDHS and the SSO/MoL, as well as through the diagnostic studies

presented. The JP initiated something new, and many government staff and others now better understand the importance of social protection which was enhanced by the demonstration effect of the COVID-19 pandemic. Through the JP there was an opportunity to engage closely with several government agencies such as MSDHS, MoL, NESDC and MoF to collaborate on social protection issues and start a working dialogue. It has broadened the range of partners of the 4 PUNOs.

Mindsets with respect to the understanding concerning the position of certain vulnerable groups and their needs for social protection have also been changed, in particular domestic and migrant workers, and the JP led to an increased consciousness among government organisations of social protection related to women and children's advancement. Another example showing the impact on mindsets is that the employers' organisation after having attended several JP workshops reached an enhanced understanding of contributions to social protection by employers and started to spread that idea among their members; in addition, this understanding in combination with certain background reports of the JP stimulated the organisation to write up their own recommendations.

Institutionalisation of the project support by government agencies

With respect to Outcome 1, reference can be made to the quote in Section 3.4. of the speech by the Secretary General of the NESDC indicating that the diagnostic review was institutionalised in the 13th National Economic and Social Development Plan, in other words the diagnostic review has clearly been used by government organisation. With respect to Outcome 2, it was already mentioned in the above that the support from UNICEF and the UNJP has been institutionalised in the MSDHS, and that the background study on social protection for children has been used effectively to enhance advocacy for CSG, while the technical note on Sustainability Financing of social protection was used to investigate the available fiscal space. In addition, the cabinet approval on the extension to Universal Coverage of the CSG is pending and this was based of the policy options developed by the JP. Concerning Outcome 3 it is more difficult to arrive at conclusions on institutionalisation as some work is still going on. However, the MoL/SSO is using some of the work undertaken by the UNJP to investigate the inclusion of domestic workers in the Social Security Act (Article 33: Definition of Insured Persons).

Upscaling, replication and catalysts for change

Upscaling will principally depend on the implementation of the 13th Plan of the NESDC, while the scaling up to universal coverage of the CSG awaits cabinet approval. Replication of the JP *design* could be done in other similar Middle-Income Countries where there are already signs of a relatively comprehensive social protection system in place as in Thailand. *Significantly*, the MSDHS has already requested UNICEF's support with the replication of the MIS of CSG to their other programmes. In this sense the JP was certainly catalytic in setting in motion other developments and the government brought in their own funding (e.g. the MSDHS for the MIS of CSG) leading towards a possible boom-effect (in this case of the installing of more MIS's and integrating them).

3.7 Sustainability

The extent to which activities and results are likely to continue after the JP has ended

The evaluation found that there are some activities, results and effects that are expected to continue after the programme has ended on 30 June 2022. Crucially, social protection has now been included in the 13th National Economic and Social Development Plan (2023-2027) of the NESDC and therefore it will be prioritised by the Royal Thai Government for implementation in the coming years. In addition, networks and informal groupings among key national stakeholders and among individual staff members have been established and have the potential to sustain. It is foreseen that the four PUNOs in Bangkok will continue to work with the relevant Government Organisations, considering that the next implementation steps do not require heavy funding but especially the time of the experts involved and the organisation of (high-level) political events. In particular, UNICEF will continue their work on social protection from their own yearly budget for their social protection policy programme (about US\$ 500,000 annually), and the ILO Country Office in Bangkok has also allocated funds from their regular budget to continue the work on social protection after June 2022. ILO will further implement another project to extend coverage of social protection at the regional level with funding from Japan. A different, specific example of sustainability is that the NESDC has requested budget from the Budget Bureau of the Prime Minister Office to continue the training in social budgeting that was initiated by the JP.

Ownership

The evaluation further found that ownership differs per outcome and among the key stakeholders involved in the JP. The MSDHS has clearly taken ownership of parts of the JP through the Permanent Secretary and more recently also through the Minister chairing a meeting with the UNRC and PUNO's where the RC presented the set of Recommendations of the JP to the RTG in late April 2022. However, the Government does not yet *own* the Social Protection Diagnostic Review (SPDR) and its Recommendations in particular because they still need to be formally launched in June 2022, and because some of these recommendations have budget implications.

With respect to the Child Support Grant, the DCY of the MSDHS clearly has ownership of it for many years now, and this was again confirmed when they managed to acquire government resources for its Management Information System (MIS); UNICEF also has a long-standing close alliance with the DCY and has worked with them on the CSG for over a decade.

Ownership of the JP has not developed as much in the Ministry of Labour (MoL); while the MoL is involved in many other projects with the ILO in Thailand in which it has been actively involved and developed substantial ownership, in the present UNJP it is the MSDHS which is the primary counterpart and thus the MoL took on a more supportive role. However, the Social Security Office (SSO) does indeed *own* the activities undertaken by the UNJP related to pensions. The NESDC has engaged increasingly over the course of the implementation period of the JP, including the work on the integration of databases, increasing social protection for informal workers, and their interest in International Best Practices. Ownership among the employers' and workers' organisations and among the CSOs has not developed as they generally attended workshops as informants and provided comments when requested. To be sure, overall, ownership could have been enhanced further if more face-to-face meetings would have been possible in the past two years.

3.8 Cross-cutting Issues

Social and Tripartite Dialogue

While dialogue and networking has been extensive in the JP, dialogue between social partners and tripartite dialogue was not specifically targeted, although it has been enhanced somewhat by inviting employers' and workers' organisations to several meetings. To be sure, these organisations were already deeply involved in a different project funded by SSO and implemented simultaneously by the ILO (2019-2023) on actuarial Issues for pension reform; this absorbed a lot of the capacity of these organisations. In addition, social protection is not the core area within the capacities of these EO and WO, but several of them underlined the fact that their interest has now been raised and they expressed their intention to take it up further.

Target Beneficiaries

The target beneficiaries of the JP, in particular children, informal, migrant and domestic workers as well as the elder, have not as such been reached directly, but evidence-based proposals have been made to improve their situation once these proposals are implemented as was discussed in Section 3.4 on Effectiveness, while particularly the number of children receiving the CSG has increased substantially due to the sustained efforts of the DCY/MSDHS and the support thereby of the JP/UNICEF.

Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination

The attention for Gender Equality cuts across the three Outcomes of the JP, and it was included in each of the background and other reports and notes produced. In addition, several activities of the JP were specifically targeted at women, such as:

- The Background Study on Social Protection Gender-Impact assessment (under Outcome 1).
- The National Policy Review on social protection for Domestic Workers who are in large majority women under Outcome 3, including a survey among 400 Domestic Workers and 200 Employers.
- The ongoing trainings in Gender Responsive Budgeting (GRB) for government staff for which the GRB-Manual was approved by the Cabinet in December 2021.

Since the Department of Women's Affairs and Family Development (DWAFD) of the MSDHS is the main counterpart of UN Women, this department could have been involved more in the implementation of the JP from the beginning.

The four PUNOs have mainstreamed gender issues into their regular programmes, and the Programme Team is clearly gender sensitive. According to the PRODOC the JP intended to contribute to the ratification of ILO Convention 189 on Domestic Workers through Outcome-3 and evidence that can contribute to that has been and is being collected. A general challenge is that gender-disaggregated data are not very widely available and/or accessible for all components, although the SPDR did manage to present the key gender-disaggregated data. A large number of *national* stakeholders indicated that gender **in**-equality is not so pervasive in Thailand compared to many other countries in the region, and that it is not a barrier to access social protection, while also several interviewees underlined the broad attention in Thailand for LGBTQ (e.g. through many TV series). Although gender-inequality may be less than in other e.g. neighbouring countries, there are still many inequalities persisting (see e.g. <https://asiapacific.unwomen.org/en/countries/thailand>).

Overall, therefore, the UNJP has contributed to gender-equality in a few specific areas through a few targeted activities; several stakeholders indicated that attention for gender-inequality could have been more systematic, for example through a comprehensive gender strategy with dedicated resources developed at the outset of the programme.

The project has contributed to non-discrimination in one particular area as the advocacy work and communication strategy of the JP/IOM in cooperation with MoL and the CSO Community (MWG, HomeNet) has led to a more positive perception vis-a-vis migrant workers among parts of the Thai population as explained in Section 3.6.

Inclusion of People with Disability

While disability inclusion was not part of the *design* of the JP (cf. the PRODOC), it is one of the elements in the Social Protection System, and the JP has made some progress in this area especially through the work of UNICEF on the Disability Grant, e.g. one activity under Outcome-2 was targeted at communication concerning this grant. UNICEF also works with the Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (DEP) and TDRI to improve the design features of this Disability Grant, including eligibility criteria, adequacy of transfers and feasibility of introducing a tiered system of benefits. UNICEF already has a component in their regular programme across various sectors on *Children with Disabilities*, liaising for example with the *National Committee on Disability* chaired by the PM. UNICEF further conducted a feasibility study with their own funds, investigating the definition of 'disabled' through a less medical approach.

Environmental Concerns

The last cross-cutting issue, environmental concerns, was not explicitly included in the JP.

4 Conclusions and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusions

The conclusions of the present Final Joint Independent Evaluation are below categorized according to the seven evaluation criteria used throughout this report as well as the cross-cutting issues. With respect to the first evaluation criteria, **Relevance**, the present Evaluation found that the UN Joint Programme (JP) is highly relevant and that its objectives respond to the needs of key stakeholders in Thailand. In addition, all stakeholders interviewed underlined that the JP was very **timely**, as almost simultaneously COVID increased attention for Social Protection (SP), the National Economic and Social Development Council (NESDC) was developing the 13th National Economic and Social Development Plan (2023 – 2027), and the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (MSDHS) was in need of enhancing the Management Information System (MIS) for the Child Support Grant (CSG) due to the policy expansion in 2019. The JP clearly responded to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries and recipients, but it differed among types of stakeholders. The alignment to the priorities of the **Thai Government** was very clear, in particular with the new **13th Plan** (Milestone 9), and with the policies of the MSDHS (including DCY) and the Ministry of Labour (including SSO). Alignment was much less clear in the case of the Employers' and Workers' Organisations in Thailand. It was further found that the JP was clearly relevant to the country programmes of the four Partner UN Organizations (PUNOs) as well as for the UN as a whole in Thailand, through its UNSDCF (2022-2026). The JP certainly remained or even became more *relevant* after the COVID-19 pandemic started.

On the **Validity of Design**, it was found that strategies of the UNJP were adequate to enhance Thailand's social protection system, and to reach certain population groups who are being left behind. The need for a Diagnostic Review on SP (SPDR) arose through the long-standing dialogue between UNICEF and MSDHS, while ILO had been working on the Social Protection Floor (SPF). The *Joint Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) Fund* provided an opportunity to propose a joint project. For the design consultations were held with the MSDHS, but not with many other stakeholders because there was only a relatively short time to develop the PRODOC. The program's logic included in the Theory of Change and the Outcome Statement with three Outcomes and 10 Outputs are straightforward and logical in itself (Table 1). The three Outcomes themselves are quite diverse, but the logic behind that is rationalised by aiming for an enhanced evidence-base needed for a system review (Outcome 1) as well as targeting certain gaps in the system, in particular those left behind (Outcome 2 on the CSG and Outcome 3 on domestic workers). The *Programmatic Results Framework* of the JP is clear and measurable with three Outcome-indicators and 34 Output-indicators and a summary of the results achieved by the JP until 31 December 2021 is given in Annex 4). The original *timeframe* of just two years (2020-2021) was not realistic to push for a complete social protection system reform, nor to complete all the deliverables identified especially also due to the delays caused by the pandemic.

With respect to **Coherence**, it was found that the cooperation between the four PUNOs coordinated by ILO as the lead agency was effective to achieve the expected results including the support from the UN Resident Coordinator Office (RCO). The cooperation with *government organisations* was particularly close with the MSDHS, MoL and NESDC, while for certain activities

it was extended to other Ministries. The engagement with the Employers' and Workers Organisations was more incidental, and that with CSOs (e.g. HomeNet and MWG) was directed at specific activities where they could play a complementary role. The JP lastly cooperated closely with two research institutes, TDRI and PIER. By its very nature the JP implemented by four PUNOs contributed to UN reforms including UN Country Team (UNCT) coherence by acting as a kind of platform within the UN to advocate for social protection which demonstrated how the UN can offer integrated policy advice to the government. Lastly, coherence with other interventions implemented by the four PUNOs in Thailand and in South-East Asia contributed also to the JP.

The **Effectiveness** of the JP will be more than satisfactory at the end of June 2022 as the interventions are expected to achieve most of its expected results and outputs. Nevertheless, in part due to the COVID-19 pandemic, a number of activities were delayed, and a few activities were abandoned. Several *key achievements* for the programme as a whole were highlighted, such as the substantial awareness raising and exchange of information on social protection among many stakeholders, the extension of the evidence-base, and the formulation of proposals for solutions of problems and gaps in the social protection system. With respect to **Outcome 1**, the Thailand Social Protection Diagnostic Review (SPDR) based on six background studies and a series of workshops with many stakeholders providing inputs to the 13th Plan is a major achievement. In addition, technical notes were developed, training courses held, and policy dialogue and public advocacy conducted. The indicator for **Outcome 2**, scale up of CSG coverage to 2 million by end 2021, was substantially *surpassed*, with 2.35 million children (48.6% girls) registered in April 2022. The JP/UNICEF provided technical assistance to the DCY to improve the capacity of the Management Information System (MIS) of the CSG, and to enhance the design of the CSG grant itself. In addition, the implementation and scaling-up of the CSG and the Disability Grant, was supported and programme communication improved. The indicator for **Outcome 3** is to design/test policy options to ensure a more effective coverage of domestic workers, including migrants, which is still a work in progress, and includes the National Policy Review by UN Women and ILO on social protection for Domestic Workers and the implementation of a Communication strategy on that by IOM. The visibility of domestic workers among stakeholders has substantially increased as a result of such JP activities.

A number of **challenges** have been identified by the evaluation which were encountered by the JP during its implementation, such as the COVID-19 pandemic, the particularly large number of stakeholders to be coordinated, the great diversity in types of workers, perceptions on migrant workers, and some minor coordination issues among PUNOs. The main **success factors** which contributed to achieve the progress described in the above include the timeliness of the JP, the solid engagement from the beginning with the MSDHS, the constructive role played by MoL/SSO, the strong networking activities, the combined legitimacy and credibility of the four PUNOs, and the high commitment of the Programme Team of the four PUNOs and of the NPC. The **management arrangements** also contributed to that, including the meetings of the PSC, the meetings called by the RCO in the inception phase, and the many ad hoc meetings of PUNO staff often coordinated by the NPC. The stakeholders interviewed were quite satisfied with the quality of the tools, advice, workshops and trainings delivered by the project, and the JP was much valued for bringing in the international perspective and attention for vulnerable groups. The timeframe was limited to measure concrete contributions to the SDGs, but there were clearly potential impacts on several of them (SDG 1, 3, 5, 8 and 10).

The *Efficiency of Resource Use* was satisfactory to achieve the results of the JP. The original project period of two years was relatively short, though, for the intended outcomes, and the resources from the Joint SDG Fund to be divided over four UN agencies were relatively modest with a total of almost USD 2 million. The budget was enlarged with co-funding by the four PUNOs in the form of staff expertise (in total USD 662,000). The largest amount of the original budget (Joint SDG Fund plus Co-funding) was allotted to the activities per se (contractual services and transfers/grants to counterparts) amounting to almost 50%, followed by staff costs (35%). Overall spending has been slow in the first 1.5 years due to the pandemic and the fact that the NPC started in May 2020 but picked up rapidly in 2022. By the end of April 2022, the Expenditures for Outcomes 1 and 3 amounted to just over 90% of their respective budgets and for Outcome 2 it was about 50%; most of the balance has already been committed or scheduled to be spent before the end of June. There was only one dedicated staff member in the project (the NPC) and most stakeholders underlined that it would have been more efficient to have a larger dedicated project team, possibly including a CTA and admin/finance staff. Due to the delays mentioned, a no-cost extension of six months was granted by the donor until 30 June 2022. Reporting was efficient and timely including a comprehensive Risk Management Matrix.

With respect to *Impact*, it was found that in order to change the entire social protection system of a country would take many more years, but the JP has made several important steps into such a direction. The JP has done very substantial work on background and diagnostic studies creating a solid evidence-base for potential policy reforms. For the future, Milestone 9 of the 13th Plan is crucial, and significantly the JP provides a set of Recommendations (Annex 6) as well as practical steps to support the implementation of this Plan's targets and objectives. An increase in the actual coverage of social protection schemes is difficult to measure and it principally depends on the Thai Government for approving the extensions of such schemes. With respect to Outcome 2, the increase in the CSG coverage to 2.35 million may not be directly attributable to the JP itself, but the long-standing partnership between MSDHS and UNICEF certainly contributed to it. In addition, advocacy for CSG was enhanced, and the available fiscal space investigated. The further increase to Universal Coverage of the CSG is already endorsed by the National Child and Youth Committee, and the JP developed policy options to implement it. Concerning Outcome 3, the MoL/SSO is investigating the inclusion of domestic workers in the Social Security Act; the UNJP is contributing to that through the study on Domestic Workers. The JP had a kind of positive impact on the perception of migrant workers among parts of the Thai population through the advocacy and communication activities of IOM in collaboration with the Ministry of Labour and the CSO Community

A significant impact of the JP is the enhanced networking among the different stakeholders through workshops and training courses, advocacy and communication. The JP also had an impact on certain specific issues that received attention in the news, in particular the policy brief on the COVID-19 Response, the advocacy of UNICEF with the MSDHS leading to top-ups of several grants, the review of the new National Pension Fund proposed by the MoF, and the review of the proposal by the MoL on the SSF. Institutional attitudes and mindset have also been influenced by the JP through the different activities undertaken in the areas of social dialogue, awareness raising and capacity development at the MSDHS and the SSO/MoL, as well as through the diagnostic studies presented. Mindsets with respect to certain vulnerable groups have also been changed, in particular domestic and migrant workers, and the JP led to an increased consciousness among government organisations of social protection related to women and children's advancement.

The project support was for certain elements institutionalised by government agencies, for example the diagnostic review was used for the 13th National Economic and Social Development Plan, concerning the CSG the support from UNICEF and the UNJP has been institutionalised in the MSDHS. In addition, the cabinet approval on the extension to Universal Coverage of the CSG is pending and this was based of the policy options developed by the JP. Concerning Outcome 3 it is more difficult to arrive at conclusions on institutionalisation as some work is still going on; however, the MoL/SSO is using some of the JP work to investigate the inclusion of domestic workers in the Social Security Act. Upscaling will principally depend on the implementation of the 13th Plan, while the scaling up to universal coverage of the CSG awaits cabinet approval. Replication of the JP *design* could be done in other similar Middle-Income Countries, and significantly, the MSDHS has already requested UNICEF's support with the replication of the MIS of CSG to their other programmes. In this sense the JP was certainly catalytic in setting in motion other developments whereby the government brought in their own funding.

On **Sustainability**, it was found that there are some activities, results and effects that are expected to continue after the programme has ended on 30 June 2022. Crucially, social protection has now been included in the 13th Plan and therefore it will be prioritised by the Royal Thai Government for implementation in the coming years. In addition, networks and informal groupings among key national stakeholders and among individual staff members have been established and have the potential to sustain. It is foreseen that the four PUNOs in Bangkok will continue to work with the relevant Government Organisations, considering that the next implementation steps do not require heavy funding but especially the time of the experts involved and the organisation of (high-level) political events, and in particular UNICEF and ILO have made budget reservations for that. A specific example of sustainability is that the NESDC has requested budget from the Budget Bureau of the PM Office to continue the training in social budgeting initiated by the JP.

The evaluation further found that *ownership* differs per outcome and among the key stakeholders involved in the JP. The MSDHS has clearly taken ownership of parts of the JP, but does not yet *own* the Social Protection Diagnostic Review (SPDR) and its Recommendations in particular because they still need to be formally launched in June 2022, and because some of these recommendations have budget implications. With respect to the CSG, the DCY/MSDHS clearly has ownership of it for many years already and UNICEF has a long-standing close alliance with this department. Ownership of the JP has not developed as much in the MoL although the SSO does indeed *own* the activities related to pensions, while NESDC has engaged increasingly over the course of the implementation period of the JP. Ownership among CSOs and employers' and workers' organisations has not developed as they generally attended workshops as informants.

With respect to the **Cross-cutting Issues**, it was found that *tripartite dialogue* was not specifically targeted, although it has been enhanced somewhat by inviting employers' and workers' organisations to several meetings. To be sure, these organisations were already deeply involved in a different project funded by SSO and implemented by the ILO on actuarial Issues for pension reform (2019-2023). The attention for *Gender Equality* cuts across the three Outcomes of the JP and was included in all reports and notes produced. The UNJP has contributed to gender-equality in a few specific areas through a few targeted activities (e.g. the Gender-Impact assessment, the National Policy Review on social protection for Domestic Workers and the GRB-trainings). The four PUNOs have mainstreamed gender issues into their regular programmes, and the Programme Team is clearly gender sensitive. However, several stakeholders indicated that

attention for gender-inequality could have been more systematic, for example through a comprehensive gender strategy with dedicated resources developed at the outset of the programme. The project has also contributed to *non-discrimination* in one particular area as the advocacy work and communication strategy of the JP/IOM in cooperation with MoL and the CSO Community has led to a more positive perception vis-a-vis migrant workers among parts of the Thai population. While *disability inclusion* was not part of the *design* of the JP, it is one of the elements in the Social Protection System, and JP/UNICEF has undertaken several activities in this area (e.g. on the Disability Grant and on Children with Disabilities liaising with the National Committee on Disability).

The **Validity and Reliability** of the above findings was guaranteed by the entire process of the evaluation as it has been described in its full details in Section 1.3. Guided by an evaluation manager who has not been involved in the programme before, the two independent consultants (international and national) have interviewed a large number of stakeholders and compared the findings with the documents studied. Simultaneous translation was arranged where required, especially with government organisations and employers' and workers' organisations. Two Stakeholder validation workshops were held where the consultants presented their preliminary findings. In addition, the management and quality assurance arrangements were geared towards enhancing the validity and reliability of the findings. Lastly, the comments on the draft report have been included in the present final report.

4.2 Recommendations

The recommendations formulated on the basis of the findings of the present evaluation are as follows:

- 1. Establish a Pathway to keep the momentum of the UN Joint Programme (JP) going** and to differentiate between **Short-term urgent priorities** (Recommendations 2 and 3 below), and the **medium/longer-term** recommendations, such as the integration of coverage. The pathway should cover all seven Recommendations of the SPDR (Annex 6).

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
Programme Team/PUNOs, UNRC, MSDHS	Very High	Coming months	None

- 2. Set-up an Independent Coordination Body or Mechanism for social protection, for example an Inter-Ministerial Body**, to coordinate all 23 government agencies now involved in social protection schemes, which can also serve as platform for communication and Knowledge Management and sharing. Include in this process as much as possible also the relevant social partners and CSOs. It might be useful to investigate in how far the National Social Welfare Committee (NSCW) could be revitalized to serve as such a coordinating body with respect to social protection issues.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
Relevant Government Agencies (MSDHS, MoL, NESDC, MoF, PM Office and others), PUNOs, UNRC, Social Partners, CSOs	High	Coming months	Part of regular budgets

3. **Extend Coverage to Workers in all Sectors**, and pay specific attention to SMEs, informal sector, Domestic and Migrant Workers (especially Portability of benefits), Elderly people, and Workers aged between 55 to 60 years old, and their retirement plans. Examine thereby if increasing social protection and portability of benefits will enhance the use of more regular channels by migrant workers in other words in how far it is a tool to reduce irregular migration.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
PUNOs, Government Agencies, Social Partners, CSOs	Medium	New intervention	New project and/or part of government budget

4. **Raise awareness of and educate the workers** through advocacy campaigns and communication strategies on issues around social protection (e.g. Pension), and in particular explain clearly the benefits under the Social Security Fund to them.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
PUNOs, SSO and other Government Agencies, Social Partners, CSOs	Medium	New intervention	New project and/or part of government budget

5. **Involve Workers' and Employers' Organisations (EO/WO) and CSOs more systematically** in future interventions, possibly including a **CSO Coalition**, and arrange for **Capacity building** of the staff from EO and WO on social protection.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
PUNOs, Social Partners, CSOs	Medium	New intervention	New project

6. **Develop a Gender Equality Strategy** in any follow-up intervention and allocate dedicated resources to this strategy. Take into consideration Gender-Responsive Budgeting (GRB), increasing gender-disaggregated data, Domestic work, and Care economy. In addition, engage gender *focal points* in different ministries so they can be supported to undertake gender advocacy on social protection issues across an entire ministry.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
PUNOs, Government Agencies, Social Partners, CSOs and Organisations representing Women Workers and Entrepreneurs	Medium	New intervention	New project

7. **Conduct the Launch of the Synthesis Report of the Social Protection Diagnostic Review (SPDR) before the end of the project in June** in order to consolidate the

achievements of the JP and to solidify the networking around social protection issues with government, EO/WO, CSOs, academic institutions, donors and UN agencies.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
Programme Government Partners, CSOs, Academics	Very High	May-June 2022	Part of the JP budget (remaining balance)

8. **Discuss with the Joint SDG Fund** the possibility for a *new* Joint Programme on social protection in Thailand, considering the catalytic nature of the present programme, which resulted for example in the RTG bringing in their own funding for the MIS of the CSG.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
Programme SDG Fund, UNRC	High	Coming months	None

9. **The UNCT should consider a separate Working Group (WG) on social protection co-led by ILO and UNICEF**, whereby this JP can serve as an example, as it has operated as a *de facto* Working Group, and has cooperated well with the Thai Government which has referred to it as “*the latest flagship partnership*”.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
UNCT, Team/PUNOs	Medium	2022	None

5 Lessons Learned and Good Practices

This chapter identifies two lessons learned (LL) and two good practices (GP) from the experience gained by the evaluation in the present report.

Lessons Learned

One of the purposes of evaluations is to improve project or programme performance and promote organizational learning. Evaluations are expected to generate lessons that can be applied elsewhere to improve programme or project performance, outcome, or impact. The present evaluation has identified two Lessons Learned (LL) and these are briefly introduced below while the full descriptions in the new ILO/EVAL Templates are included in Annex 9.

LL1 – The potential for impact and sustainability of an intervention are substantially enhanced if they are developed and implemented simultaneously with the development of national or sectoral economic and/or social development plans.

The UN Joint Programme (JP) started when the National Economic and Social Development Council (NESDC) was developing its 13th National Economic and Social Development Plan (2023 – 2027). Significantly, the SPDR provided inputs to this Plan which can be illustrated by a quote from the speech of the Secretary General of the NESDC on 18 May 2022 to ECOSOC: “The situation analysis from the diagnostic review is one of valuable resource as an input for drafting the 13th National Economic and Social Development Plan (2023 – 2027) especially in a social protection milestone we would like to achieve in the next 5 years.”

LL2 – Extensive networking through workshops, meetings, trainings, advocacy, informal app groups, etc. leads to incremental changes in mindsets of the stakeholders.

The JP was transparent with its aims and shared information and data with all government and other counterparts throughout the whole period of implementation of the JP. This helped with the consolidation of information from different government agencies and emphasized the importance of sharing information. The JP activities brought officials who worked on different parts of the social protection system together in the same room to holistically examine the social protection system and understand better the links between each part. The process of engaging and exchanging information with stakeholders during data collection, key informant interviews, and consultation workshops led to incremental changes in mindsets especially of mid-level government staff in MSDHS, SSO and NESDC, and potentially drive changes in policies toward a more integrated social protection system and the inclusion of different vulnerable groups. In addition, the involvement of CSOs, social partners and research institutes supported this process further by exchanging views with government organisations and sharing information.

Good Practices

ILO evaluation sees lessons learned and emerging good practices as part of a continuum, beginning with the objective of assessing what has been learned, and then identifying successful practices from those lessons which are worthy of replication. The present evaluation has identified two Good Practices (GP) and these are briefly introduced below while the full ILO/EVAL Templates are included in Annex 9

GP1 – The implementation of the JP by four Partner UN Organisations (PUNOs) was a Good Practice in particular because the JP could piggyback on long-standing partnerships between PUNOs and Government and other National Stakeholders and because the combined legitimacy and credibility of these PUNOs convinced the national stakeholders to be involved actively in social protection.

The strong networking activities of the JP and its four PUNOs brought together multi-stakeholders to exchange views, and enhanced and extended several long-standing partnerships, such as UNICEF – MSDHS (including DCY); ILO – MoL (including SSO); IOM – MoFA; UN Women - DWAFD/MSDHS; ILO – Social Partners; UNICEF – TDRI; ILO – HomeNet; and IOM – MWG. This also further enhanced the combined legitimacy and credibility of the four implementing PUNOs.

GP2 – The comprehensive process of the Diagnostic Review of the JP is a Good Practice involving a combination of background studies, workshops to discuss research findings, the formulation of recommendations, technical meetings to review these recommendations, and a synthesis report launched at a final programme event.

The Thailand Social Protection Diagnostic Review (SPDR) of the JP is based on six background studies and a series of workshops with many different stakeholders to discuss the findings of these studies resulting in a comprehensive Set of Recommendations which in their turn were reviewed and revised through a series of technical meetings with the stakeholders. The synthesis report is currently in its final stages and the Launch Event is being organised for later in June 2022. In addition, the design of the JP contributed to this process with its combination of approaches (Outcomes) focusing, on the one hand, on the national policy level aiming for system reform and Universality of social protection (Outcome 1) and, on the other hand, on selected instruments (i.e. grants; Outcome 2) and/or targeted groups (i.e. domestic workers; Outcome 3).

Templates in Annex 9

The new ILO/EVAL Templates with the full description of these Lessons Learned (LL) and Good Practices (GP) are provided in Annex 9.

ANNEXES

Annex 1: Terms of Reference (TOR)

Terms of Reference

Final Joint Independent Evaluation

Joint Programme Title	Accelerating Progress towards an Integrated and Modernized Social Protection System for All in Thailand (United Nations Joint Programme on Social Protection for All in Thailand)
Project Location	Thailand
Type of Evaluation	Joint Evaluation
Evaluation timing	Final
Project Period	1 January 2020 – 30 June 2022
Implementation Agency	ILO, IOM, UNICEF, and UN Women
Funding Agency	United Nations Joint SDG Fund
Total budget	US \$ 2,661,815
Type of contract	External Collaboration Contract
Structure of Evaluation team	A team of evaluation consultants including 1 team leader (Thai or foreigner) and 1 national evaluator
Expected evaluation dates	1 March 2022 – 15 June 2022
Evaluation Manager	Rattanaporn Pongpattana, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
Joint Evaluation Committee	Composed of RC/O and PUNO M&E Specialists or relevant staff who had not prior involvement in the project implementation, the JEC has the approves authority of the evaluation process and report.
Evaluation Reference Group	Comprised by project teams from all the PUNOs, the ERG provides comments and substantive feedback to ensure the quality – from a technical point of view – of key evaluation deliverables including the inception report and draft report.

Abbreviations

DWCP	ILO Decent Work Country Programme
DWT	ILO Decent Work Technical Support Team
EM	Evaluation Manager
ERG	Evaluation Reference Group
JEC	Joint Evaluation Committee
JP	Joint Programme
PUNOs	Partner UN Organizations
RCO	UN Resident Coordinator's Office
ROAP	ILO Regional Office of Asia and the Pacific
SP	Social Protection

Background of the Joint Programme

While Thailand has been internationally recognized for its efforts to reduce poverty and its development from a low-income country to a middle-income country, its economic growth has not been fully inclusive. Growth has been concentrated only in some areas, giving rise to both geographical and income inequality. The government also needs policy support as aging population and an influx of migrants and domestic workers increase demand for social protection.

The Accelerating Progress towards an Integrated and Modernized Social Protection System for All in Thailand (United Nations Joint Programme (UNJP) on Social Protection for All in Thailand), funded by the Joint SDG Fund, is a joint ILO, IOM, UNICEF, and UN Women project. The JP aims to enhance and integrate Thailand's social protection system, and reach those being left behind, especially for the more vulnerable groups, such as children, elders, informal workers, migrant workers, and people with disabilities. Under this project, the Child Support Grant will be scaled up from supporting 700,000 children to 2 million by the end of 2021, as a result of the strengthened integrated social protection systems. Policy changes to the existing social security schemes will be designed and tested, to allow for more effective coverage of domestic workers, including women and migrants.

The Long-term vision of the JP is to increase the social protection coverage towards universality, including for children and specific vulnerable groups (including domestic workers and migrant workers), through sustainable social protection systems, including floors, contributing to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda in Thailand.

Overall Result: The government's social protection system is reformed in a way to ensure effective and efficient implementation of policies for all populations, including migrants and children.

Outcome statement	Responsible agency
<p>Outcome 1: Integrated policy solutions developed following a review of the social protection system</p> <p>Output 1.1: Policy dialogue to foster dialogue on strategic directions for social protection in Thailand</p> <p>Output 1.2: Public Advocacy on the importance of social protection is increased, including among the public opinion and decision makers</p> <p>Output 1.3: A comprehensive review of the social protection system developed and followed by policy recommendations for a more inclusive, integrated and coherent system</p> <p>Output 1.4: National Social Protection Policy Framework and a National Social Protection Monitoring Framework</p>	<p>ILO, UNICEF, IOM, UN WOMEN</p>
<p>Outcome 2: Scale up of coverage of the Child Support Grant from 700,000 children to 2 million by end of 2021 because of strengthened integrated social protection systems</p> <p>Output 2.1: Improved capacity of the national identification system to register and monitor through the MIS the registration of new beneficiaries</p> <p>Output 2.2: National policy consultations on integration of the cash/non-cash under the Child support grant with transformative programs for ECD in place for maximizing the potential of the grant to all children</p> <p>Output 2.3: Evidence generation for the impact of the grant on young children in Thailand to inform further policy expansions towards UCSG</p> <p>Output 2.4: Improved public and programme communication</p>	<p>UNICEF</p>
<p>Outcome 3: Provide policy options to ensure a more effective coverage of domestic workers, including migrants, within the existing social security schemes, are designed and tested</p> <p>Output 3.1: Policy assessment and design of innovative program solutions to eliminate the barriers for the coverage of domestic workers developed and discussed</p> <p>Output 3.2: Pre-test of suggested policy options with targeted domestic workers completed, and assessed</p>	<p>ILO, IOM, UN WOMEN</p>

Theory of change

The causal logic for the change is as follows:

- **If** the national policies are revised and harmonized to ensure full coverage along the life cycle, based on clear diagnostic evidence on the current status quo and impact; alignment and harmonization of targeting mechanisms; clear projections for fiscal sustainability; and clear policy coordination mechanisms for leadership of design and implementation of reform, **then** the social protection system is likely to function in an effective and efficient manner and contribute to the acceleration of achievement of indicators under SDG 1.3.

- **If** the monitoring and registration system for the Child Support Grant is fully upgraded and improved, including infrastructure system and vertical and horizontal human resources capacity; if the policy is revised to include statutory linkages with other existing high quality/impact supply side interventions; and if additional evidence is generated on the longer-term impact of the CSG, **then** the projected 2.4 million children will be able to have access and enjoy the developmental benefits from the policy. This is also likely to lead to the acceleration effects of the Child Support Grant on the achievement of SDG 1.3. and other related indicators such as 2.1. and 2.2. as well as 4.2.

- **If** the specific rights of migrants and domestic workers, are reflected in revised and expanded social protection schemes and adequate and sustainable social protection benefits are also considered for them under the social protection system in Thailand, **then** the social protection system is likely to be more equitable and offer a maximized potential for adopting a life-cycle approach that fully captures the potential current population dynamics in Thailand and the region for influencing prosperity in Thailand, ensure inclusive growth as well as contribute to the achievement of SDGs, namely 5.4 and 10.1.

The project contributes to the following SDG targets:

- i.- (SDG 1.3) The proportion of the population covered by social protection benefits is expanded, particularly for families with children
 - ii.- (SDG 2.2) The expansion of the Child Support Grant and the establishment of further linkages with other Early Childhood Services is expected to contribute to reducing malnutrition
- (SDG 10.1) A more effective social protection system should increase the income of the bottom 40% of the population

The Target groups of the project include: children and informal and migrant workers (often women who are domestic workers) and the elder. This joint programme aims to address geographical and age coverage, improvement of the governance system for social protection, including implementation and improved fiscal space, and improved methods for capturing the poor and invisible such as migrants, preferably through a better focus on universal schemes and specific provisions for groups hard to cover such as migrant and domestic workers. Beyond the traditional life-cycle approach, particular attention will be given to groups such as homeless people and people with disabilities.

Purpose, objectives and scope of the joint evaluation

The main purpose of this final joint independent evaluation is to promote accountability to key stakeholders, including the Government of Thailand and the donor-UN joint SDG fund, and to enhance learning within the PUNOs, and key stakeholders. Knowledge and information (including lessons learned, good practices, challenges, etc.) obtained from this evaluation, will be used to help inform the design and implementation of similar interventions in the area.

The final joint independent evaluation has the following specific objectives:

- Assess the coherence, relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness of the project interventions, while identifying the supporting factors and constraints that have led to them, including strategies and implementation modalities chosen, and partnership arrangements;
- Assess the extent to which the project management and coordination mechanisms adequately addressed the needs and implementation challenges and how effectively the project management monitored project performance and results;
- Provide insights on (i) the contribution to improving the situation of vulnerable groups identified in the JP document (ProDoc), with a focus on disability, (ii) contribution to SDG acceleration, and (iii) contribution to UN reforms, including, UNCT coherence;
- Identify lessons learned, good practices, and recommendations on the design and implementation of similar interventions in the area;
- Assess project impact (including where the project's support has been most/least effective and why), including the extent to which the RTG's capacity has been strengthened, and the benefits of the project's contribution to improvement of social protection system;
- Assess contributions and results of the interventions (both expected and unexpected, both positive and negative changes) and examine how and why the changes were caused by the intervention and measure the size of the effect caused by that intervention or tactic;
- Assess the project's contribution to COVID-19 immediate responses and recovery;
- Assess the extent to which the Project outcomes will be sustainable, and;
- Assess the extent to which the Project promote gender equality and non-discrimination and disability inclusiveness.

iii.Scope

Operational scope: The evaluation will cover all the three components of the project. Where possible, interviews should be taken with ultimate beneficiaries and recipients. The evaluation will cover the entire project period, from 1 January 2020 to 30 June 2022.

Geographical Scope: Thailand

Clients and users of the joint evaluation

The main users of this independent evaluation will include

User	Intended Use
Partner UN Organizations (PUNOs): ILO, UNICEF, IOM, and UN Women.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide accountability and learning from the JP, to inform the design and implementation of future SP/JP interventions. • Inform decision-making for the UNCT in terms of programmatic design and resource allocation based on assessment of performance. • Inform UNCT on how to most effectively support the RTG and key stakeholders to improve SP.
Government Counterparts: Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (Permanent Secretary Office, Department of Children and Youth, Department of Women's Affair and Family Development, Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities, Department of Social Welfare and Development), Ministry of Labour (Social Security Office, Bureau of International Coordination, Department of Employment and Department of Labour Protection and Welfare), Ministry of Finance (Fiscal Policy Office), Ministry of Public Health, Ministry of Interior, and Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council, and Equitable Education Fund (EEF).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide accountability on achievements of the initiative • Inform on UNCT's commitment to continue improving its programming in support SP in Thailand • Reflect on evaluation findings in as much as they also relate to jointly implemented interventions • Engage together with UNCT in the response to the evaluation recommendations • Provide the necessary information for potential scale up of the interventions.
Social Partners, Civil Society Organizations, and other organizations: Migrant Working Group (MWG), Employers Confederation of Thailand (ECOT), Labour Congress of Thailand (LCT), Thai Trade Union Congress (TTUC), National Congress Private Industrial of Employees (NCPE), and State Enterprises Workers Relations Confederation (SERC), Thailand Development Research Institute (TDRI), Thai Health Promotion Foundation, Puey Ungphakorn Institute of Economic Research (PIER), Foundation for Children Development (FCD), Foundation for Slum Child Care (FSCC), HomeNet Foundation, and Human Rights and Development Foundation (HRDF).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflect on evaluation findings in as much as they also relate to jointly implemented interventions • Provide accountability on achievements of the initiative • Inform on areas that need support and improvements to better support results for SDGs and SP
Joint SDG Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide accountability and learning from the JP • Inform on areas that need support and improvements to better support results for SDGs and SP that can be used in funding decisions • Provide objective evidence on UNCT's commitment to learning and improving social protection in Thailand

Evaluation Criteria & Key evaluation questions

The table below provides the list of evaluation criteria and evaluation questions. It is expected that the evaluation will address all of these questions. Any fundamental changes to the suggested evaluation questions must be agreed upon in advance between the evaluation team and the EM in consultation with the stakeholders.

	Theme	Evaluation Questions
1	Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent the JP has responded to the need of the tripartite constituents, beneficiaries and recipients? • Do the JP activities (i.e. awareness raising, advocacy, and policy capacity building interventions) meet the needs and priorities of the RTG and other key stakeholders? • How important is the JP's intervention for the target beneficiaries and to what extent does it address their needs and interests? • How relevant is the JP to the partners' respective country programmes in Thailand? • To what extent was the project able to remain relevant and adapt in response to the COVID-19 crisis as well as the local context?
2	Validity of design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the Theory of Change for programme components adequately described and is there clarity of logic across the results levels? • To what extent are results, indicators, and activities measurable?
3	Coherence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent does the JP work effectively between the PUNOs agencies, and with other organizations to achieve expected results? • To what extent the JP contributed to UN reforms, including UNCT coherence? • To what extent does the JP work effectively to promote social protection consistently with other initiatives in this area?
4	Effectiveness (including effectiveness of the management response)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have the interventions achieved its expected results and outputs? • What factors were crucial for the achievement or failure to achieve the expected results? What key challenges have detracted from the effectiveness of activities?

	Theme	Evaluation Questions
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has the project management, monitoring systems and coordination mechanisms effectively addressed the needs and implementation challenges? • Were the RTG and partners satisfied with the quality of tools, technical advice, training, and other activities delivered by the project? • To what extent the JP contribute to acceleration toward the relevant SDGs?
5	Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the allocation of financial, human, institutional and technical resources been optimal for achieving the results? • Have the project activities been completed on-time /according to the project document and adjusted to take into account COVID-19? If not, what factors have hindered timely delivery and what counter-measures have been taken to address them?
6	Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How has the project impacted on the social protection systems? Has the JP contributed to improved social protection systems/schemes? How? • Have institutional attitudes and mindset been changed as a result of the JP/JP activities? How? • To what extent has the government agencies institutionalized the support provided by the project? Who uses the JP knowledge materials and outputs? Are they likely to be catalysts for change? • What approaches have potential for further upscaling and/or replication through future work by the UN agencies and its partners?
7	Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent will activities, results and effects be expected to continue after project activities have ended? How will this be ensured? What are the strong evidences that they would be continued? • To what extent have constituents/relevant stakeholders been involved in the implementation of the project? To what extent has the project identified and engaged with the right stakeholders to achieve its objectives?

	Theme	Evaluation Questions
8	Cross-Cutting Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent did the project facilitate and strengthen social dialogue to achieve its expected results? To what extent are the JP management and implementation guided by tripartite dialogue? To what extent are the target beneficiaries reached? Did the project ensure gender balance and inclusion of people with disability in the beneficiary outreach? To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality and non-discrimination and disability inclusiveness?
9	Lessons learned and good practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the good practices from this project which can be adopted/replicated in other similar projects? What should have been different, and should be avoided in similar future projects?

Evaluation Methodology

The Evaluation Team will be expected to conform to guidelines and standards set by the UN the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016), UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system (2008), UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (2020), UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator (2018), and UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation (2014).

The evaluation is an independent evaluation and the final methodology and evaluation questions will be determined by the Evaluation Team in consultation with the Evaluation Manager, and the Evaluation Reference Group.

The evaluation will apply an appropriate mix of qualitative and quantitative methods to gather data and information in order to offer diverse perspective to the evaluation and to promote engagement of key stakeholders of the project at all levels during the design, field work, validation and reporting stages. To collect the data for analysis, the evaluation will make use of the techniques listed below (but not limit to). The data from these sources will be triangulated to increase the validity and rigor of the evaluation findings.

Desk review of project design and strategy documents (PRODOC), progress reports, activity documents, communications, research, and publications, ILO DWCP Thailand, UNPAF, SDG relevant documents.

Key informant interviews/Focus Groups/Survey with project staff and relevant specialists of PUNOs, Government agencies/service providers, tripartite

constituents, civil society organizations and other stakeholders and partners, and FGDs with beneficiaries, i.e. informal and migrant workers. A survey may be undertaken, if deemed necessary.

Evaluation approach and method should be determined by the evaluator in consultation with the Evaluation Manager on the basis of what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives, and answer to evaluation questions. Selection of the field visits locations should be based on criteria to be defined by the evaluation team, and to be approved by the Evaluation Manager.

Due to the current COVID19 situation, the methodology may need to be flexible and field visits to the project sites may face some challenges. The Evaluation Team once on board will review relevant documents and will discuss with the project management to prepare a detailed inception report. The inception report will elaborate in detail proposed methods of data collection (face-to face or remotely etc.) and that they must be reliable, most practical, and sensitive to the situation faced by different key stakeholders whom to be interviewed etc.

At the end of the field work the Evaluation Team will present preliminary findings to the project key stakeholders in a workshop to discuss validate and refine the findings and fill information gaps.

Ethical considerations

The bidder will set out how they expect the evaluation process to be designed and undertaken in accordance with ethical guidelines as set out in UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (2020). During the evaluation process, full compliance with all UNEG ethical guidelines will be required. All informants should be offered the option of confidentiality for all methods used. Dissemination or exposure of results and any interim products must follow the rules agreed upon in the contract. In general, unauthorized disclosure is prohibited. Any sensitive issues or concerns should be raised, as soon as they are identified, with the evaluation management team.

Main Deliverables

- a) **An inception report** - upon the review of available documents and an initial discussion with the project management team of ILO and PUNOs, and the donor, the inception report will follow the report structure detailed in Annex 1. The Evaluation Manager before proceeding with the fieldwork should approve the inception report in consultation with the ERG (PUNOs).
- b) **PowerPoint Presentation slides** (both **in Thai and English**) that provide key evaluation findings and recommendations at the end of field work phase
- c) **Stakeholders' workshop**. A half day workshop will be technically organized by the Evaluation Team with the logistic support of the project, to present key

evaluation findings and recommendations at the end of field work phase. The comments from stakeholders will be considered in the draft evaluation report.

d) **First draft of Evaluation Report.** See Annex 2 for suggested report structure and Section VIII for quality assurance of the report.

d) **Final version of the evaluation report** (both in **Thai** and **English**) incorporating comments received (or a specific justification for not integrating a comment). The report should be no longer than 50 pages excluding annexes. The quality of the report will be assessed against the EVAL checklist 6. The report should also include a section on output and outcome level results against indicators and targets as well as comments on each one. The final version is subjected to final approval by ILO Evaluation Office (after initial approval by the evaluation manager, ERG and Regional evaluation officer). **The joint evaluation report must be translated into Thai.**

e) **Executive summary and Lessons Learned and Good Practices** in ILO template

Management Arrangements and Timeline

The programme is subject to a joint independent evaluation with established arrangements for managing it. The evaluation will be led by ILO and managed jointly by the partner agencies through a joint Evaluation management team, i.e. ERG. The evaluation report should be submitted to ILO Evaluation Office for its evaluation repository. Kindly refer to the [UNEG Resource Pack on Joint evaluation](#) for more details.

An M&E Officer from ILO ROAP will be the **Evaluation Manager**. Evaluation Team leader reports to the evaluation manager. The evaluation manager is responsible for completing the following specific tasks:

- Draft and finalize the evaluation TOR with inputs from key stakeholders including PUNOs team (draft TORs to be circulated for comments);
- Develop a call for expression of interest and manage selection of an independent Evaluation Team in coordination with Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and ILO Evaluation Office (EVAL);
- Brief the evaluator on ILO evaluation policies and procedures;
- Initial coordination with the project team on the development of a field mission schedule and a preliminary result workshop;
- Approve the inception report;
- Circulate the first draft of the evaluation report for comments by key stakeholders;

- Ensure the final version of the evaluation report address ERG's and other stakeholders' comments (or an explanation why any comment has not been addressed) and meets ILO requirements, and;
- Share the report with RCO and PUNOs for the final approval.

ILO project team

The ILO, as lead agency, will handle administrative and contractual arrangements with the evaluator and provide logistical and other assistance as required.

Joint evaluation Committee

A Joint evaluation Committee (JEC) should be set up as the main decision-making structure. It is chaired by RC and composed by in-country PUNO staff (e.g. M&E specialists) who had not prior involvement in the project implementation. The JEC has the approves authority of the evaluation process and report. Primary responsibilities include:

- Approving ToRs, endorsing the overall evaluation framework and the release of the evaluation products;
- Providing oversight of the evaluation and being accountable for its robustness;
- Reviewing and approving all deliverables including the evaluation reports;

Evaluation Reference Group (PUNOs teams).

An Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) should be set up and comprise a small group of key UN internal stakeholders, i.e. project staff of ILO, UNICEF, IOM, and UNWOMEN. Primary responsibilities include:

- Provide comments on the development of the ToRs;
- Providing project documents and materials to the ILO National Project Coordinator and Evaluation Manager;
- Providing list of interviewees and their contact details;
- Helping schedule interviews/consultations when needed;
- Being on hand and available to provide information, written inputs, and face to face interviews as requested;
- Participating in the stakeholders' workshop;
- Contributing to quality assurance through comments and feedback on draft deliverables; reviewing and providing

feedback on the terms of reference, inception report, draft and final evaluation report, and;

- Develop the Evaluation Management Response in consultation with stakeholders.

Evaluation Team

The evaluation will be conducted with the support of a team of consultants. The Evaluation Team will have the final responsibility for the evaluation report and ensure the quality of data (validity, reliability, consistency, and accuracy) throughout the analytical and reporting phases. The Evaluation Team will agree on the distribution of work and schedule for the evaluation and stakeholders to consult. It is expected that the report will be written in an evidence-based manner.

The Evaluation Team reports to the ILO's Evaluation Manager.

VIII. Quality Assurance

Quality assurance throughout the process will be undertaken by:

- **ILO in consultation with the ERG**, leading on quality assurance of all deliverables, will provide quality assurance in line with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines and other relevant procedures checking that the evaluation methodologies, findings and conclusions are relevant, and recommendations are implementable, and contribute to the dissemination of the evaluation findings and follow-up on the management response. ILO/ERG will review the initial deliverables (such as draft inception report, first draft of the final report) and work with the Evaluation Team on necessary revisions to ensure the deliverables meet minimum quality standards. Once the minimum standards are met, the Evaluation Manager requests feedback from stakeholders, consolidates all comments from the Evaluation Reference Group, and other key stakeholders on a response matrix and requests the Evaluation Team to indicate actions taken against each comment in the production of the penultimate, and final draft.
 - **ERG** provides provide comments and substantive feedback to ensure the quality – from a technical point of view – of key evaluation deliverables including the inception report and draft report.
 - **ILO** is responsible for final quality assurance checking and final sign off on all deliverables of the evaluation

IX. Qualifications

The Evaluation Team leader has the responsibility to undertake the evaluation and deliver all the required deliverables as per this TOR. He/she will be supported by a national consultant.

The table below described desired competencies and responsibilities for an evaluation team leader

Responsibilities	Profile
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Conduct evaluation and deliver all deliverables under this TOR ✓ Desk review of programme documents and other related documents ✓ Develop evaluation instrument and draft inception report ✓ Virtual interviews with project team and specialists of PUNOs ✓ Undertake a field visit within Thailand (to be determined) ✓ Facilitate stakeholders' workshop/ debriefing with the programme and key stakeholders ✓ Draft evaluation report ✓ Finalize evaluation ✓ Draft stand-alone evaluation summary as per standard ILO format 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Not been previously involved with the Accelerating Progress towards an Integrated and Modernized Social Protection System for All in Thailand Project. ✓ Can be either Thai or foreigner. ✓ University Degree, with 10-12 years of experience in Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) experience, including significant experience with UN development cooperation projects. ✓ A minimum of 8 evaluations led at the program and/or outcome levels with international organizations. ✓ Experience in conducting evaluations for UN agencies or major bilateral donor country programs, and familiarity with UNEG Norms and Standards. ✓ Strong background in the areas of organizational and institutional capacity building, Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA) programming, and Results-Based Management and Monitoring. ✓ Ability to bring gender dimensions in to the evaluation including design, data collection, analysis and reporting writing. ✓ Has extensive knowledge, and experience in applying, qualitative and quantitative research methodologies. ✓ Excellent analytical skills and communication skills. ✓ Demonstrated excellent report writing skills in English. ✓ Prior professional experience in social protection issues (ideally in Asia) would be an advantage.

The table below described desired competencies and responsibilities for the Evaluation Team member

Responsibilities	Profile
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Desk review of programme documents and other related documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Not been previously involved with the Accelerating Progress towards an Integrated and Modernized Social Protection System for All in Thailand Project.; ✓ Thai national ✓ University Degree, with 5-8 years of experience in

Responsibilities	Profile
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Assist the team leader in developing evaluation instrument and drafting inception report ✓ Take part in the interviews with key stakeholders and assist in note taking during interview ✓ Undertake a field visit in Thailand ✓ Assist the team leader in facilitating stakeholders' workshop/ debriefing with the programme and key stakeholders ✓ Contribute to the drafting of the evaluation report prepared by the team leader ✓ Might be requested to write certain sections in the draft report as requested by the team leader · participate in and jointly facilitate the stakeholders workshop ✓ Provide interpretation during the evaluation data collection as required ✓ Translate the final evaluation report and PPT slides into Thai language. While ILO could provide translation service, it is the responsibility of the Evaluation Team to check the accuracy of the translation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) experience, including significant experience with UN development cooperation projects; ✓ Demonstrated technical expertise in evaluation methodologies and demonstrated skills and experience in undertaking evaluations of similar projects; ✓ Strong background in the areas of organizational and institutional capacity building, Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA) programming, and Results-Based Management and Monitoring; ✓ Has extensive knowledge, and experience in applying, qualitative and quantitative research methodologies; ✓ Excellent analytical skills and communication skills; ✓ Demonstrated excellent report writing skills; ✓ Knowledge of UN evaluation norms and UN programming is desirable; ✓ Prior professional experience in social protection issues (ideally in Asia) would be an advantage.

X. Evaluation timetable and schedule

The evaluation will be conducted tentatively between **1 March 2022 and 15 June 2022**. The final report is due on 15 June 2022.

Task	Responsible person	Timeline
Preparing and drafting TOR Evaluation Manager	Evaluation Manager	October 2021

Task	Responsible person	Timeline
Sharing the TOR with all stakeholders for comments/inputs	Evaluation Manager	October 2021
Finalization of the TOR	Evaluation Manager	October 2021
Approval of the TOR EVAL	JEC	Oct 2021
Circulation of TOR		7 November 2021-7 February 2022
Selection of consultant team	Evaluation Manager/ILO ROAP/JEC	27 November 2021
Sign the contract (vendor registration requires 2 weeks)		20 February 2022
Brief evaluators on ILO evaluation policy	Evaluation Manager	1 March 2022
Desk review, and audio/skype/video conference with project, and inception report	Project and evaluators (at home based)	Submission of inception report – 1 st week of March 2022
Data collection	Evaluator	Between 3 rd week of March and 3 rd week of April 2022
Stakeholder consultation workshop	Evaluator/All stakeholders	on 4 th week of April 2022
Drafting of evaluation report and submitting to the Evaluation Manager	Evaluator	Early May 2022.
Sharing the draft report to all concerned for comments	Evaluation Manager	2 nd week -3 rd week of May 2022.
Consolidated comments on the draft report, send to the evaluator	Evaluation Manager/ERG/JEC	3 rd week of May 2022.
Finalisation of the report	Evaluator	4 th week of May -1 st week of June 2022
Review of the final report	Evaluation Manager/ERG/JEC	2 nd week of June 2022
Submission of the final evaluation report	Evaluation Manager	June 2022
Approval of the final evaluation report	JEC	15 June 2022

Proposed workdays (payable days) for the Evaluation Team

Phase	Responsible Person	Tasks	# days
I	Evaluator	Briefing with the evaluation manager, the project team and the donor Desk Review of programme related documents Stakeholder analysis Inception report	12
II	Evaluator, Organisa- tional support from ILO	In-country consultations with programme staff Field visits Interviews with projects staff members of the 4 PUNOs, partners beneficiaries, ultimate beneficiaries Survey (if needed) Stakeholders workshop for sharing findings	10
III	Evaluator	Draft report based on consultations from field visits and desk review and the stakeholders' validation workshop	10
IV	Evaluation Manager	Quality check and initial review by Evaluation Manager Circulate revised draft report to stakeholders Consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to team leader	0
V	Evaluator	Finalize the report including explanations on why comments were not included	5
TOTAL			37*

**36 days maximum. Working days of each team member may vary depending on specific tasks assigned to them.*

XI. Role of key stakeholders

All stakeholders, particularly the relevant ILO staff, the donor, tripartite constituents, relevant government agencies, NGOs and other key partners will be consulted throughout the process and will be engaged at different stages during the process. They will have the opportunities to provide inputs to the TOR and to the draft final evaluation report. The main stakeholders that should be consulted as following:

- The Royal Thai Government
- Workers' and Employers' organizations
- ILO DWT - Bangkok

Key stakeholders will be informed and consulted in the design of the evaluation, and the views of a wide range of stakeholders will be solicited in the consultation and data collection stage.

XII. Legal and Ethical Matters

The evaluation will comply with UN Norms and Standards. The TOR is accompanied by the code of conduct for carrying out the evaluations. UNEG ethical guidelines will be followed. It is important that the evaluator has no links to project management or any other conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of evaluation.

Ownership of data from the evaluation rests jointly with the RC/RCO and all PUNOs and the evaluator. The copyright of the evaluation report will rest exclusively with the RC/RCO and all PUNOs. Use of the data for publication and other presentations can only be made with the written agreement of the RC/RCO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

XIII. Annexes

Annex 1: Inception Report structure

The Inception Report ensures that the evaluation team has a clear understanding of the TOR of the evaluation. It translates the TOR into an operational plan which determines how the evaluation will be carried out. The Inception Report forms the agreement between the Evaluation Manager and the Evaluation team on the operational plan for the evaluation. The structure for the inception report is:

- **Table of contents**
- **Abbreviations and acronyms**
- **Introduction**
 - Purpose of the Country Programme Evaluation
 - Scope of the evaluation
- **Country context**
 - Highlight key features of the country context which are relevant to Social Protection
 - Identify any key changes in context during the period being covered by the evaluation (e.g. any conflicts or disasters, major changes in policies affecting children etc)
- **UN Joint Programme**

- UN Joint programme in context of UN response
- UN Joint programme strategy, objectives, goals, reach and achievements
- **Stakeholder analysis**
 - Identify key stakeholders, their interests and how they will be involved in the evaluation
- **Evaluation Approach and Methodology**
 - State the evaluation approach and rationale for the approach with reference to the degree of stakeholder participation
 - State the evaluation questions which the evaluation will address; if these differ substantially from those noted in the Terms of Reference, indicate why they have been changed.
 - Indicators
 - Sources of data and data collection methods
 - Data analysis approach and tools to be used to answer the evaluation questions
 - (If applicable) Sampling strategy or plan and rationale for it
 - Limitations
- **Quality assurance**
 - Sets out the key quality assurance milestones, processes, and responsibilities for QA of the evaluation
- **Work Plan**
 - Indicate timing of key steps and deliverables for the evaluation
 - Outline responsibilities of each member of the evaluation team and level of effort
- **Annexes**
 - Terms of Reference
 - Bibliography
 - Evaluation matrix (evaluation questions, indicators, data sources and data collection methods)
 - Draft data collection tools/ instruments (e.g. Key Informant Interview protocols, draft survey instruments)

Annex 2: Evaluation Report Format

Report length: 40-50 pages excluding annexes

- **Executive Summary (up to 4 pages)**
- **Acknowledgments**
- **Table of contents**
- **Abbreviations and acronyms**
- **Map**
- **Introduction (6-7 pages)**
 - Purpose of the Country Programme Evaluation
 - Scope of the evaluation
 - Methodology and approach to the evaluation

- **Country context and UNJP (6-7 pages)**
 - Draw from the appropriate sections of the Inception Report, with relevant updates based on the subsequent fieldwork and analysis
- **Findings (25-30 pages)**
 - Answers to each of the evaluation questions
- **Conclusions (5- 6 pages)**
- **Lessons Learned and Good Practices (3-4 pages)**
- **Recommendations (3-4 pages)**
- **Annexes**
 - Terms of Reference
 - Inception Report including Evaluation Matrix
 - Bibliography
 - (As appropriate) methodological tools (including the reconstructed Theory of Change)

Annex 3: Assessing Risks and mitigating against these.

The table sets out some risks based on previous evaluation experience that need to be assessed and mitigation measures that the evaluation team need develop

Risk and implications	Mitigation measures
Covid-19 Virus spreading, or risk of spreading, results in restricted access and it is being impossible for evaluation country visit and meet stakeholders. Major impact on methodologies and/or timing	Delay implementation of the evaluation by an agreed period Consider options on ET working remotely through desk review and telecoms/video cons and surveys to engage with stakeholders (and include consideration of further reduction of scope) Consider delaying the timing of the start of the evaluation Build in regular review times (e.g., at start and end of inception) to assess and decide on progressing, delaying, or cancelling the process, and review proposed methodologies designed to cope with access constraints
The evaluation is over-ambitious in what it is attempting to cover or wrongly focused resulting in insufficient depth of analysis and/or missed opportunities on key areas	Use inception report to ensure relevance/responsiveness to stakeholder needs and to test feasibility, including assessing and factoring in where other evaluation processes already provide data and findings Reduce or change scope, clearly prioritise areas for evaluation focus, and clarify areas deprioritised
Insufficient time and attention paid to the evaluation at critical points in the process	Plan well in advance and ensure strong messaging by leadership. Ensure evaluation tasks incorporated into the team and key individual objectives Ensure other evaluation processes are scheduled outside the evaluation implementation
Major crisis in the country, requiring response by UN and partners leaving reduced capacity and attention on the evaluation	Delay implementation of the evaluation by an agreed period In case of a high-level crisis, postpone evaluation to the next cycle or greatly reduce scope Allocate dedicated staff to be kept free from crisis response to focus on the evaluation
Poor performance by the Evaluation Team (ET) likely to result in poor timeliness and quality of deliverables and poor return on the evaluation investment	Ensure due diligence in ET recruitment and onboarding Invest time in regular interaction with ET and closely monitoring progress in all phases of the process Monitor changes in team members and set requirements on like-for-like replacements Change evaluation team (or individuals) if necessary

Annex 4 – Disability evaluation and guiding questions on Persons with Disabilities

As persons with disabilities are among the most vulnerable and marginalized groups across countries and considering the critical role that social protection can play in supporting their inclusion, most joint programs had identified them as direct or indirect beneficiaries.

In line with the Leaving No One Behind principle and the obligations stemming from the Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities, even programs that do not target directly persons with disabilities should ensure that persons with disabilities within targeted population can access the program without discrimination.

The evaluation will therefore assess to what extent:

- Joint programme design, implementation, and monitoring have been inclusive of persons with disabilities (accessibility, non-discrimination, participation of organizations of persons with disabilities, data disaggregation)
- Joint programme effectively contributed to the socio-economic inclusion of persons with disabilities by providing income security, coverage of health care, and disability-related costs¹⁰ across the life cycle.

Guiding questions

- To what extent did the programme target persons with disabilities?
 - Not specifically targeted
 - One of the groups of direct beneficiaries targeted
 - Main target group for the programme
- To what extent did the design and implementation of activities of the joint program supported include disability-related accessibility and non-discrimination requirement?
 - No requirements
 - General reference
 - Specific requirements
- To what extent have persons with disabilities, in particular children and women with disabilities, been consulted through their representative organizations?
 - Not invited
 - Invited
 - Specific outreach
- To what extent did support to data collection and analysis, registries, and information system feature disability?
 - No reference to disability

¹⁰ [Joint statement on inclusive social protection system for full and effective participation and inclusion of persons with disabilities](#)

- Disability included via Washington group short set or similar but no analysis
- Disability included via Washington group short set or similar
 - Part of general analysis
 - with specific analysis
- To which extent did the programme contribute to support inclusion of persons with disabilities via:
 - Ensuring basic income security
 - Coverage of health care costs, including rehabilitation and assistive devices
 - Coverage of disability-related costs, including community support services
 - Facilitate access to inclusive early childhood development, education, and work/livelihood

Annex 5: UNEG Ethical Code of Conduct

UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Foundation Document

UNEG, March 2008

The Code of Conduct was formally approved by UNEG members at the UNEG Annual General Meeting 2008.

Further details of the ethical approach to evaluation in the UN system can be found in the *Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation in the UN System* (UNEG/FN/ETH [2008]).

UNEG/FN/CoC(2008)

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR EVALUATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

1. The conduct of evaluators in the UN system should always be beyond reproach. Any deficiency in their professional conduct may undermine the integrity of the evaluation, and more broadly evaluation in the UN or the UN itself, and raise doubts about the quality and validity of their evaluation work.
2. The UNEG¹¹ Code of Conduct applies to all evaluation staff and consultants in the UN system. The principles behind the Code of Conduct are fully consistent with the Standards of Conduct for the International Civil Service by which all UN staff are bound. UN staff are also subject to any UNEG member specific staff rules and procedures for the procurement of services.
3. The provisions of the UNEG Code of Conduct apply to all stages of the evaluation process from the conception to the completion of an evaluation and the release and use of the evaluation results.
4. To promote trust and confidence in evaluation in the UN, all UN staff engaged in evaluation and evaluation consultants working for the United Nations system are

¹¹ UNEG is the United Nations Evaluation Group, a professional network that brings together the units responsible for evaluation in the UN system including the specialized agencies, funds, programmes and affiliated organisations. UNEG currently has 43 such members.

required to commit themselves in writing to the Code of Conduct for Evaluation¹² (see Annexes 1 and 2), specifically to the following obligations:

Independence

5. Evaluators shall ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.

Impartiality

Evaluators shall operate in an impartial and unbiased manner and give a balanced presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the policy, program, programme or organizational unit being evaluated. **Conflict of Interest**

7. Evaluators are required to disclose in writing any experience, of themselves or their immediate family, which may give rise to a potential conflict of interest, and to deal honestly in resolving any conflict of interest which may arise. Before undertaking evaluation work within the UN system, each evaluator will complete a declaration of interest form (see Annex 3).

Honesty and Integrity

8. Evaluators shall show honesty and integrity in their own behaviour, negotiating honestly the evaluation costs, tasks, limitations, scope of results likely to be obtained, while accurately presenting their procedures, data and findings and highlighting any limitations or uncertainties of interpretation within the evaluation.

Competence

9. Evaluators shall accurately represent their level of skills and knowledge and work only within the limits of their professional training and abilities in evaluation, declining assignments for which they do not have the skills and experience to complete successfully.

Accountability

10. Evaluators are accountable for the completion of the agreed evaluation deliverables within the timeframe and budget agreed, while operating in a cost-effective manner.

Obligations to participants

11. Evaluators shall respect and protect the rights and welfare of human subjects and communities, in accordance with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other human rights conventions. Evaluators shall respect differences in culture, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, personal interaction, gender roles, disability, age, and ethnicity, while using evaluation instruments appropriate to the cultural setting. Evaluators shall ensure prospective participants are treated

¹² While the provisions of the Code of Conduct apply to all UN staff involved in evaluation, only UN staff who spend a substantial proportion of their time working on evaluation are expected to sign the Code of Conduct, including staff of evaluation, oversight or performance management units directly involved in the management or conduct of evaluations. All evaluation consultants are required to sign when first engaged by a UNEG member.

as autonomous agents, free to choose whether to participate in the evaluation, while ensuring that the relatively powerless are represented. Evaluators shall make themselves aware of and comply with legal codes (whether international or national) governing, for example, interviewing children and young people.

Confidentiality

12. Evaluators shall respect people's right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality, while ensuring that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source.

Avoidance of Harm

13. Evaluators shall act to minimize risks and harms to, and burdens on, those participating in the evaluation, without compromising the integrity of the evaluation findings.

Accuracy, Completeness and Reliability

14. Evaluators have an obligation to ensure that evaluation reports and presentations are accurate, complete, and reliable. Evaluators shall explicitly justify judgements, findings and conclusions and show their underlying rationale, so that stakeholders are able to assess them.

Transparency

15. Evaluators shall clearly communicate to stakeholders the purpose of the evaluation, the criteria applied and the intended use of findings. Evaluators shall ensure that stakeholders have a say in shaping the evaluation and shall ensure that all documentation is readily available to and understood by stakeholders.

Omissions and wrongdoing

16. Where evaluators find evidence of wrong-doing or unethical conduct, they are obliged to report it to the proper oversight authority.

(Each UNEG member to create its own forms for signature)

Annex 1: United Nations Evaluation Group – Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Evaluation Staff Agreement Form

To be signed by all staff engaged full or part time in evaluation at the start of their contract.

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Staff Member:

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Evaluation Group Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at (place) on (date)

Signature: _____

(Each UNEG member to create its own forms for signature)

Annex 2: United Nations Evaluation Group Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Evaluation Consultants Agreement Form

To be signed by all consultants as individuals (not by or on behalf of a consultancy company) before a contract can be issued.

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant:

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant):

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at (place) on (date)

Signature: _____

Annex 6 - Other resources for inception and evaluation reports

- UNJP project documents, blogs, HIS, reports
- **Other useful documents:**
- [UNEG Resource Pack on Joint evaluation](#)
- [United Nations Evaluation Group. 2008. *Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation in the UN System*](#)
- [United Nations Evaluation Group. 2014. *Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations*](#)
- [United Nations Evaluation Group. 2016. *Norms and Standards for Evaluation*](#)
- [United Nations Evaluation Group. 2018. *UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator - Technical Note and Scorecard*](#)
- [ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 4th ed., \(Nov 2020\)](#)
- [ILO Checklist No. 3 Writing the inception report](#)
- [ILO Checklist 5 preparing the evaluation report](#)
- [ILO Checklist 6 rating the quality of evaluation report](#)
- ILO Template for [lessons learnt](#)
- ILO Template for [Emerging Good practices](#)
- [ILO Guidance note 7 Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation](#)
- [ILO Guidance note 4 Integrating gender equality in M&E](#)

[of projects](#)

- [ILO Template for evaluation title page](#)
- [ILO Template for evaluation summary](#)

Annex 2: Data Collection Worksheet

Below is the Data Collection Worksheet specifying the Evaluation Criteria and Questions, as well as the sources of data, stakeholder interviews and specific methods used in the present final joint independent evaluation (Source: Inception Report, 11 April 2022).

Evaluation Criteria and Questions	Sources of Data	Stakeholder Interviews	Specific Methods
A. Relevance			
1) To what extent the JP has responded to the need of the tripartite constituents, beneficiaries and recipients?	Policies of RTG and of Social Partners, PRODOC, Annual Progress Reports (APR), UNPAF/UNSDCF, SDGs, PUNO Country Programmes	RTG & Social Partners, CSOs & Research Institutions (RIs), JP Team/PUNOs (incl. RCO), PUNO country offices	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
2) Do the JP activities (i.e. awareness raising, advocacy, and policy capacity building interventions) meet the needs and priorities of the RTG and other key stakeholders?	Policies of RTG and of Social Partners, PRODOC, Annual Progress Reports (APR)	RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs, JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
3) How important is the JP's intervention for the target beneficiaries and to what extent does it address their needs and interests? <u>Merge</u> with Evaluation Question (EQ) 1, as they address the same needs/interests.	---	---	---
4) How relevant is the JP to the partners' respective country programmes of the four PUNOs in Thailand?	PUNO Country Programmes, PRODOC, APR, UNPAF	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
5) To what extent was the project able to remain relevant and adapt in response to the COVID-19 crisis as well as the local context?	APR, PSC Minutes, No-cost extension request	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
B. Validity of Design			
6) Is the Theory of Change for programme components adequately described and is there clarity of logic across the results levels?	LogFrame/ ToC, PRODOC, APR	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices, MSDHS, MoL	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
7) To what extent are results, indicators, and activities measurable?	LogFrame/ ToC, PRODOC, APR	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices	
C. Coherence			
8) To what extent does the JP work effectively between the PUNOs agencies, and with other organizations to achieve expected results?	APR, PRODOC, UNPAF/UNSDCF, SDGs, PUNO Country programmes, Joint SDG Fund policy	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices Joint SDG Fund, RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews

9) To what extent the JP contributed to UN reforms, including UNCT coherence?	UNPAF/UNSDCF, SDGs, PUNO Country progr.'s, Joint SDG Fund policy, APR, PRODOC	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices, Joint SDG Fund	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
10) To what extent does the JP work effectively to promote social protection consistently with other initiatives in this area?	UNPAF/UNSDCF, SDGs, PUNO Country programmes, Joint SDG Fund policy, APR, PRODOC	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices, Joint SDG Fund, RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
D. Effectiveness			
11) To what extent have the interventions achieved its expected results and outputs?	PRODOC, LogFrame/ToC, APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports produced	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices, Joint SDG Fund, RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
12) What factors were crucial for the achievement or failure to achieve the expected results? What key challenges have detracted from the effectiveness of activities?	APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices, Joint SDG Fund, RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
13) To what extent has the project management, monitoring systems and coordination mechanisms effectively addressed the needs and implementation challenges?	PRODOC, LogFrame/ToC, APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices, Joint SDG Fund	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
14) Were the RTG and partners satisfied with the quality of tools, technical advice, training, and other activities delivered by the project?	APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports, Communication strategy documents	RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs, JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices, Joint SDG Fund	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
15) To what extent the JP contribute to acceleration toward the relevant SDGs?	UNPAF/UNSDCF, SDGs, PUNO Country progr.'s, Joint SDG Fund policy, APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices, Joint SDG Fund, RTG	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
E. Efficiency			
16) Has the allocation of financial, human, institutional and technical resources been optimal for achieving the results?	Financial Reports, APR, PSC Minutes, No-cost extension request	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices, Joint SDG Fund, RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs	Review of Financial Reports & Stakeholder Interviews
17) Have the project activities been completed on-time /according to the project document and adjusted to take into account COVID-19? If not, what factors have hindered timely delivery and what counter-measures have been taken to address them?	Financial Reports, APR, PSC Minutes, No-cost extension request	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices, Joint SDG Fund, RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs	Review of Financial Reports & Stakeholder Interviews
F. Impact			
18) How has the project impacted on the social protection systems? Has the	APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs,	Documents Review &

JP contributed to improved social protection systems/schemes? How?		JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices	Stakeholder Interviews
19) Have institutional attitudes and mindset been changed as a result of the JP/JP activities? How?	APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs, JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices	Documents Review & Stakeholder Interviews
20) To what extent has the government agencies institutionalized the support provided by the project? Who uses the JP knowledge materials and outputs? Are they likely to be catalysts for change?	APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs, JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices	Documents Review & Stakeholder Interviews
21) What approaches have potential for further upscaling and/or replication through future work by the UN agencies and its partners?	APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices Joint SDG Fund, RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs	Documents Review & Stakeholder Interviews
G. Sustainability			
22) To what extent will activities, results and effects be expected to continue after project activities have ended? How will this be ensured? What are the strong evidences that they would be continued?	APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs	Documents Review & Stakeholder Interviews
23) To what extent have constituents/relevant stakeholders been involved in the implementation of the project? To what extent has the project identified and engaged with the right stakeholders to achieve its objectives?	APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs, JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices Joint SDG Fund	Documents Review & Stakeholder Interviews
H. Cross-Cutting Issues			
24) To what extent did the project facilitate and strengthen social dialogue to achieve its expected results? To what extent are the JP management and implementation guided by tripartite dialogue?	PRODOC, APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs, JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices	Documents Review & Stakeholder Interviews
25) To what extent are the target beneficiaries reached? Did the project ensure gender balance and inclusion of people with disability in the beneficiary outreach? To what extent have persons with disabilities been consulted through their representative organizations?	APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs, Joint SDG Fund	Documents Review & Stakeholder Interviews
26) To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality and non-discrimination and disability inclusiveness?	APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs, Joint SDG Fund	Documents Review & Stakeholder Interviews

Annex 3: List of Stakeholders Interviewed

The list of 33 Key Stakeholders interviewed of which 22 females and 11 males for the present evaluation is indicated below:

<u>UN Resident Coordinator Office</u>	<u>Male/Fem.</u>
1. Ms Gita Sabharwal, UN Resident Coordinator in Thailand	F
<u>Donor</u>	
2. Mr. Nenad Rava, Head of Programmes. Joint SDG Fund	M
<u>ILO</u>	
3. Mr. Graeme Buckley, Director, ILO Country Office, Thailand, Cambodia, and Lao PDR	M
4. Mr. Nuno Cunha, Senior Social Protection Specialist	M
5. Ms. Jittima Srisuknam, Programme Office	F
6. Mr. Vasu Thirasak, National Project Coordinator	M
<u>UNICEF</u>	
7. Ms. Sarah Shahyar, Chief, Social Policy	F
8. Ms. Khwanploy Cheechang, Social Policy Officer	F
9. Ms. Siriporn Arunsangsuree, Social Policy Officer (Social Protection)	F
<u>IOM</u>	
10. Ms. Geraldine Ansart, Chief of Mission	F
11. Mr. Max Pottler, Head of Labour Migration and Human Development	M
12. Ms. Vivienne Liang, Programme Manager	F
13. Ms. Jitradee Singhakowin, Project Coordinator	F
<u>UN WOMEN</u>	
14. Ms. Sarah Knibbs, Officer-in-Charge for UN Women Asia and the Pacific	F
15. Ms. Naruedee Janthasing, Programme Analyst	F
<u>Government:</u>	
<u>Ministry of Social Development and Human Security</u>	
16. Ms. Patcharee Arayakul, Permanent Secretary	F
17. Ms. Piyawadee Pongthai, Child Support Grant Director, Department of Children and Youth	F
18. Ms. Nantnadda Ritmontri, Director, Policy Development and Social Innovation (PDSI), Division of Policy Development and Social Innovation	F
19. Ms. Thapanee Indradat, Director of International Cooperation Section, Department of the Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (DEPD)	F
<u>Ministry of Labour</u>	
20. Dr. Nethnapa Vongskan, Policy and Plan Analyst, Strategy and Planning Division (PPPD), Permanent Secretary Office, Ministry of Labour	F
<u>Social Security Office (SSO)</u>	
21. Ms. Jeeranush Kongmanee, Legal Specialist, Legal Affairs Division	F
22. Ms. Oranee Pantapalin, Senior Social Security Officer, Contribution Bureau	F

23. Ms. Dollaporn Nakdee, Senior Social Security Officer, Office of Social Security Development for Informal Workers	F
24. Ms. Chayanee Paweerawat, Senior Foreign Relations Officer, Policy and Planning Division	F
25. Mr. Supakorn Loychusak, Social Security Officer, Policy and Planning Division	M
Ministry of Finance	
26. Mr. Pawin Parapuntakul, Economist, Fiscal Policy Office (FPO)	M
Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council (NESDC)	
27. Ms. Pataraporn Laowong, Plan and Policy Analysts,	F
Research Institutions:	
28. Dr. Nada Wasi, Research Director Puey Ungphakorn Institute of Economic Research, Bank of Thailand (PIER)	F
29. Dr. Somchai Jitsuchon, Research Director, Thailand Development Research Institute (TDRI)	M
Civil Society/Employer Organizations:	
30. Mr. Ukrih Kanchanaketu, Employers Confederation of Thailand (ECOT)	M
31. Ms. Poonsub Suanmuang Tulaphan, HomeNet Foundation	F
32. Dr. Pongthiti Pongsilamane, State Enterprises Workers' Relations Confederation (SERC)	M
33. Mr. Chao Klaicharoen, National Congress Private Industrial Employees (NCPE)	M

Annex 4: Results as per JP Programmatic Results Framework

Results as per the JP Programmatic Results Framework

(Source: JP Annual Progress Report 2020-2021 (2022: 14-20)).

Below this table a summary is provided of the results.

Result / Indicators	Baseline	Expected 2021 target	2021 Result	Reasons for variance from planned target (if any)	Expected Final target
Outcome 1: Integrated policy solutions developed following a review of the social protection system					
Outcome 1 indicator – The Royal Thai Government has a National Social Protection Policy with cross-sectoral relevance	No	Yes	No	The 13 th National Economic and Social Development Plan with strategies and targets on Social Protection is being drafted.	Yes. The National Economic and Social Development Plan with national development plan on social protection will be finalized in mid-2022.
Output 1.1 – Policy dialogue to foster dialogue on strategic directions for SP in Thailand					
Output 1.1 indicator - # of high-level policy dialogue events	0	1	0	Event moved to end of the JP Implementation Period (May or June 2022)	1
Output 1.1 indicator - # of technical seminars associated with the development of a social protection review	0	4	6 (Workshops on Pension, Migrant Workers, SPDR Kick-off Webinar, Children, Active Working Age, and Academic, Social		9 (6 in 2021 + 3 in 2022: Social Protection Financing Workshop, Visioning Workshop, and Policy Reform Options Workshop)

			Partners, and CSOs Webinars)		
Output 1.1. indicator - # of policy recommendations resulting from the high-level policy dialogue events and technical seminars	0	5	2 (Technical Note on COVID-19 Response)	Delays in arranging seminars/workshops due to COVID-19 situation.	12 (2 in 2020 + 1 in 2021 + 9 in 2022: SPDR, Mapping and Vulnerability Analysis Report, Social Protection Financing, Social Budgeting Report, Background Papers on Children, Informal Economy, Pension, Migrant, and Gender, and Policy Review on Domestic Workers in Thailand)
Output 1.2 – Public Advocacy on the importance of Social Protection is increased, including among the public opinion and decision makers					
Output 1.2 indicator - A media campaign to promote social protection is being implemented	No	Yes	No	COVID-19	Yes in 2022. Media campaign implemented (press release and possible media interviews)
Output 1.2 indicator – Level of public awareness on Social Protection	Low	High	Medium	The public and decision makers are more aware of the importance of Social Protection. Communication activities are moved to 2022 when the reports are ready to publicize.	High
Output 1.2 indicator – Number of policy advocacy events to be run by the National Civil Society Coalition	No	Yes	No	COVID-19	0
Output 1.2 indicator – # of meetings with key policy makers, parliamentarians and political parties	0	1	0	Rescheduled meeting with Secretary-General of Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council (NESDC) to 2022	3 (2 in 2020: Met with Permanent Secretaries of MSDHS and Ministry of Labour in 2020; 1 in 2022: Meeting with

					NESDC rescheduled to Q1 2022)
Output 1.2 indicator – Thailand is a member of the Global Universal Social Protection Coalition	No	Yes	No	Will determine in 2022 if the JP has enough time and resources to pursue this Output.	No
Output 1.3 – A comprehensive review of the social protection system is developed followed by policy recommendations towards a more inclusive, integrated and coherent system					
Output 1.3 indicator - A Mapping of Welfare Schemes exists and is available for discussions by senior stakeholders	No	Yes	Yes	The report has been published for a limited circulation for a validation purpose. The finalized publication will be publicly available in 2022.	Yes
Output 1.3 indicator - # of background papers supporting the SP Review ready and available for discussion by National Welfare Committee or Cabinet	0	3	4 (Background Papers on Children, Informal Economy, Migrant Workers, and Pension available)	N/A	5
Output 1.3 indicator – A background paper on Social Protection and Gender is available	0	Yes	No	COVID-19, delayed to Q2 2022	Yes
Output 1.3 indicator – Background paper on Social Protection and Migrant workers are available	0	Yes	Yes	The report was published for a limited circulation for validation by key government agencies, NGOs, works and employers’ organizations, and academic institutions at the Validation Workshop The finalized publication will be publicly available in 2022.	Yes
Output 1.3 indicator – Background paper on Social Protection and Persons with disabilities is available	0	Yes	No		Yes

Output 1.3 indicator – A Comprehensive Review of the SP System in Thailand is finalized and includes policy recommendations for the National Welfare Committee or Cabinet	0	Yes	No	COVID-19, delayed to Q2 2022	Yes
Output 1.3 – A Budget Forecasting tool is developed and available for use by MSDHS/FPO and BB	0	Yes	No	The tool is under the development process. It will be finalized in Q1 2022	Yes
Output 1.4 - National Social Protection Policy Framework and a National Social Protection Monitoring Framework					
Output 1.4 indicator – A draft of the National Social Protection Policy/Strategy is finalized before adoption by Cabinet	No	Yes	No	The 13 th National Economic and Social Development Plan with strategies and target for national development on social protection is being drafted and will be finalized in 2022.	Yes
Outcome 2: Scale up of coverage of the CSG from 700,000 children to 2 million by end 2021 as a result of strengthened integrated SP systems					
Outcome 2 indicator - Coverage of the Child Support Grant	700,000	2 million	2.3 million (as of December 2021)	New policy expanding CSG to 4 million eligible children pending cabinet approval.	2 million
Output 2.1 Improved capacity of the national identification system to register and monitor through the MIS the registration of new beneficiaries					
Output 2.1 indicator - Technical assessment of the MIS system in place with recommendations for technical upgrade of the system, including resources (financial and human) required for its	No	Yes	Yes	The technical report was conducted in 2020 and key recommendations were implemented in 2021 until present.	Yes

operation					
Output 2.1 indicator – Revised MIS upgraded	No	Yes	Yes	95% completed. The enhanced MIS is being tested and will be hand overed to the Government in early 2022. One training to prepare the Government for the testing and handover was organized in September 2021. The JP has continued providing technical support during the testing and handover. An additional module on grievances is being developed. A series of training on the enhanced CSG MIS and the development of user training materials will be conducted in Q1 2022.	Yes
Output 2.2: National policy consultations on integration of the cash/non-cash under the Child support grant with transformative programs for ECD in place for maximizing the potential of the grant to all children					
Output 2.2 indicator - Number of consultation meetings organized that resulted in policy proposals	0	4	1	One consultation meeting organized in December 2021.	4
Output 2.2 indicator – Draft of revised integrated policy available for adoption by NCYDC	0	2	0	Work in progress	2
Output 2.3: Evidence generation for the impact of the grant on young children in Thailand to inform further policy expansions towards UCSG					
Output 2.3 indicator – MoU in place for the research partnership for evidence generation	No	Yes	Yes	Work in progress. TDRI has conducted the three assessments at the moment.	Yes
Output 2.3 indicator - Research design adopted for a longitudinal evaluation and implementation	No	Yes	No	Work in progress.	Yes

Output 2.3 indicator – Research is being implemented	No	Yes	No	Work in progress.	Yes
Output 2.4: Improved public and programme communication					
Output 2.4 indicator - Public communication strategy finalized and adopted by the MSDHS	No	Yes	Yes	The communications strategy of the CSG was in place in 2021. Currently the Government with support from the UNJP, has implemented the prioritized recommendations in the strategy.	Yes
Output 2.4 indicator - Program communication strategy in place on the revised CSG	No	Yes	Yes		Yes
Output 2.4 indicator - # of visits of the bilingual website on the GSC	N/A	3.3 million	3.5 million	Based on the CSG website, https://csg.dcy.go.th/th/home 192,000 likes on the CSG Facebook, https://www.facebook.com/CSGProjectOfficial/	3.3 million
Output 2.4 indicator – # of staff trained on the new integrated policy design	0	100	383	383 CSG implementing staff trained on public and programme communication in January 2021.	100
Outcome 3: Policy options to ensure a more effective coverage of domestic workers, including migrants, within the existing social security schemes, are designed and tested					
Outcome 3 indicator# Reform proposals for the inclusion and increased registration of domestic workers approved	No	1	0	Work in progress. Delay due to COVID-19 situation.	1
Output 3.1 Policy assessment and design of innovative program solutions to eliminate the barriers for the coverage of domestic workers developed and discussed					
Output 3.1 indicator# Report reviewing the existing policy, schemes and barriers and proposing solutions to reduce barriers	0	1	0	Work in progress.	1 (Policy Review on Domestic Workers in Thailand – in progress)

and increase access to domestic workers to social protection is available					
Output 3.1 indicator# No. of workshops organized to discuss design solutions	0	2	1 (Extension of Coverage Workshops)	Consultation Workshop on Domestic Workers will be held once the Policy Review is ready in Q2 2022)	3 (Two Extension of Coverage Workshops in 2020 and 2021 + 1 Consultation Workshop in 2022)
Output 3.1 indicator# Technical note detailing final scheme design proposal, including administrative elements, is available	0	1	1 (Technical Brief on Domestic Workers in Thailand)		1
Output 3.1 indicator# of female domestic workers attending dialogue sessions on the design of the scheme	0	150	0	Due to the COVID-19 situation, dialogue session will be changed to qualitative interviews and quantitative survey.	20 Qualitative interviews + 200 Quantitative survey.
Output 3.2 Pre-test of suggested policy options with targeted domestic workers completed and assessed					
Output 3.2 indicator# A campaign is being implemented to promote the extension of coverage to domestic workers	0	1	1	N/A	1
Output 3.2 indicator# Level of awareness of DWs and SS benefits and regulations	Low	High	Low	Awareness activities will be implemented 2022.	High
Output 3.2 indicator# Policy options assessed based on the results of the campaign	0	3	0	To be implemented after the completion of the policy review under Output 3.1.	3

Annex 5: Risk Management Matrix

The Updated JP Risk Management Matrix is as follows (Source: Progress Report on 2021; 2022: 22-25):

Risks	Risk Level: (Likelihood x Impact)	Likelihood Certain - 5 Likely - 4 Possible - 3 Unlikely - 2 Rare - 1	Impact: Essential - 5 Major - 4 Moderate - 3 Minor - 2 Insignificant - 1	Mitigating measures	Responsible Org./Person
Contextual risks					
Changes in political priorities – Especially the focus on COVID-19 situation and response.	Medium	3	3	The JP continued systematic involvement of partners in project implementation have mitigated some risks. Engagements in the development of the programme document and participatory process proved effective. The Project Steering Committee meetings, consultative meetings and workshops were organized, and the work plan for all occasions explained and updated with counterparts to ensure buy-in of national stakeholders. However, COVID-19 and the unstable political situation are still looming towards end of 2021.	RC and PUNOs
Deviation of the project objective by Politicians associated to the project	Medium	3	2	Engagement with politicians interested by this issue was in plan for the launch event with Ministers from different ministries and guest speakers attending. However, due to the COVID-19 situation and the schedule conflicts of key ministers, the event was postponed to 2022, along with the involvement of the communication strategies.	Office of the Permanent Secretary of MSDHS with support from PUNOs
Programmatic risks					
Willingness of national stakeholders to collaborate amongst themselves	Medium	3	3	The involvement of the different line ministries in the JP's implementation and activities increased collaboration between the agencies, which will eventually lead to the development of integrated policy frameworks. The JP is	Each PUNO is responsible in encouraging participation with the

				maintaining the engagement levels and relationship of all stakeholders involved.	working groups, they are supporting. MSDHS to reach out to relevant ministries in case of difficulties in collaboration.
Negative sentiments and discriminatory attitudes towards migrant workers influence political openness to extend coverage to them	High	4	3	Consultative meetings and workshops with relevant stakeholders have been conducted to ensure migrant workers' rights and needs are included in the policy dialogue. This is supported by the JP's communication strategy to provide evidence-based targeted messages, highlighting positive socioeconomic contribution of migrant workers and a need to provide them social protection, as well as advocacy message in the context of COVID-19 where no one is safe until everyone is safe in order to adjust changes in public opinions and to harness the opportunity available given the degree of public support for advocacy for policy change that take into consideration the inclusion of social protection for migrant workers.	IOM with support of ILO and other UN partner agencies
Institutional risks					
High staff turnover – line Ministry staff regularly change;	Medium	3	3	The JP organized several activities and workshops involving participation of both high-level and technical-level officials to ensure that the knowledge is not lost with the changes in departmental leadership.	ILO assessed training needs with PUNOs and MSDHS' support.
Fiduciary risks					
Thailand's economic performance: funding for social protection is dependent on revenue created so a contraction of the economy could reduce the fiscal space available.	Medium	3	4	The JP is working on a Social Protection Financing Report and Social Budgeting Report to reemphasize the importance and long-term benefits of enhancing the Social Protection systems and schemes.	PUNOs with support from UNRC, IMF, WB, ADB

Annex 6: Set of Recommendations by the JP to the RTG

During the meeting with the MSDHS Minister on 27 April 2022 the UNRC has presented seven key recommendations that emerged from the diagnostics conducted by the JP:

- 1) The first recommendation is to scale up benefits under the Child, Elderly and Disability grants to keep pace with the cost of living. The current values for the grants were established years ago and need to be adjusted to today's conditions to secure lives.
- 2) The second recommendation is to universalize the Child Grant scheme, as a little over half of children between 0 to 6 years do not receive cash support. The UN recommends establishing a roadmap for gradual implementation bearing in mind the fiscal constraints of the government.
- 3) The third recommendation is to consider moving domestic workers to Section 33 of the Social Security Act, making coverage mandatory and employers as responsible as workers for contributions. Our analysis shows that domestic workers, who constitute anywhere up to 500,000, have both interest and the capacity to make contributions. For the government this would imply an additional financing of XX%.
- 4) The fourth recommendation is to create an entry-level package as a pilot to formalize those working in micro and small enterprises, in sectors such as commerce, transport and tourism [wholesale and retail trade, construction, and food and accommodation], by introducing a single registration and payment system for tax and social security alongside other incentives. Together such an approach would ensure that over 7 million workers currently not covered by social protection would become part of the system. My colleague from ILO can talk more to this.
- 5) Fifth recommendation is to integrate contributory and non-contributory benefits through a tiered approach, which could be used for Pensions, Family/Children and Disability grants.
- 6) The sixth recommendation is to integrate the social protection data and payments infrastructure.
- 7) And finally, given the significant reforms proposed, we recommend establishing a coordination body to drive the process forward.

Annex 7: Attendees at Stakeholder Workshop

The Stakeholder Workshop was held virtually via Zoom on Thursday 26 May 2022. The international consultant presented the preliminary findings, after which a general discussion was moderated by the ILO Evaluation Manager. The 30 attendees were as follows:

National Stakeholders:

1. Mr. Thanasunthorn Swangsalee, Deputy Permanent Secretary, MSDHS
2. Ms. Nantnadda Ritmontri, Director, Policy Development and Social Innovation, MSDHS
3. Ms. Pornpirin Inso, Policy Development and Social Innovation, MSDHS
4. Ms. Pornthip Sawangwareesakul, Policy Development and Social Innovation, MSDHS
5. Mr. Krittatee Amolthitwarakron, Policy Development and Social Innovation, MSDHS
6. Dr. Nethnapa Vongskan, Strategy and Planning Division, Permanent Secretary Office, MOL
7. Mrs. Punnarat Morkmoang, Contributions Bureau, SSO
8. Mr. Thanodom Jariyapan, Policy and Planning Division, SSO
9. Mrs. Dollaporn Nakdee, Office of Social Security Development for Informal Workers, SSO
10. Mr. Kanchitpon Soonthonchaiya, Legal Affairs Division, SSO
11. Mr. Pawin Parapuntakul, Economist, FPO
12. Mr. Ukrish Kanchanaketu, ECOT
13. Ms. Lamyuang Suanboon, SERC
14. Ms. Poonsap Tulaphan, HomeNet Foundation

ILO

15. Mr. Graeme Buckley, ILO
16. Mr. Nuno Cunha, ILO
17. Ms. Pamonrat Pringsulaka, ILO
18. Ms. Jittima Srisuknam, ILO
19. Ms. Rattanaporn Pongpattana, ILO
20. Mr. Vasu Thirasak, ILO

UNICEF

21. Ms. Sarah Shahyar, UNICEF
22. Mr. Oscar Huertas, UNICEF
23. Ms. Khwanploy Cheechang, UNICEF
24. Ms. Siriporn (Cherie) Arunsangsuree, UNICEF

IOM

25. Mr. Max Pottler, IOM
26. Ms. Vivienne Liang, IOM
27. Ms. Jitradee Singhakowin, IOM

UN Women

28. Ms. Naruedee Janthasing, UN Women

Evaluators

29. Mr. Theo Van Der Loop, Evaluator
30. Ms. Napapan Der Kinderen, Evaluator

Annex 8: Evaluation Work Plan

Updated Work Plan by Phase, Deliverables, Timeline and Level of Effort of Evaluators.

Phase	2022	Tentative Timeline	IE/Days	NE/Days
Inception Phase	28 Mar – 8 Apr	Briefings, Develop Inception Report	10	2
	8 – 11 Apr	ERG/JEC review of Inception Report		
Data Collection Phase	11 - 15 Apr	(<i>Songkran/Thai holiday</i>) Revise inception report by IE Interview International Stakeholders	7	7
	18 –10 May	Data collection: Interviews		
Two Workshops	19 May	1) Present Preliminary Findings to the PUNOs.	10	3
	26 May	2) Stakeholders' Validation Workshop (to be attended by all stakeholders).		
Draft/Final Report	11 - 28 May	Write Draft report		
	28 May	Share Draft Report with Key Stakeholders for review		
	June	Send consolidated comments to Evaluators Finalize report & Validate the Translation into Thai	3	3
	June	Evaluators submit Final Report		
TOTAL			30	15

Annex 9: Lessons Learned (LL) and Good Practices (GP)

This Annex provides the full description of two Lessons Learned (LL) and two Good Practices (GP) in the new ILO Templates as follows:

Accelerating Progress towards an Integrated and Modernized Social Protection System for All in Thailand (United Nations Joint Programme on Social Protection for All in Thailand)

Project DC/SYMBOL: THA/19/50/UND

Name of Evaluator: Theo van der Loop and Napapan der Kinderen

Date: 29 June 2022

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

<i>LESSON LEARNED ELEMENT</i>	<i>TEXT</i>
Brief description of lessons learned (link to specific action or task)	The potential for impact and sustainability of an intervention are substantially enhanced if they are developed and implemented simultaneously with the development of national or sectoral economic and/or social development plans.
Context and any related preconditions	The UN Joint Programme (JP) started when the National Economic and Social Development Council (NESDC) was developing its 13th National Economic and Social Development Plan (2023 – 2027).
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	Developers of new interventions of the PUNOs.
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	The challenge is to align the timing of the intervention to the development of the national plan.
Success / Positive Issues -Causal factors	The JP provided inputs to this Plan which can be illustrated by a quote from the speech of the Secretary General of the NESDC on 18 May 2022 to ECOSOC: “The situation analysis from the diagnostic review is one of valuable resource as an input for drafting the 13th National Economic and Social Development Plan (2023 – 2027) especially in a social protection milestone we would like to achieve in the next 5 years.”
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	The planning of new interventions should take into account the planning of the government of national or sectoral plans.

Accelerating Progress towards an Integrated and Modernized Social Protection System for All in Thailand (United Nations Joint Programme on Social Protection for All in Thailand)

Project DC/SYMBOL: THA/19/50/UND

Name of Evaluator: Theo van der Loop and Napapan der Kinderen

Date: 29 June 2022

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

<i>LESSON LEARNED ELEMENT</i>	<i>TEXT</i>
Brief description of lessons learned (link to specific action or task)	Extensive networking through workshops, meetings, trainings, advocacy, informal app groups, etc. leads to incremental changes in mindsets of the stakeholders as was found by the evaluation through the interviews conducted with stakeholders. Several staff members, especially mid-level, of MSDHS, SSO and NESDC underlined this, and also most of the involved PUNO's mentioned this in the interviews conducted.
Context and any related preconditions	The JP was transparent with its aims and shared information and data with all government and other counterparts throughout the whole period of implementation of the JP. This helped with the consolidation of information from different government agencies and emphasized the importance of sharing information through networking. The JP activities brought officials who worked on different parts of the social protection system together in the same room to holistically examine the social protection system and understand better the links between each part. The process of engaging and exchanging information with stakeholders during data collection, key informant interviews, and consultation workshops led to incremental changes in mindsets especially of mid-level government staff in MSDHS, SSO and NESDC, and <i>potentially</i> drive changes in policies toward a more integrated social protection system and the inclusion of different vulnerable groups. In addition, the involvement of CSOs, social partners and research institutes supported this process further by exchanging views with government organisations and sharing information
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	Government Organisations, CSOs, Social Partners and Research Institutes.
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	The challenge was to conduct meetings during the COVID-19 pandemic while face-to-face encounters usually provide more opportunities for enhanced networking.
Success / Positive Issues -Causal factors	Positive changes in the mindsets of the stakeholders involved especially of mid-level government staff in MSDHS, SSO and NESDC.

ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	Budget resources for networking in new interventions.
--	---

Accelerating Progress towards an Integrated and Modernized Social Protection System for All in Thailand (United Nations Joint Programme on Social Protection for All in Thailand)

Project DC/SYMBOL: THA/19/50/UND

Name of Evaluator: Theo van der Loop and Napapan der Kinderen

Date: 29 June 2022

The following emerging good practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.

<i>GOOD PRACTICE ELEMENT</i>	<i>TEXT</i>
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	The implementation of the JP by four Partner UN Organisations (PUNOs) was a Good Practice.
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	The implementation of the JP by four Partner UN Organisations (PUNOs) was a Good Practice because the JP could piggyback on long-standing partnerships between PUNOs and Government and other National Stakeholders and because the combined legitimacy and credibility of these PUNOs convinced the national stakeholders to be involved actively in social protection.
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	The strong networking activities of the JP and its four PUNOs brought together multi-stakeholders to exchange views, and enhanced and extended several long-standing partnerships, such as UNICEF – MSDHS (including DCY); ILO – MoL (including SSO); IOM – MoFA; UN Women - DWAFD/MSDHS; ILO – Social Partners; UNICEF – TDRI; ILO – HomeNet; and IOM – MWG. This also further enhanced the combined legitimacy and credibility of the four implementing PUNOs.
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	Partnerships were enhanced and extended with the relevant national stakeholders.
Potential for replication and by whom	Potential for replication in UN Joint Programmes, in particular also those funded by the Joint SDG Fund.

Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	Enhances UNCT coherence, and contributes to the country UNSDCF, the UN Reform and the SDGs.
Other documents or relevant comments	Not applicable.

Accelerating Progress towards an Integrated and Modernized Social Protection System for All in Thailand (United Nations Joint Programme on Social Protection for All in Thailand)

Project DC/SYMBOL: THA/19/50/UND

Name of Evaluator: Theo van der Loop and Napapan der Kinderen

Date: 29 June 2022

The following emerging good practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.

<i>GOOD PRACTICE ELEMENT</i>	<i>TEXT</i>
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	The comprehensive process of the Diagnostic Review of the JP is a Good Practice involving a combination of background studies, workshops to discuss research findings, the formulation of recommendations, technical meetings to review these recommendations, and a synthesis report launched at a final programme event.
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	The Thailand Social Protection Diagnostic Review (SPDR) of the JP is based on six background studies and a series of workshops with many different stakeholders to discuss the findings of these studies resulting in a comprehensive Set of Recommendations which in their turn were reviewed and revised through a series of technical meetings with the stakeholders. In addition, the design of the JP contributed to this process with its combination of approaches (Outcomes) focusing, on the one hand, on the national policy level aiming for system reform and Universality of social protection (Outcome 1) and, on the other hand, on selected instruments (i.e. grants; Outcome 2) and/or targeted groups (i.e. domestic workers; Outcome 3).
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	The comprehensiveness of the Diagnostic review is important to involve the stakeholders and to arrive at a Set of Recommendations recognizable and potentially acceptable for most stakeholders.

Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	Public and private stakeholders should be involved.
Potential for replication and by whom	Potentially replicable in different types of interventions.
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	Linked to the Country Programmes of the PUNOs, the UNSDCF and the SDGs.
Other documents or relevant comments	The synthesis report of the SPDR is currently in its final stages and the Launch Event is being organised for later in June 2022.

Annex 10: Documents Consulted

Evaluation Documents:

- Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Final Independent Evaluation of UNJP Thailand, November 2021 (see Annex 1).
- Inception Report (11 April 2022).

UNJP Thailand Programme Documents:

- Joint Programme Document (PRODOC) for the United Nations Joint Programme on Social Protection for All in Thailand (Revised, 27 August 2021).
- Progress reports
- Minutes of the meetings of the Project Steering Committee (PSC)
- DWCP Thailand
- Relevant ILO's P&B's, and Centenary Initiatives.
- UNPAF and UNSDCF on Thailand.
- Research and studies conducted by the Project
- Financial reports
- Websites, including of the project.

UNJP Thailand Strategic Documents (cf. Progress report 2021 p.20-22):

- 1) Technical Note on Protecting the Most Vulnerable from the Impact of COVID-19; 03/2020.
- 2) The Technical Note on Protecting the most vulnerable from socio-economic impacts of COVID-19; 05/2021.
- 3) Technical Brief: Opportunities for extending social security protection to domestic workers in Thailand; 06/2021.
- 4) Background Paper on Social Protection for Migrant Worker and their Families in Thailand; 06/2021.
- 5) UNCT Social Impact Assessment of COVID-19 in Thailand; 07/2020; <https://thailand.un.org/sites/default/files/2020-09/Social%20Impact%20Assessment%20of%20COVID-19%20in%20Thailand-EN-Designed.pdf>
- 6) Letter to the Office of Council of State, and Policy Brief: Towards better retirement benefits in Thailand, 27 September 2021; 09/2021.
- 7) Technical Note on Protecting the Most Vulnerable from the Impact of COVID-19: Migrant Workers; 03/2020.
- 8) Technical Note on Protecting the Most Vulnerable from the Socio-Economic Impacts of COVID-19: Communities affected by COVID-19, families with children, people with disabilities, elderlies, and migrant workers; 05/2021.
- 9) Technical Brief: Opportunities for extending social security protection to domestic workers in Thailand: Domestic Workers and Migrant Domestic Workers; 06/2021.
- 10) Background Paper on Social Protection for Migrant Workers and their Families in Thailand; 06/2021.

Overall Evaluation Documents

- UNEG Resource Pack on Joint evaluation
- United Nations Evaluation Group. 2008. Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation in the UN System

- United Nations Evaluation Group. 2014. Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations
- United Nations Evaluation Group. 2016. Norms and Standards for Evaluation
- United Nations Evaluation Group. 2018. UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator - Technical Note and Scorecard
- ILO (2020): Policy guidelines for results-based evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 4th edition (Nov 2020). ILO-EVAL, Geneva. See: https://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS_571339/lang--en/index.htm
- ILO Checklist No. 3 Writing the inception report
- ILO Checklist 5 preparing the evaluation report
- ILO Checklist 6 rating the quality of evaluation report
- ILO Template for lessons learnt
- ILO Template for Emerging Good practices
- ILO Guidance note 7 Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation
- ILO Guidance note 4 Integrating gender equality in M&E of projects
- ILO Template for evaluation title page
- ILO Template for evaluation summary
- EVAL (2020): Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO: An internal guide on adapting to the situation. Geneva: http://www.ilo.ch/wcmstp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_741206.pdf, and: www.ilo.ch/eval/WCMS_744068/lang--en/index.htm
- ILO EVAL (2021): ILO's response to the impact of COVID-19 on the world of work: Evaluative lessons on how to build a better future of work after the pandemic (August 2021): <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2787>
- OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation (2019): Better Criteria for Better Evaluation; Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use. December 2019.