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# **Executive summary**

#### Evaluation object, aims, background and scope

This evaluation has focused on the TUDCN-implemented project *‘Consolidating the contribution of an inclusive Trade Union Development Cooperation Network for more effective impact and development effectiveness’*, which covered the period 2011 – 2012 and has been funded by the European Commission. Where necessary to assess the network’s present performance and achievements, developments from before the 2011-2012 period have also been taken into account.

The main objectives of this evaluation were (1) to demonstrate to which extent the TUDCN has been able to produce *a specific added value* and has the potential to continue doing so in the future, (2) to account for the use of the resources received and (3) to learn lessons from the TUDCN activities, approach and results achieved with a view of improving future performance of the network, in particular in relation to the next project that is expected to start in April 2013.

TUDCN has been established in 2007 following the first ITUC congress in Vienna by a core group of national trade unions (TU) active in development cooperation. It became a formal TU network for coordinating TU development cooperation via support achieved from the EU in 2008-2009. Two other EU supported projects allowed TUDCN to consolidate its achievements and to further expand its scope (both in geographic and program terms), thereby attaching specific attention to the inclusion of Southern Organisations. As such, the TUDCN has today become a unique trade union platform for development cooperation bringing together a broad range of TU-related organisations. Its mandate is (1) to improve trade union development cooperation effectiveness through sharing of information and practices and by stimulating improved impact and results of the solidarity efforts within the trade union movement; and (2) to ensure input of trade union views in the development related policy debates.

#### **Evaluation approach and methodology**

The evaluation approach and methodology have been designed in view of the particular characteristics of the evaluation object (a worldwide network), the aims of the evaluation and the resources available for the evaluation. The evaluation was implemented via three phases: an inception phase consisting mainly of initial contacts and discussions between the evaluation team and the TUDCN secretariat, an implementation phase with a varied range of activities including documentary analysis, interviews with internal and external stakeholders and an electronic survey sent to 245 members, and a synthesis phase consisting of pulling together and triangulating the findings obtained, based on which the evaluation report has been drafted. The evaluation process started in December 2012 and ended in April 2013 with the presentation and discussion of the main findings at the TUDCN General Meeting.

While the evaluation could be roughly implemented as planned, the evaluation team faced a few methodological challenges in view of guaranteeing the validity of the analysis and findings. These challenges relate to the nature of TUCDN itself as a worldwide network and, more importantly, to the poor response rate (8.6%) to the survey, which might imply that the results obtained are not representative for the network in its entirety.

#### **TUDCN’s institutional setup**

TUDCN is the Development Cooperation Network under the ITUC, which represents 175 million workers in 156 countries and territories as members of its 315 national affiliated trade union centres or confederations[[1]](#footnote-2). Its membership is composed of the (1) ITUC affiliates and (2) ITUC regional federations, and further (3) the TU-SSO (Solidarity Support Organisations, mostly national organisations having the mandate to organise and implement TU development cooperation programmes) and (4) the so-called Global Union Federations (GUF) that represent workers from organisations belonging to the same sector. The network has a *General Meeting* (GM), which is the main decision-making body and meets twice a year, a *Facilitation and Steering Group* (FSG) that monitors programme implementation in-between the general meetings and assists the secretariat in implementing the network’s activities, and *Working Groups* (WG) organised around key TUDCN programme issues such as development effectiveness and EU policies. In 2011-2012 the *TUDCN secretariat* was composed of a network coordinator (3/4 FTE), an advocacy officer (1 FTE), one outreach officer responsible for communication (1 FTE) and an administrative assistant (1/2 FTE).

Over the 2011 – 2012 period, most funding was provided via the EU project (budget € 1,331,530), of which 75% (€ 998,648) has been contributed by the EC.

#### Key achievements of TUDCN

**1. TUDCN is a well functioning network that is able to ensure the interest and participation of a broad group of members who strongly belief in its need and added value.**

TUDCN’s achievements in terms of network development can be analysed as follows:

**The goals of the network are widely known and understood by the network members**. There is a broad consensus on the relevance and importance of the two main objectives of TUDCN – representation of TUs in the international development debates and advocacy on one hand, and improving the effectiveness of TU development cooperation on the other hand. These goals also correspond with the members’ expectations towards the network and address what many actors consider as important shortcomings of TU development cooperation in the past, namely: the absence of TUs in the international development debate, the low level of effectiveness of TU development actions and of coordination between these actions.

Moreover, the evaluation revealed that members’ expectations have not significantly changed over time, which indicates that members know what they can/should expect from the network and that the network is adequately responding to these expectations. It appears also that the network raised the members’ interest in being informed on issues that are on the international development agenda, an area many members were relatively unfamiliar with in the past.

The findings depicted above apply at least for those members who are moderately to strongly involved in the network. It is less clear in how far the network and its goals are also well known by the broader group of (potential) members, and in how far this affects their (lack of) commitment with the network. It is likely that members’ expectations and priorities, e.g. with regard to the focus of the advocacy work, will also become more diverse in as far as TUDCN will increasingly realise its ambition of becoming more inclusive and representative as a global TU network. To deal with the complexity of members’ interests and expectations will thus most probably remain an important challenge in the future.

**Members have possibilities to participate in the network’s decision-making and activities and there is a feeling of ownership of the network. There are however still a number of important challenges in this regard.** At present, TUDCN functions as an open platform with a loose membership structure. As such, the network is easily accessible for those interested. It however poses some challenges in terms of membership management and in terms of representation.

Member participation is encouraged in different ways, which makes that most members feel they have sufficient possibilities to contribute information to the network, to participate in the network’s activities and in decision-making. In practice, active participation remains confined to a small group of committed members however. While this should not be considered a major shortcoming as such – many networks rely on a limited group of active members for achieving their goals, moreover real participation requires serious investment (in terms of time and effort) which not everybody can make - care should be taken that TUDCN does not become too much an affaire of ‘insiders’, gradually leaving the broader group of members – with their particular expectations and interests – behind.

An important weakness with regard to member representation and participation, especially in view of TUDCN’s ambition of becoming a unique and “inclusive” platform representing the voice of TU movement in the international development debate, is that some important TU actors still remain underrepresented. Particularly the underrepresentation of the South and the absence of the GUFs are considered as a major problem. Participation of the South has increased over the past two years but still there is a lot to do in terms of strengthening the regional network dynamics, and to develop mechanisms to adequately include Southern members and their points of view in the overall networking process. The reasons for the low interest from the GUFs are not always clear. There are indications that some GUFs feel uncomfortable with TUDCN’s ambition of becoming a unique actor representing the ‘voice’ of the TU movement in international forums. This might not only conflict with the GUFs own advocacy agenda, but also with the GUFs autonomy from by the ITUC (TUDCN is perceived as an ITUC initiative, rather than as a semi-independent network with broader membership). There is a demand for clarifying role and relationships in this regard.

There is a good level of trust among network members and in the work of the secretariat and the working groups. The conferences organised in 2009-2010 have played an important role in trust building; at present the General Meetings have taken over this role. Trust building becomes more challenging where members have competing interests and expectations (which is the case in some regions in the South; it might as well be the case for some of the GUFs). In line with what has been said above, trust building is thus likely to become a major point of attention as the network gradually becomes more inclusive and diverse.

Opinions diverge on whether the present structure of network **– with the secretariat, the FSG, the general meeting and 2 working groups – is optimally fitting the purpose of the network.** The regionalisation of the network in the South as well as the integration of TUDCN in the ITUC (see further), are seen as the major challenges in this regard.

The **TUDCN secretariat** plays a key role in implementing the different activities of the network. Its work is highly appreciated and the present secretariat is considered competent to fulfil its tasks. Some however feel that the secretariat risks to work too autonomously, and to focus too much on the external advocacy work, at the expense of investing in internal network strengthening (including the strengthening of the network dynamics in the regions) and member participation.

The **Facilitation and Steering Group** has not yet fully taken up its role as a governance structure, representing the different categories of membership groups, despite repeated efforts to improve its functioning. It is expected that the recent 2-days meeting of the FSG, in January 2013, will act as a new starting point in re-dynamising the FSG and increasing its importance for the network.

The General meetings, organised twice a year, bring together all members of the network. The GM endorses all important decisions regarding the networks’ objectives and agenda setting. The GMs are seen as an important network moment and therefore considered very important. TUDCN tries to make optimally use of these network gatherings by putting not only ‘internal affairs’ but also content work on the agenda of the meetings. The drawback is that this usually leads to overloaded agendas that leave too little time for liaising, true exchange and networking.

Two working groups are presently active in TUDCN: a WG on development effectiveness and a WG on EU policies. The WGs played a key role in the preparation of several TUDCN key documents produced over the past two years. The principles outputs of the Development Effectiveness WG have been the “TU principles and guidelines on Development Effectiveness“ (2011) and the “TU Development Effectiveness Profile (TUDEP)” (2011). A document on Monitoring and Evaluation at outcome and impact level is in preparation. The EU working group has been responsible for preparing several TUDCN/ITUC positions with regard to EC policies and documents in the field of development cooperation. The most important products of the working groups are known and highly valued by network members. Members seem to be less familiar with the functioning of the WGs as such. A limitation of the WGs is that they rely on a small number of active participants. This is especially the case for WG on development effectiveness, where the low levels of participation can partially be explained by the very technical character of the work. Whereas the present WG fulfil an important role in the network, some members suggest to look for more diversified ways of member participation, e.g. the creation working groups in the South, punctual working groups focussing on specific themes, online discussions and debates, … so as to make better use of the large potential that is actually available within the network.

**Good communication and information sharing mechanisms are in place**. Network communication is coordinated through the TUDCN secretariat. Communication and information sharing takes place through the TUDCN website, the monthly newsletter, “Trade Union focus on Development”, the dissemination of network documents such as position papers and briefing notes, etc. A ‘projects directory’ has been created, where TUDCN members share information on on-going development projects in the South. Especially the TUDCN newsletter and the communications sent as ITUC briefing notes are considered highly useful by members to remain informed on what is going on in the network, on evolutions in the global development agenda and on how TUs are positioning themselves towards these evolutions. A weakness of the present communication system is that the mailing list used to disseminate information is no longer up-to-date. Another weakness is that member response to calls for contributions remains low, which seems to be a consequence of time constraints rather than of limited interest or lack of willingness to contribute. The creation of less time-consuming and thus more accessible alternatives for members to share information and thoughts might provide part of the solution here.

**Institutional embedment within the ITUC is still weak**. The ITUC hosts the TUDCN secretariat. Within the ITUC structure, TUDCN falls under the direct responsibility of one of the two Deputy General Secretaries. In practice, TUDCN has a quasi-independent status within the ITUC. There is a dependency for practical day-to-day operations (communication, internet, office space, ...) and one of the TUDCN policy officers is now also paid as ITUC staff. At the operational level there is a certain degree of coordination and cooperation between TUDCN and some of the ITUC departments.

The weak institutional embedment mainly relates to the fact that the role and added value of TUDCN seem to be poorly understood by the ITUC management and that political support for the network is low. TUDCN is rather seen as a project that exists because of EU-funding, not as an intrinsic part of the work of the ITUC in the longer-term. More than for its achievements (which are little known and understood), TUDCN seems to be valued for the external funding it brings in. This situation can partially be explained by the fact that, indeed, TUDCN was initially developed as a project, with little participation or involvement from the ITUC management. Another factor is that development cooperation is generally not considered a TU priority, which in turn has to do with the fact that there is still a lot of misunderstanding of what development cooperation is about (it is mainly seen as ‘sending funds to projects in the South’, not as working on an agenda for development).

Many actors see the weak political support from the ITUC, as well as the weak institutionalisation of TUDCN within the ITUC as a major weakness, jeopardizing both the legitimacy of the network and its sustainability in the longer term. Moreover it creates a number of missed opportunities. For instance, the large advocacy potential of TUDCN remains largely under-utilised, and there is little structural co-thinking on development and the role of TUs in development cooperation.

Which form a ‘stronger institutional embedment’ in the ITUC should take is less clear. Becoming an ITUC department would possibly conflict with the network character of TUDCN (as a network, TUDCN should be accountable to its members – which do not only include ITUC-affiliates – rather than to the ITUC hierarchy). In any case, there is a broad agreement that stronger ITUC support is needed, which would minimally imply that the importance of development cooperation and the role of TUDCN are recognised and that a political decision is taken to further support the institutional development of TUDCN.

2. TUDCN has clearly contributed to increased capacity for TU development action in the South and the North but the outreach of its influence might still be limited.

### **In terms of internal achievements, the main results of TUDCN’s action can be summarised as follows:**

The network has undoubtedly contributed to strengthened TU views on development cooperation policies and practices. The major piece of work in this regard is related to the development of the *‘Trade Union Principles and Guidelines on Development Effectiveness’*, which were developed in a consultative way. Many members referred to the principles as a tool providing them with something in common that strengthened their identity and confidence. The principles allow the TUs to both positioning themselves within the large CSO community *and* to articulate their specific identity. Lastly, the principles have also served as a basis for strengthening internal capacities related to development cooperation and development issues at large. While these achievements are important, they also should be framed against the context that in many TUs development cooperation was an issue that had remained largely unaddressed till TUDCN became active. It seems also that these ‘strengthened views’ have allowed TUs opening themselves more broadly for development (cooperation) issues, which implies that TUDCN’s strategy to start with work first on a common view as a basis for further capacity building has worked well.

While TU views on development cooperation have been strengthened, the level of inclusion and ownership of development cooperation within TUs remains still rather shallow. Many TUs have ‘development cooperation partisans’ but they often are not representative for their organisation and point to the difficulties to get development cooperation (in terms of activity domain, views, tools) truly integrated in their organisation. The way the ITUC headquarters position itself towards development cooperation (see above), can be illustrative in this case. As such and apart from the SSOs that are structurally linked to the TUs, TUCDN seems to be the only forum/location where development cooperation themes are *structurally* discussed and embedded.

**TUDCN has substantially contributed to increased coordination and coherence of TU development cooperation**. The lack of coordination among TU development initiatives, both in the North and the South, and leading to duplication of efforts, inefficiency and even competition, has constituted one of the major reasons to create TUDCN. The network has in various ways altered this problematic situation and TUs involved in development cooperation state they now better coordinate their action, aim for more coherence (whereby the principles and guidelines are an important support) and, in some cases, engage in operational cooperation to achieve bigger leverage and impact. Some consider the changes brought by the network in this area as its major achievement.
A key factor in this regard has been in the first instance the creation of the network as such, which filled an important void that had actually existed for too long, and almost automatically implied increased consultation and exchange among TU cadres dealing with development cooperation. A second important factor has been the setup of a project directory that has clearly produced its intended effects, also because members have positively reacted to the network’s appeal to provide information for the directory.
While TUDCN’s success in this area is undeniable, there remain important challenges, in particular in achieving improved coordination and cooperation in the South. A situation where northern partners coordinate their action in particular southern countries/settings so as to achieve bigger coherence and leverage is indeed still quite far away; in addition, with the exception of South America, TUDCN has not yet been that instrumental in promoting South-South cooperation. This can be partially explained by historical and contextual constraints, but certainly also by the so far limited outreach of the network to the South.

**TUDCN has been instrumental in increasing TU capacity and effectiveness for development action.** To start with, the initial achievements clearly have created a fertile ground and an enabling environment for enhancing capacity and effectiveness. In addition the network has undertaken specific activities to increase development capacity and effectiveness in the more technical sense. Some tools have been developed which for many TUs constitute a welcome operational complement to the rather normative and conceptual way development effectiveness has been outlined in the TU principles and guidelines. Two major initiatives stand out in this regard: the development of a TU Development Effectiveness Profile Tool (TUDEP) and the guidance note for TUs on Monitoring and Evaluation at outcome and impact level. While most members rate the TUDEP positively, opinions related to the Monitoring and Evaluation guidance note (which is still in the process of finalisation) are rather mixed. Furthermore, it is clear that TUDCN cannot address the specific needs of *all* members (SSOs versus TUs) in the same way. Understandably it has opted to mainly address the needs of the bulk of its members (TU structures).
In line with what has been mentioned with regard to the ‘TU views and principles’, ensuring the actual use of the tools within the organisation has often been a challenge. Some consider this as a ‘missing link’ in TUDCN’s support that should be addressed in the future.

### **3. TUDCN has achieved significant external achievements which can be considered exceptional in view of its short lifetime and limited resources**

### **TUDCN’s main external achievements can be summarized as follows.**

**TUDCN has significantly contributed to common TU positions with regard to development and development cooperation.** In view of the diversity of its membership, at least conceptually it might be a challenge for TUDCN to come up with “common positions” that are shared by all members. However, so far no major problems have been experienced in this regard. This can be explained by a combination of factors related to the nature of the positions developed (often of a rather broad nature, with a high level of agreement already existing among TUs), the adequate functioning of the network (good communication, leadership and quality of the secretariat leading to high levels of trust) and the fact that for many members ‘development cooperation’ is a rather new domain.

While things have gone well so far, some issues need to be considered in view of the future. They deal in first instance with the way the network organises internal consultation, which raises questions at the level of some key external actors and might eventually tarnish TUDCN’s image as a unique and truly representative TU network. In addition, so far there are no mechanisms to derive messages organically from the network members and the regions through a bottom-up approach, as (mainly) the secretariat takes the initiative to engage in particular issues whereby – it should be acknowledged – members are consulted adequately.

**TUDCN has succeeded in increasing visibility and recognition of TUs as development actors in their own right.** Overall, ‘*increased visibility and recognition’* is generally considered as a major achievement of TUDCN. Actually, ensuring increased visibility and recognition was a major consideration behind the network’s inception and its first major initiatives, in particular the organisation of high profile public events that were meant to reiterate the importance of TUs as actors in development cooperation.

Apparently, TUDCN has been most successful in this regard at the international level, via its continuous, adequate and skilful involvement in key CSO platforms related to international debates such as the Development Effectiveness debate after the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action, and the EU structured dialogue initiative. TUDCN has also organised a comparative study on donor support systems for TU that has attracted much attention. In these events and initiatives, TUDCN, mainly via its secretariat, adopted roles and positions both as ‘general’ CSO and ‘specific’ TU representative. Considering the TU presence at the level of these forums has for a long time been rather exceptional and even marginal, TUDCN’s participation has led to TUs being recognised as a distinct actor in its own right, both at the level of the larger CSO community and at the level of international development institutions. However, as mentioned in our previous point, the prominent role of secretariat members in these forums has to some extent raised representation concerns. This strong role of the secretariat is also internally viewed as a weakness to be addressed in the future.

Also at regional level TUDCN’s action has led to increased visibility and recognition, in particular in Latin America. At national level, the changes could not be documented fully. It is clear that through various TUDCN actions, members have gained in confidence and skills and in some countries have engaged in joined initiatives that have added to their visibility and recognition. In other countries, specific factors have implied that the effects have remained limited so far.

TUDCN has enhanced increased TU contributions in development debates and policies. In terms of ‘*participation in development debates and policy formulation’*, the findings are closely linked to those dealing with visibility and recognition. Besides the convincing findings at international level, several success stories of TUs making tangible progress in participating in development debates at the national level were identified, but also examples where particular constraints prevented such effective participation. It is difficult to judge to which extent these contributions at national level can overall be considered as a success or not, the more because TUDCN has no mechanism yet for recording achievements at decentralised levels.

Assessing *actual influence* *on (the outcome of) development debates and policies* is even more challenging from a methodological point of view. This being said, it can be safely assumed that increased participation at all levels must have led at least to ‘some’ effective influence on the outcomes of the development debates and on policies. The results seem to be most tangible, or at least visible, at international level. In the process leading to the Busan declaration, TU representatives played a significant role in solidifying the CSO contribution in terms of contents, strategy and organisation and in ensuring that typical TU concerns related to decent work and social protection were included in the declaration. At EU level, some external observers state that the TUs have had ‘tremendous’ impact, among others because their participation in the corresponding Working Group was of good quality. TU representatives managed to bring in ‘typical’ TU preoccupations such as decent work, labour issues and role of the private sector that influenced the final communication with regard to the EU policy towards CSOs.

A few nuances should be added, which however do not truly affect the achievements of the network in this area. First, many of the debates have come from the outside to TUDCN and, hence, were not initiated by TUDCN itself. Consequently, TUDCN has acted rather reactively and not proactively. Second, some state that the high-quality TUDCN inputs (e.g. via position papers) were insufficiently complemented by a more comprehensive campaigning strategy that would fully use its position as the worldwide network representing the ITUC.

**Improved external networking and cooperation**. This achievement can be mainly considered as both the effect *and* the cause of the other external achievements of the network that have been described above. Overall, the network has been highly instrumental in TUs now occupying an important position in many CSO platforms at the international and national level where they are accepted as an actor that enriches the debates and strengthens the platforms while safeguarding their specific interests. As many CSO platforms struggle(d) with issues related to their legitimacy and representation, the active role of TUs in CSO networks has certainly added to the latters’ legitimacy, notwithstanding the fact that much still needs to be done, in particular in terms of ensuring increased representation and influence from the South.

#### **Conclusions**

Overall it can be concluded that TUDCN has succeeded to develop itself into a network that is fairly stable, inclusive, representative and legitimate. It clearly worked along its mandate to improve trade union development effectiveness and to ensure input of TU views in development policy debates, in particular concerning the inclusion of the decent work agenda and democratic ownership. There are in addition clear signs that TUDCN’s work in these areas has been effective to an important degree.

Moreover and while the achievements so far are already substantial, the network has the possibility to further develop the considerable potential of involvement of TUs in development cooperation and, more generally, in promoting a more equal, democratic and sustainable development.

Whether or not the network will effectively be able to further expand its added value in the medium and longer term and to fully realise its potential, will depend on various factors. The evaluation team has highlighted a few important points in this regard:

* **The sustainability of the network is not yet guaranteed.** So far, ‘sustainability’ has not really been an issue in the network. This is understandable as till now most energy has gone to the setup and initial development of the network, to the elaboration of services and products that benefit the members and, maybe above all, to a series of concerted efforts ‘to put TU development cooperation on the map’. However, TUDCN’s dependence on external grants and its unclear position under the ITUC umbrella are two important challenges which, if not addressed adequately, might jeopardise its longer-term sustainability.
* **High level of dependence on individuals**. The evaluation has come across several situations where the role of individuals has been key to the network’s success. While capable staff and members are to be considered a key asset for all organisations, high levels of dependence on these people make the organisation inevitably vulnerable.
* **Representation and legitimacy will increasingly become an issue to address**. Ensuring representation and legitimacy are core to TUDCN’s long-term sustainability. So far TUDCN has succeeded in dealing fairly well with this issue, notwithstanding the fact that a major part of the representation work, of positions adopted, … is in the hand of a few individuals. ‘Representation and legitimacy’ might however come increasingly under scrutiny by external parties (as they might feel increasingly ‘embarrassed’ by TUDCN’s effectiveness) and by members (that become more competent and, hence, will claim a bigger role).

#### **Lessons learned**

Several lessons can be learned from the TUDCN experience, including:

* The development of an effective network is a complicated process that needs time, resources and, above all, strategic competence and direction. Notwithstanding the successes booked by TUDCN after more than six years of good work, the network remains vulnerable, which is an illustration of the challenge and complexities involved in network development, rather than of the lack of strategic view of the network proponents.
* The TUDCN experience shows that is possible for a network to combine internal (e.g. capacity building of members, network strengthening) and external (e.g. influence on development policies) objectives, in such a way that synergic effects are produced. This however requires an exercise of permanent balancing between both types of objectives.
* The quality and consistency of the contributions of network representatives is *the* key factor for success and recognition of a network, rather than the fact that these individuals represent powerful mass organisations that out of their power might claim a certain level of influence.

#### **Recommendations**

Based on the evaluation findings and conclusions, the following recommendations have been formulated:

1. TUDCN should **continue and even strategically expand and (in some cases) redirect existing efforts** with – at least – the same quality of involvement and mobilisation of resources, so as to maintain the momentum gained and to safeguard the achievements of the past.

More specifically this implies:

1. To further expand the network in such a way that **southern membership** increases, the voice of the south is more consistently heard and mechanisms are developed to bring southern concerns and priorities more systematically on the agenda of international, regional and national forums.
2. To address more systematically the issue of **representation and legitimacy**: (a) by increasing southern participation; (b) by further optimising internal consultation and representation mechanism and (c) by exploring possibilities to increase GUF participation.
3. To **sustain, via TUDCN, the TUs dynamic** **engagement and leadership role in the CSO forums and platforms**. This implies: (a) to continue to engage in issues that come up via international dynamics, thereby trying to become somewhat more proactive than in the past; (b) to engage more consistently in-country level work (via the members); and (c) to make a critical analysis and identification of the issues and forums TUDCN should concentrate on. It is thereby recommended that TUDCN would broaden its institutional targets (aside from the EU and the post-Busan process) and that the focus would be on advocacy issues that are close to the core of TUDCN as a *TU* network. This might imply a shift in focus from ‘development cooperation management’ as such to issues related to the broader agenda of ‘development’ (provided that good agreements are made with the ITUC and the GUFs in terms of complementarity, coordination and role division).
4. To give more attention to **internal capacity building**, next to the external advocacy work. This should go beyond the (participatory) development of tools, guidelines and approaches to include also support TU representatives in their efforts to mainstream and/or diffuse these tools and approaches in their organisations, partnerships and country-based activities.
5. To develop a comprehensive **sustainability strategy**, which addresses the organisational, institutional as well as financial dimensions of sustainability: (a) at organisational level: to further consolidate the network in technical terms, thereby giving particular attention to the present over-dependence on some individuals; (b) at institutional level: to clarify the network’s position towards and within the ITUC; (c) financially: to develop a strategy that allows TUDCN to gradually become less dependent on external funding.
6. To develop a comprehensive **campaigning approach and strategy** **to make better use of the potential of its TU members** in advocacy.
7. To open the debate on the **specific nature and interests of TUs within the broader CSO family**, so as to be prepared to react adequately if situations would occur where the interests and strategic choices of TUs and those of the broader CSO family would diverge.
8. To **further consolidate and develop the network internally**. This implies: (a) to optimise and diversify internal consultation and participation mechanisms, so as to increase the possibilities for members to effectively participate in the network (e.g. online discussion forums, an opinions page in the newsletter, working groups in the South, etc.); (b) to use General Meetings as a means to more actively engage members in some areas; (c) to ensure that the FSG becomes a true ‘internal’ countervailing power and effectively represents the different member categories; (d) to be a bit more formal in membership management, e.g. by periodically asking members to confirm their interest in being part of the network and by asking small membership fees; (e) to give priority to making the mailing list up-to-date; (f) to continue to use short briefing papers to diffuse important network messages; (g) to give more attention to the capitalisation of experiences within the network; and (h) to reflect on how to further proceed with the work on monitoring and evaluation, thereby taking into account the existing demands for the development of TU-specific, ready-to-use instruments and tools regarding M&E.
9. To **increase the resources of the network,** preferentially including an expansion of the network secretariat.
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# **1. Evaluation OBJECT, aims and justification**

This evaluation has as its major object, the Trade Union Development Cooperation Network (TUDCN) and more in particular the TUDCN-implemented project ‘Consolidating the contribution of an inclusive Trade Union Development Cooperation Network for more effective impact and development effectiveness’. This project covers the period 2011 – 2012 and was funded by the European Commission. The 2011 – 2012 project proposal included an evaluation to be implemented towards the end of the project[[2]](#footnote-3), in order to account for the results achieved and to learn lessons for the new phase of the TUDCN (2013-2016). The European Commission acknowledges the evaluation as a useful source to assess the relevance of its support to the TUDCN[[3]](#footnote-4).

Against this background, the aims of this evaluation have been determined as follows:

* to demonstrate the extent to which the TUDCN has been able to produce *a specific added value* and has the potential to continue doing so in the future, in particular towards its donors and constituencies;
* to account for the use of the resources towards the TUDCN member organisations, the ITUC, donors and the public at large;
* to learn lessons from the TUDCN activities, its approach and the results achieved with a view of improving future performance of the network, in particular in relation to the next project that is expected to start in April 2013.

This evaluation report is structured as follows. The following (second) chapter will shortly describe the evaluation background and scope, whereas the third chapter will deal with the evaluation approach and methodology. Then follows a short project description in chapter four. The fifth chapter constitutes the core of this report as it assesses the performance of the TUDCN network both in terms of the development of the network as such, and of its internal and external achievements. The main conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations are presented in chapters six and seven. Five annexes complete this report: the Terms of Reference, a presentation of the methodological instruments used, a list of the persons interviewed, a presentation of the survey results and a short bibliography of the main documents consulted.

# **2. EVALUATION BACKGROUND and scope**

The TUDCN has been established in 2007 following the first ITUC congress in Vienna by a core group of national trade unions (TU) active in development cooperation. It became a formal TU network for coordinating TU development cooperation via support achieved from the EU in 2008-2009. In 2010 another application was introduced to the European Commission under budget line 21.03.01 meant to support Non-State Actors and Local Authorities in Development. The EU support allowed the TUDCN to gradually become more inclusive and global, and further develop the scope and outreach of its program.

Later, the EU approved a new project proposal for the period 2011 – 2012. This project endeavoured to consolidate the experience and achievement of the previous period and to further expand the scope (both in geographic and program terms) of the network, thereby attaching specific attention to the inclusion of Southern Organisations[[4]](#footnote-5).

Today the TUDCN has become a unique trade union platform for development cooperation bringing together the affiliates of the ITUC, the regional organisations from Africa, America, Asia-Pacific and Europe, the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC), the Trade Union Solidarity Support Organisations, the Global Union Federations, the Trade Union Advisory Committee to the OECD (TUAC)and other interested trade union based organisations.

The **mandate of the TUDCN** is:

* (1) to improve trade union development cooperation effectiveness (cooperation and coordination) through sharing of information and practices and by stimulating improved impact and results of the solidarity efforts within the trade union movement; and
* (2) to ensure input of trade union views in the development related policy debates, especially concerning the inclusion of the decent work agenda and democratic ownership in development as key issues for sustainable development strategies.

While the evaluation has concentrated on the 2011-2012 period, it has not applied strict time boundaries, since many actions of that period found their origin before 2011 and because it has proved impossible to truly assess the network’s performance without understanding the developments since the network’s inception in 2007.

# 3. Evaluation approach and methodology

The evaluation approach and methodology have been designed in view of the particular characteristics of the evaluation object (a worldwide network), the aims of the evaluation (taking into account the expectations of both the network itself and the EC as its main donor); and the resources available for the evaluation.

Broadly spoken the following approach and phases can be distinguished:

* **Inception phase (December 2012)**

This phase included the first contacts and discussions between the evaluation team and TUDCN, i.c. the senior members of its secretariat. During this phase, the evaluation team engaged in a concise analysis of a few key documents and attended the TUDCN General Meeting of November 2012 as an observer. The phase resulted in the drafting of Terms of Reference after discussions between evaluation team and TUDCN at the level of the FSG and the TUDCN secretariat and a consultation with the EC programme officer in charge of EU – TU cooperation[[5]](#footnote-6). Based on the terms of reference, the evaluation team developed a methodological framework[[6]](#footnote-7).

* **Implementation phase (December 2012 – March 2013)**

This phase constituted the core of the evaluation and consisted of a varied range of activities including (1) the study of project documentation and TUDCN documents as available on the ITUC website ([www.ituc-csi.org](http://www.ituc-csi.org)/development-cooperation), (2) interviews with members of the TUDCN secretariat and a panel of resource persons belonging to TUDCN’s key stakeholders (active members, FSG members, CSO partners, representatives from donor organisations, representatives from Global Union Federations, ITUC staff and policy makers[[7]](#footnote-8)) following a predetermined interview protocol[[8]](#footnote-9) and (3) an electronic survey sent to 245 members[[9]](#footnote-10). The evaluation team also participated in the FSG meeting of January 2013 to present its preliminary findings and engage in a reflection on a few important issues.

* **Synthesis phase (March – April 2013)**

This phase started early March 2013 and consisted in pulling together and triangulating the findings obtained via various data collection methods. A draft report was submitted to TUDCN by March 28. Reactions on the draft report that has been sent to the members of the FSG were assessed by the evaluation team and used to elaborate the final draft of the evaluation report. This draft, in particular its conclusions and recommendations, has been presented and discussed during the TUDCN General Meeting of April 2013, after which the final version of the evaluation report has been prepared. The executive summary of this evaluation has been translated in French and Spanish.TUDCN further considers publishing the evaluation as one of its Development Papers.

While the evaluation could broadly be implemented according to plan, it is important to highlight some of its methodological challenges in view of ensuring the validity of the evaluation’s major findings. First of all, the evaluation object, a recently established worldwide network, poses particular challenges in the sense that data collection is situated at various levels (the core of the network, its member organisations and, if possible, the constituent parts of these member organisations). As TUDCN is a worldwide network, it has been impossible for the evaluation team to conduct genuine fieldwork. The evaluation team has only been able to collect data and information at the level of the core of the network and representatives of its member organisations. Effects at the level of these member organisations and their constituents could only be assessed via a few meetings were representatives of these organisations were present and via interviews with representatives while the quality of their information could not be double-checked.

Secondly, TUDCN is a large network that the evaluation has tried to cover to the extent possible via the setup of an electronic survey directed to all members. The response rate to this survey has however been rather disappointing (8,6%) and it can be safely assumed that the survey results do not reflect the opinions at the level of the TUDCN membership at large, but rather those of its most committed members. The fact that interviews have to a major degree been directed to active members that have cooperated closely with TUDCN might be another factor to conclude that the views of TUDCN members as presented in this report do not reflect the ‘average’ opinion of its membership. In addition, the external stakeholders interviewed also belonged to the category of ‘involved stakeholders’, which also might have implied that the views of the evaluators have been modelled further in the same direction.

The evaluation team finds that the readers of this report should be aware of the biases that might have been created by the nature of the evaluation object (a relatively young worldwide network) and, above all, by the overrepresentation of committed members and other stakeholders in the interview sample and among the survey respondents. They however feel that this is not a major constraint in itself, as most networks, their output and performance are actually shaped by their most active members. This does however not alter the fact that the imbalanced participation of members remains an issue to be considered, which will be taken up in final chapters of this report.

# 4. Short programme description

## 4.1 Institutional framework

TUDCN is the Development Cooperation Network under the ITUC, which represents 175 million workers in 156 countries and territories as members of its 315 national affiliated trade union centres or confederations[[10]](#footnote-11). ITUC has regional organisations in Africa, Asia Pacific, the Americas and Europe. One of ITUC’s Deputy Secretary Generals is in charge of development cooperation including the follow-up of TUDCN. Reporting on TUDCN’s work is conducted yearly at the occasion of the ITUC General Council.

TUDCN’s membership is composed of the above mentioned (1) ITUC affiliates and (2) ITUC regional federations, and further (3) the TU-SSO (Solidarity Support Organisations, mostly national organisations or NGOs having the mandate to organise and implement TU development cooperation programmes) and (4) the so-called Global Union Federations (GUF) that represent organisations from workers belonging to the same sector.

The main target group for the EU funded project are the staff in charge of TU development cooperation at the national TU centres, the SSOs and the GUFs.

The network itself is structured as follows:

* The **TUDCN General Meeting** (organised 2 times yearly over the last two years; till 2010 there were 3 General Meetings a year) is the main policy-defining and decision-making body of the network. It is composed of all members, with associates participating as observers.
* The **TUDCN Facilitation and Steering Group** (FSG - called ‘coordination group’ before) is composed of maximum 10 members, including representatives from all TUDCN constituents. The FSG monitors programme implementation in-between the general meetings and assists the secretariat in implementing the network’s activities.
* The **TUDCN working groups** (WG) around key TUDCN programme issues:
* A **WG on development effectiveness**, which looks at the technical and methodological aspects of trade union development cooperation, including principles for TU development cooperation, relationships between partners, monitoring and evaluation, …
* A **WG on EU policies**, which addresses all aspects of EU development policies, including participation in the structured dialogue process and in the policy forum for development.
* Initially, there was also a **Policy Working Group** (then referred to as ‘work stream’), which looked at the advocacy aspects of the international development agenda: HLF Busan, the OECD-DAC, Rio +20, private sector development, … and included the representation and cooperation with civil society platforms. In 2011, this working group was abolished as a separate group – a last Working Group meeting took place in September 2011 - and the issues previously dealt with by the Working Group were integrated in the agenda of the General Meetings.
* The **TUDCN secretariat**, which is hosted by the ITUC secretariat and has its offices in the ITUC premises. Over the last two years, the secretariat team was composed of a network coordinator (3/4 FTE), an advocacy officer (1 FTE), one outreach officer responsible for communication (1 FTE) and an administrative assistant (1/2 FTE). Over the 2011 – 2012 period, most funding was provided via the EU project (budget € 1,331,530), of which 75% (€ 998,648) has been contributed by the EC. The ‘own contribution’ of 25% was partially financed through ITUC and partially through programme partners’ contributions (SSO or individual ITUC members).

## 4.2 Major achievements till 2010

Established under the ITUC umbrella in 2007, the TUDCN has quickly evolved into a global and inclusive TU network, which not only has ITUC trade union organisations as it members, but later on also SSOs and GUFs. From 2009 onwards, special efforts were undertaken to reach out to TU organisations in EU new member states. The particular setup of the network and its programme choices implied that it aimed at both improving in-country coordination and effectiveness of TU development work, and developing a coordinated and articulated TU voice in development cooperation policy discussions, both at the (interrelated) national and international levels.

In line with the network’s mission to enhance TU development cooperation practices and policies that effectively contribute to ITUC’s vision (combating poverty, hunger, exploitation, oppression and inequality), ITUC/TUDCN has taken up important roles in international CSO coordination platforms following the implementation of the Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) and the Paris Declaration. TUDCN has also taken up leading roles in Civil Society platforms such as BetterAid and the Open Forum for CSO Effectiveness, representing the CSOs towards the UN system in cooperation matters.

This external representation work has gone hand in hand with a gradual internal development of the network structure and procedures, and with capacity building of its members in issues related to development cooperation.

In 2009 and 2010 the major focus was on creating the basis of the network, by working on the principles on TU development cooperation and accessing key international forums to gradually build up visibility and influence. By that time, three work streams were put on the rails related to EU development cooperation policies, global policy issues, and the development of adapted tools, instruments and methods for TU development cooperation.

By 2010 considerable progress had been realised, which needed to be further consolidated and sustained. An internal evaluation, conducted mid 2010, identified the following achievements:

* the action so far has been effective in shaping and scooping the TU network, but more time and resources are needed for consolidation;
* the network has gained recognition from the government and international institutions;
* TUDCN has been able to enlarge discussions on development cooperation in TUs from a ‘TU aid-recipient’ approach to a broader interest in overall policy issues on development cooperation;
* solid working relationships have been established with a broad range of other stakeholders including governments, international institutions, CSOs, working groups at the international level (OECD/DAC Working Party on Development Effectiveness, BetterAid, Open Forum, …);
* trust has been created among the different TU actors in development cooperation and allowed developing common ways of addressing challenges;
* the TUs offer worldwide a tremendous potential in terms of advocacy for development and development cooperation practices.

Elements of concern of the same evaluation included:

* the under-representation of the South in the work of the network; agenda setting has been very much driven by northern considerations;
* TU positions on international development challenges should be elaborated more in public and TU contributions to policy debates made more visible and better structured so as to increase the impact of TU policy demands;
* service provision to the members should be further increased, in particular in terms of improving the database on TU development cooperation;
* some important TU players for different reasons could not yet be associated fully to the network’s initiatives;
* some working methods seem to become inefficient and/or to put too heavy pressure on already overloaded agendas of members.

## 4.3 Programme for 2011 - 2012

The program for 2011 and 2012 builds further on the achievements of the previous period. It wants to focus on increased involvement of Southern actors via regional ITUC organisations, and on supporting local TUs in setting up their development cooperation commitments. The project proposal introduced to the EC for co-funding states the following in terms of programme objectives and actions:

* **The overall objective** is ‘*to achieve a more efficient cooperation, increased synergies and a more structured dialogue between the Trade Union Development Cooperation Network and the EU and other relevant international or regional institutions, and to contribute to the achievement of the Development Effectiveness Agenda, including the AAA provisions on the role of CSOs (in casu Trade Unions) as actors in development out of their own right*’.
* The three following **specific objectives and outcomes** were further formulated:
* *Sharing ownership of TU development cooperation by all actors at all levels*, with the following expected outcomes: (1) more coherent and effective TUs; (2) effective coordination and follow-up (governance) within the network/ownership; (3) an inclusive, more representative and (financially) sustained network;
* *Develop capacity for TU development action in South and North*, with the following expected outcomes: (1) increased participation and voice for the South; (2) cooperation among TU partners on common capacity development programmes; (3) better ‘donor’ coordination; (4) more and appropriate resources for TU development coordination;
* *Develop TU views on cooperation policies and practices*, with the following outcomes: (1) TU network partners agree to common positions; (2) TU activists are acquainted with policy challenges on development cooperation; (3) external development institutions policies and practices reflect TU views (decent work and democratic governance); (4) CSO recognise TU contribution to policy agenda and promote common action; (5) TU practices are visible and confirmed as contributions to development cooperation.

The objectives are to be achieved via a series of actions and initiatives that are typical for networks and can be summarised as follows:

* *network meetings,* involving all members, that act as a kind of assembly and decide on organisational measures and political positions that are proposed either via the secretariat or the working groups;
* *working groups* on specific issues and objectives that are open for all members. At the start of the project it was foreseen to have WG on ‘principles, guidelines and indicators’, a ‘policy working group’, an ‘ad-hoc group monitoring the structured dialogue with the EU’, a ‘capacity development organising group’ and a ‘network coordination group’;
* *services* from the secretariat including information dissemination via the network newsletter and web portal, the setup and updating of a project database, research, training seminars and actions to promote the network’s visibility.

# 5. key achievements of TUDCN

## **5.1 Introduction**

Assessing and, above all, coherently describing the key achievements of TUDCN has proven a challenge. Not so much because these achievements were hard to identify, but rather because TUDCN’s performance can be approached in various ways and because members and outsiders of the network value the various elements of that performance differently. In addition, ‘tearing apart’ the achievements in different categories proves actually artificial as most components are influencing each other mutually and can actually be seen as different aspects of a broader process of network evolution[[11]](#footnote-12).

In view of this challenge, we have opted to distinguish three different levels of key achievements of TUDCN: (1) those related to the (development of) the network *as such* and the way it is functioning; (2) ‘internal achievements’ which we define as DC related achievements at the level of members (both individually and as a group) and (3) ‘external achievements’ which are considered as outcomes achieved beyond the boundaries of TU development cooperation in the narrow sense. In line with what is said in the previous paragraph, there is a lot of mutual influencing between these three categories as depicted in the scheme below:

Internal achievements

External achievements

Network development

The sub-chapters below will follow the structure of this scheme. We will start with the analysis of TUCDN as a network, to continue with internal achievements, and then deal with external achievements at the end.

## 5.1. Network development

The fact that the network exists and is functioning, and that it is able to keep the interest and participation of a broad group of members who strongly belief in the need and the added value of this initiative, is an achievement in itself. Hereafter we will analyse various aspects of the achievements of TUDCN in terms of network development.

### 5.1.1 Clarity on common vision and goals

According to network theory, the commitment to a common vision and goals is at the core of the existence of any network. These vision and goals should be shared, widely accepted and understood by the network’s participants. For the network to be effective, network goals should furthermore be congruent with the members’ expectations towards the network, serve an existing need and be important enough for the members to be willing to allocate resources and delegate authority to the network.

In the case of TUDCN, the network objectives are summarized as follows on the TUDCN website: (1) *“to bring the trade union perspective into the international development policy debates*, and (2*) “to improve the coordination and effectiveness of trade union development cooperation activities”*.

Discussions with network participants confirm that this twofold objective – representation and advocacy on one hand, and improving the effectiveness of TU development cooperation on the other hand – is widely known and understood. Moreover there is a broad consensus on the relevance and importance of these goals. The previous absence of the TU movement in the international development debate, the low level of coordination between TU development actions and the perceived low level of effectiveness were seen as important shortcomings in the past, which asked for a coordinated answer.

The survey results confirm that TUDCN’s goals correspond with the members’ expectations towards the network, as can be seen in Figure 1. Survey respondents were asked about (1) the expectations they had when they joined TUDCN, (2) their present expectations towards the network. The graph shows high expectations with regard to ‘increased visibility’, a ‘stronger TU presence in the international DC debate’, ‘information exchange’, the ‘development of a common vision and strategies’ and ‘increased coordination[[12]](#footnote-13)’. The majority of survey respondents also expects ‘to enhance their development project management capacities’ through TUDCN. For five (out of 31) respondents capacity strengthening in project management is not an expectation, which explains the lower average score for this issue. For many others, capacity strengthening is an important expectation. On average, respondents expect not so much ‘to enhance direct or indirect access to funding’ through their participation in TUDCN.

The survey results furthermore show that the participant’s expectations have not significantly changed since the moment they have joined TUDCN. On average, the respondents’ expectations are only slightly more modest now (indicated by slightly lower average scores) than they were in the beginning. An expectation that however became stronger is ‘to be better informed about development issues at international level’. This seems to indicate that TUDCN’s efforts to disseminate information on issues which are on the international development agenda, an area which was rather new for many network members, has led to increased interest in this regard.

Figure 1

While there is clarity and consensus on the overall network goals, at least among members that are moderately to strongly involved in the network, as well as correspondence between these goals and the members expectations, the following reflections should be taken note of in this regard:

* The evaluation could not analyse in how far the network and its goals are effectively well known by the broader group of (potential) members, and in how far this affects their (lack of) commitment and participation in the network;
* Several survey respondents formulated ‘additional expectations’ related to increasing the participation and involvement of the south, for instance: “to include Southern priorities when defining the development agenda”, “domesticating position papers at regional level”, “to strengthen south-south cooperation”, “to enforce the work of TUDCN at regional level”, etc. To strengthen the network in the South and to increase the involvement of Southern participants will be one of the priorities in the new project, starting in 2013.
* Whereas overall objectives are clear and shared, different groups of members might have different expectations with regard to the more specific objectives and priorities of the network, e.g. in terms of the direction of the advocacy work. Till know, TUDCN’s agenda setting has to a large degree been dominated by a relatively small group of mostly European member organisations. It is the aspiration of the network to increase not only the participation of the South but also of other currently underrepresented groups such as the GUFs (see next subchapter). An important consequence of a higher diversification of membership might be that renewed mechanisms will be required to deal with the higher diversity of expectations, in order keep the different groups of members on board.

### 5.1.2 Participation and ownership of members (from the North and the South) in the network

TUDCN has a specific membership structure. The network functions as an open platform, bringing together ITUC-affiliates, SSOs, GUFs and the regional organisations. There is no clear membership definition, and no formal membership structure; hence it can be described as a “coalition of the willing”. As a consequence, it is not always clear which organisations should actually be referred to as ‘members’ of the network: those who have been participating in the activities, those who are on the mailing list (which, as will be described further, is no longer up-to-date), or the broader group of organisations the network aims to unite? While an open and informal membership structure certainly has certain advantages, e.g. it makes the network easily accessible for those who are interested, there also are some challenges implied, e.g. in terms of how to ensure *clarity* in external forums on which organisations the network is actually representing[[13]](#footnote-14) and also in terms of membership management (those who are not on the mailing list risk to be forgotten).

Although the TUDCN secretariat plays an important role in implementing the network’s program, member participation is encouraged in various ways, e.g. through member consultations, by stimulating members to contribute to the newsletter or to participate in the working groups, etc. At present, there is a small group of active and committed members, who actively participate in the working groups, react to draft versions of documents sent out by the secretariat and, by being highly involved, contribute to the network’s agenda setting. A larger group of members participates in the General Meetings. It can be assumed that even more organisations are “rather passively” involved but still feel connected to the network. They might for instance read the monthly newsletter and other TUDCN documents and eventually make use of it.

The survey results indicate that a majority of members feel they have sufficient possibilities to contribute information to the network and to participate in decision-making. Members also think they are sufficiently consulted by the network (see Table 12 in Annex 4). This all contributes to the creation of a feeling of “ownership” of the network, even if the actual response to consultations remains often low. For many members, the feeling of ‘belonging’ to a network and being part of a larger international movement is important. It gives a broader dimension and an extra stimulus to the own efforts realised in development cooperation.

Two concerns with regard to member participation and involvement deserve attention: (1) the unbalanced participation of members in the network, and (2) the persisting underrepresentation of some important groups of members. These concerns will be analysed in the following paragraphs:

##### 1. Unbalanced participation of members

The fact that the number of actively involved members in TUDCN remains relatively low (around 10-15 organisations) is not necessarily a problem in itself. Most networks rely on a small group of committed members for realising most of the networks’ achievements. As long as the broader group of members remains interested, feels represented by and delegates authority the network, unbalanced participation does not necessarily affect the effectiveness and representativeness of the network.

In the case of TUDCN, active participation of many members is hindered by the fact that DC is not a high priority in their organisations. Financial and human resources available for DC use to be often limited, which makes it difficulty to invest substantial time and energy in network participation. Frequent changes of staff responsible for DC have been an additional factor complicating the continued participation of some organisations in the network.

While imbalances in member participation are not abnormal as such, they might create a potential risk in the longer run. A common pitfall for networks is to become exclusive over time, focussing mainly on the more active members and gradually leaving others behind. Although the TUDCN secretariat puts a lot of effort in keeping the broader group of members informed – through the General Meetings, information dissemination, etc. – the questionnaire results indicate that this risk exists, as illustrated in the graph below. Respondents who consider themselves ‘active members’ of the network are on average more satisfied about the existing opportunities for participation than those who consider themselves ‘moderately active’ or ‘rather passive’ network members. This indicates that ‘active members’ do not only participate more, but also perceive easier access to the network than those less involved. One survey respondent, who considers himself a ‘rather passive member’, states that “it seems difficult to become part of, or an ‘insider’ in the TUDCN if you don’t have the opportunity to take full part in the TUDCN activities”.

Avoiding that the network becomes reduced to a group of ‘insiders’ is not evident (precisely because of the difficulty to get a real response from many others) but should nevertheless remain a permanent point of attention for the TUDCN staff. The creation of low-threshold alternatives for member participation, e.g. the creation of an online discussion forum, could contribute to make network participation more accessible for those with less time and resources available.

Figure 2.

##### 2. Underrepresentation of important groups of members

A second, more important constraint relates to the underrepresentation of some important TU actors in the network. Especially the absence of the GUFs and the persisting underrepresentation of the South are seen as major weaknesses by many, affecting both the legitimacy and effectiveness of the network. Also some SSOs are still absent for unclear reasons. Full inclusion of the different groups of TU actors is all the more important in view of TUDCN’s ambition of becoming a unique and “inclusive” platform representing the voice of TU movement in the international development debate.

* Participation of **southern actors** is on the increase. To strengthen the participation of the South has been a priority in the 2011-2012 project and will even be more so in the new project starting in 2013. The different regions are now represented in the FSG and there are more southern participants in the GM. In Latin America, a regional development cooperation network has been established, which increased the involvement of TUs and CSOs in this region. There are on-going efforts to initiate a similar process in Africa. Asia and Middle East are however still poorly represented (see also chapter 5.2.3).

Despite these positive evolutions, the regional network dynamics as well as the inclusion of Southern members and their points of view in the overall networking process is still weak. As southern TUs and SSOs are not directly represented in TUDCN, but through the regional ITUC organisations, much depends on the latters’ willingness, efforts and achievements in expanding the network to the regional level. As will be analysed in chapter 5.2.3, there are important differences between the regions in this regard. Also the particular TU dynamics in each region play a role, making that bringing the different actors together in a network is not always evident.

According to many interviewees and survey respondents, the decentralisation and regionalisation of TUDCN should remain high on the network’s agenda. This implies a clarification and reinforcement of the relation between TUDCN and the regional organisations. More efforts are also still needed to promote South–South cooperation.

* The very low **participation of GUFs** remains an important area of concern. Reasons for the absence of the GUFs are not always clear. From a limited number of interviews with GUF representatives, it can be derived that at least some GUFs are still in a process of defining their positioning towards TUDCN. TUDCN is perceived both as a potential opportunity and a potential threat. According to a GUF representative, TUDCN offers opportunities in terms of technical inputs and improved coordination in the field of DC. There is however more reluctance when it comes to the political role taken up by TUDCN. Many GUFs are engaged in both DC and related advocacy work. The fear is that the ITUC, through TUDCN[[14]](#footnote-15), would want to build both the global and local TU DC agenda, which would put the GUFs autonomy from the ITUC in danger. Another concern is that the advocacy priorities of TUDCN and the GUFs are not necessarily the same. It is suggested that the boundaries between the ITUC/TUDCN and the GUFs would be clarified and that a separate meeting with the GUFs would be organised in order to explore the possibilities for coordination.

### 5.1.3 Trust among the network members

Trust plays an important role in the functioning of a network. Members will only be willing to share information and resources and to contribute to the network’s activities, as they can trust their contributions will be used to advance the common cause.

Interviews with both internal and external actors did not reveal major trust problems in the case of TUDCN. First, there is a high level of trust in the work done by the secretariat and the working groups. This trust is sustained by the existence of good mechanisms of consultation and transparency, and by the quality and good listening capacity of the secretariat staff. Leadership from the secretariat is widely accepted by members. Members are also willing to delegate authority to the secretariat to represent the network at international forums.

Secondly, there is a good level of trust between the network participants mutually. An indication for this is that many proved to be willing to share information on their DC activities by contributing the TUDCN projects directory. The first Network Conferences held in 2009 and 2010 have played an important role in terms of trust building. It was during these conferences that an agreement was reached on the overall principles of the network. These principles convinced previously competing members to join efforts for a common cause. At present, the TUDCN general meetings are considered very important moments for informal networking and trust building.

Trust building becomes particularly challenging where members have diverging interests or expectations towards the network. The analysis presented at the end of the previous subchapter revealed a certain level of distrust from (at least some) GUFs with regard to TUDCN’s political ambitions. Also in the South, trust building is often complicated by competing TU interests, in specific countries or in the region as a whole. Permanent trust building – through meetings, regular dialogue and by giving each participant the possibility to express his expectations and concerns – will thus remain an important point of attention as TUDCN realizes its ambition of gradually becoming more inclusive and diverse.

### 5.1.4 Role and function of the TUDCN components

#### 5.1.4.1 Secretariat

The **TUDCN secretariat** plays a key role in the network. The secretariat presides the FSG and the working groups, organises the General Meetings and seminars, ensures network communication (website, newsletter, projects directory, ...), prepares position papers and other network documents before these are presented to the members for consultation, and represents the network at international fora. The secretariat is also responsible for managing the EU project.

On average network participants are satisfied with the role taken up by the secretariat. This is confirmed by the survey results: see Table 1[[15]](#footnote-16). The secretariat staff is considered competent and fulfilling its responsibilities. The survey results furthermore show that the role of the TUDCN secretariat is clear to most members[[16]](#footnote-17).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicate on a scale from 1 to 6 in how far you agree with the following statements: | Scale 1-6:1: Completely disagree ……..6: Completely agree | No ans-wer | Average score(scale 1 – 6) |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| * I’m satisfied with the work of the TUDCN secretariat
 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 12 | 8 | 0 | 4,61 |
| * The role of the TUDCN secretariat is clear to me
 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 6 | 1 | 4,30 |
| * The role of the FSG is clear to me
 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 11 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3,52 |

Table 1

Despite the efforts of the secretariat to keep members informed and involved (e.g. through member consultations), some resource persons feel that the secretariat risks to be working too autonomously. Much effort is put in the ‘external work’ (e.g. lobby for the EU), which comes at the expense of investing in internal strengthening of the network and member participation (including the strengthening of the network dynamics in the regions). It is suggested that a more open debate would take place on the balance between internal and external work and on the role of the secretariat in this regard.

#### 5.1.4.2 Facilitation and Steering Group

In the 2010 document “Missions, mandate and workplan of the TUDCN”, the FSG is described as a governance structure, whose role is to facilitate the preparation, implementation and follow-up of  activities; to keep an oversight of the work of the TUDCN secretariat and of the financial and administrative situation of the network; and to ensure monitoring and evaluation. According to the same document, the FSG is composed of a number of co-chairs, on behalf the different categories of membership groups[[17]](#footnote-18). The TUDCN secretariat staff is automatically part of the FSG.

In practice, the FSG has not fully been taken up till recently. Whereas there have been a number of FSG-meetings in the period 2011-2012[[18]](#footnote-19), which focussed on workplan follow-up (the discussion on activity reports and new workplans) and progress monitoring, these meetings had a short duration, the number of participants – mainly ITUC-affiliates[[19]](#footnote-20) – was often low, and in general, the FSG did not really function as the network’s governance structure.

Recently, efforts have been done to re-dynamise the FSG and give it a more important role. In January 2013 there has been a two-day FSG-meeting, in which all ITUC regions were represented. The FSG also acts as a steering group for the present project evaluation.

To survey respondents, the role of the FSG is less clear than the role of the secretariat, as shown in Table 1 on the previous page.

#### 5.1.4.3 General Meeting

The General Meeting (GM), also referred to as “Network Meeting”, brings together all the members of the network. It acts as the ‘organizing assembly’ of TUDCN. According to the “Missions, mandate and workplan of the TUDCN” (2010), the GM sets the overall agenda for the work of the network, and takes the necessary decisions in terms of organising the work and the implementation of the workplan.

The GMs are held twice a year and have a duration of two days. In 2011-2012, four General Meetings were organised[[20]](#footnote-21): in Brussels (June 2011), Florence (December 2011), Helsingor (May 2012) and Paris (November 2012). The GMs.

The GMs are the principal “networking moment” for TUDCN and are therefore considered very important by network members. Aside from the official GM agenda, the GM is a good moment for informal networking and to strengthen interpersonal relationships. TUDCN tries to make optimally use of these network gatherings by putting not only “internal network affairs” on the agenda (e.g. the presentation of activity reports and workplans), but also leave room for “content work” (e.g. the presentation of position papers or presentations on issues that are on the international development agenda). The disadvantage is that this leads to overloaded agendas, which, according to some, leave too little time for liaising, exchange and networking. Some recommend that more of the content work would be carried over to ad hoc seminars.

The survey results indicate that a majority of TUDCN members are relatively satisfied with the GMs, especially with regard to the ‘relevance of the issues on agenda of the GM’ and the ‘way in which the GMs are prepared’. Opinions are more diverging when it comes to the ‘time allocated to the different agenda points’ and the ‘balanced participation of those attending the meeting’:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Indicate on a scale from 1 to 6 in how far you agree with the following statements regarding the last GM your organisation attended: | Scale 1-6:1: Completely disagree ……..6: Completely agree | Average score(scale 1 – 6) |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| * Overall the meeting was well prepared
 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 4,44 |
| * The issues on the agenda were relevant for the network
 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 3 | 4,44 |
| * The issues on the agenda were relevant for my organization
 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 4,08 |
| * There was an adequate time allocation for the different agenda points
 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 3,80 |
| * There was a balanced participation of those attending the meeting
 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3,60 |
| **In view of the time and resources spent, the outcomes of the meeting were satisfactory ....** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| * a. For TUDCN, its objectives and program
 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 14 | 4 | 2 | 4,00 |
| * b. For my organization
 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 3,92 |
| * c. For myself
 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 4,00 |

Table 2

81% of the survey respondents attended at least 1 general meeting in 2011-2012. In the questionnaire, a large number of ‘additional comments and suggestions’ were formulated with regard to the GMs, which illustrates the importance members give to these meetings. These additional comments and suggestions are presented in the box below. Various suggestions point at improving ‘representative participation’ in the GM, hereby especially referring to the present underrepresentation of the regions and the GUFs. Another cluster of suggestions asks for members to be better informed and more involved during the preparation of the meetings.

**Box: Additional comments and suggestions regarding the GM (survey)**

**PARTICIPATION**

* TUDCN must find ways to increase the participation and engagement of GUF and other TU actors outside ITUC otherwise the TUDCN will lose its legitimacy.
* It will be good if my organisation can be represented in these meetings.
* Is important to expand the, invitations for more TUs, especially the south
* To increase the number if participants per region
* To look for financing for the participation of all.
* To broaden the base of regional representation by adding as the Arab world as a region in its own right.

**PREPARATION OF THE GM**

* Participants could be better involved in the choice of issues for discussion.
* Working documents should be sent a couple of days in advance.
* It would be good to receive the agenda and documents in advance.
* Before fixing the dates of the GM: consult the participants so that we have the opportunity to participate in a better way.
* To ensure that these GM do not fall on the same dates as other meetings of the TU movement.

**AGENDA OF THE GM**

* The GM can be more practical and invite experts or have thematic issues.
* To organise round-tables to exchange on TU projects and practices in the field of development cooperation.
* More time may be required.

**OTHER COMMENTS / SUGGESTIONS**

* Members specifically from Africa do not have strong regional connections that would start up discussions to fit into the general meetings
* It is necessary to coordinate actions, to have more influence at national and continental level

#### 5.1.4.4 Working Groups

According to TUDCN’s mission and mandate, Working Groups (WG) are established for the implementation of specific aspects of the workplan. Ad-hoc working groups/task teams can be created in order to respond to specific challenges or to take up determined tasks. At present there are two active WGs: a WG on development effectiveness and a WG on EU policies. The former “policy and advocacy WG[[21]](#footnote-22)” has been integrated in the agenda of the GM, as it was seen that the issues dealt with by this WG were of interest for the broader group of members. The two existing WG played a key role in the preparation of several of the TUDCN key documents that have been produced over the past two years. All ‘official’ documents prepared by the WGs are endorsed by the GM.

The **Development Effectiveness WG** deals with the development of guidelines and tools aimed at improving the effectiveness of TU development cooperation projects. So far, the principal outputs of this WG have been the “TU principles and guidelines on Development Effectiveness“ (2011) and the “TU Development Effectiveness Profile (TUDEP)” (2011). The latter is a practical tool meant to support TUs in the application of the effectiveness principles in their everyday DC practice. At present the work of the WG focuses on Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E). Since 2010, the WG works together with an external HIVA expert for technical support and process facilitation.

Because of the technical character of the work, the development effectiveness WG mainly attracts experts in development projects management. According to one of our resource persons, the technical character of the WG also makes it difficult for new participants to catch up if they were not member from the start. In practice, most of the work of the WG has been done a small number (4-6 persons) of active participants. Although these were able to come up with some important outputs, the small number of participants makes the WG a little fragile, as much depends on the availability of a limited number of individuals.

As will be further analysed in chapter 5.2, the main products the WG so far – the “principles and guidelines on Development Effectiveness” and the “TUDEP-tool” – are highly valued by many members. They contributed to increasing the legitimacy and coherence of TU development cooperation, and also had positive effects in terms of capacity building.

The present work on Monitoring and Evaluation has to some degree been a more difficult process, partially because of the even more technical character of the work than in previous stages of the WG and partially because of diverging opinions on which direction the work on M&E had to take[[22]](#footnote-23). A guidance note on “M&E at outcome and impact level” is presently being finalised. Several WG participants feel the work on M&E should not stop after publishing this note. It is suggested that practical tools would be developed that would help members to bring the M&E guidelines into practice (in analogy with the TUDEP-tool); there is also still a high demand for the development of TU-specific indicators that can be used in M&E.

The **WG on EU policies** is a political working group responsible for preparing TUDCN/ITUC positions with regard to EC policies and documents in the field of development cooperation. In 2010-2011, the WG followed up TUDCN’s participation in the Structured Dialogue process. The EU WG had 1 meeting in 2011 and 3 meetings in 2012. It provided inputs and formulated positions on, among others, the EU Green Paper on Development Policy, the EC consultation paper on CSOs in development, the EC proposal of the Development Cooperation Instrument, the inclusion of Social Protection in EU Development Cooperation and the EC Communication on Europe’s engagement with Civil Society in external relations.

Although the WGs have played an important role in preparing a number of TUDCN key documents over the past few years, which are well-known to the majority of members, the survey results suggest that many network participants are less familiar with the functioning of the WGs as such: questions regarding the WGs have been left open by around 30% of the respondents (see annex 4, chapter 5), which is by far the highest ‘no response’ rate in the whole survey. Opinions on how well the WGs communicate on their activities and consult TUDCN members diverge, but are (moderately) positive on average.

In 2011-2012, no formal “ad hoc” working groups have been created. Instead a number of network seminars have been organised to discuss specific themes considered relevant to the network. In 2012 there have been seminars on Development Education, South-South Cooperation, outcome and impact measurement[[23]](#footnote-24), trade unions v. governmental donors and the Post-2015 framework.

Some resources persons consider that having two WGs is in fact little for a network as TUDCN, given the global character of the network and the variety of issues to be dealt with. The WGs also remain very focused on the North, with little or no direct Southern participation[[24]](#footnote-25). In view of workloads and for financial reasons, creating too many WG seems however unrealistic. Several network members suggest that TUDCN would look for more diversified ways to stimulate and facilitate member participation, e.g., through the creation WGs in the South, online discussions and debates, the creation of punctual WGs around specific themes that would be led by one of the members instead of the secretariat, by making more use of documents that already exist in the network and to scale these up to the network level, etc.

#### 5.1.4.5 Overall network structure

When asked whether the present structure of the network – with the secretariat, FSG, general meeting and 2 working groups – fits the purpose of the network, the answers of survey respondents are only moderately positive: see Table 3. The underrepresentation of Southern actors and GUFs (see chapter 5.1.2), as well as the weak integration of TUDCN in the ITUC (which will be analysed in chapter 5.1.6), are considered the most important weaknesses in this regard.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Scale 1-6:1: Completely disagree ……..6: Completely agree | No ans-wer | Average score(scale 1 – 6) |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| * The present structure of TUDCN (secretariat, FSG, general meeting, 2 working groups) fits the purpose of the network
 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 8 | 2 | 2(6%) | 4,03 |

Table 3

### 5.1.5 Communication and information sharing

Network communication is coordinated through the TUDCN secretariat. At present, good communication and information sharing mechanisms are in place. A monthly TUDCN newsletter, “Trade Union focus on Development”, is sent to 444 persons. This newsletter contains links to important network documents, such as position papers and briefing notes. Relevant network documents, as well as meeting reports, are also published on the TUDCN webpage (which is a subpage of the ITUC webpage). The website has also a link to the ‘projects directory’, where TUDCN members can share information on on-going development projects in the South. The website and key network documents are available in 3 languages: English, French and Spanish.

The TUDCN website is considered a useful information sharing tool by many network participants. Between 14 March 2012 and 14 March 2013, 1106 visitors of the webpage have been counted; the projects directory has been visited 966 times since it was launched on October 31st 2012[[25]](#footnote-26). These figures should be read with caution, as the tool used to calculate the number of website visitors is not very precise and reliable[[26]](#footnote-27). According to the survey results, 74% of the respondents visited the website at least once during the past 3 months[[27]](#footnote-28). Most are satisfied about the quality of the information on the website. Opinions on the user-friendliness and the degree to which the website is up-to-date diverge however. Among others, it is suggested that more links would be added to trainings, events, documents and member sites.

Furthermore, 85% of the survey respondents read the monthly newsletter, at least partially. Many members consider the newsletter, as well as other TUDCN communications, highly useful to remain informed on what is going on in the network, on evolutions in the global development agenda and on how TUs are positioning themselves towards these evolutions. The survey analysed how members rate the usefulness of a number of key documents that have been published by TUDCN over the past two years, in the form of development papers or ITUC briefing notes. The results of this assessment are very positive (see annex 4, graphs 22 -26). Especially the ITUC briefing notes (on the post-2015 development framework, decent work for all and universal social protection, ..) seem to be considered highly useful by a large majority of respondents.

The following factors have been identified as bottlenecks for optimal communication and information sharing:

* An important weakness in the present communication system is that the mailing list used to diffuse the newsletters and other network documents to members as well as to external actors, is not well organised, not complete and not up-to-date. As a consequence, not all members are included in the mailing list, and information is not always sent to the right persons. It is clear that updating the mailing list is not only important in view of improving information sharing, but also in terms of coming to a more consolidated membership management system (see chapter 5.1.2).
* Member participation in communication and information sharing remains low. At present, members are invited to contribute to the newsletter through a monthly call for contributions sent out by the secretariat, but the response to these invitations remains limited. Time constraints seem to play an important role here, rather than limited interest or a lack of willingness of members to contribute. Hence the need to look for alternative, less time-consuming and thus more accessible, possibilities for members to share thoughts and information with the network.

### 5.1.6. The relationship between TUDCN and the ITUC

There is a strong historical relationship between the TUDCN and the ITUC. TUDCN has been established following the first ITUC congress (Vienna), and the TUDCN secretariat has been hosted by the ITUC since EU funding allowed TUDCN to become a more structural network. In the South, the ITUC regional organisations ensure the link between the network and affiliates in the regions.

In the ITUC structure, TUDCN is not a department but falls directly under the responsibility of one of the two Deputy General Secretaries. As a network almost entirely financed with external funds, TUDCN has a quasi-independent status within the ITUC. There is no direct participation of TUDCN staff in the ITUC management team. During the past few years, and on the insistence of the TUDCN secretariat, there has been a gradual institutional inclusion of TUDCN in the ITUC, with the result that one of the policy officers is now fully paid ITUC staff. There also is an institutional dependency for practical day-to-day operations (communication, internet, office space, ...).

At the operational level there is a certain degree of coordination and cooperation between TUDCN and some of the ITUC departments. Dependent on the issues on the agenda, staff of the ITUC departments is invited to participate in the GM and working groups. ITUC-departments are also consulted and/or provide contributions when TUDCN prepares positions to be presented in international fora and CSO platforms[[28]](#footnote-29).

A major problem remains however that political support for TUDCN is considered weak. Many ITUC instances seem to see TUDCN as a project that exists because of EU-funding, rather than as a structural part of the work of the ITUC. In part, this can be explained by the fact that TUDCN has originally been developed as a project, with little participation or involvement from the ITUC management. Also contributing to the low interest and support is that DC is not seen as a core issue or priority for the TU movement. This has much to do with the fact that there is a still lot of misunderstanding of what DC is about. Many TU staff still seems to equate development cooperation with ‘sending funds to projects in the South’, not with working on an agenda for development, in which the search for more coherence and effectiveness as well as influencing the international development debate are among the most important challenges.

These and other factors make that the main ITUC instances seem to be little interested in and little aware of the work and the achievements of the network. The ITUC management does for instance not participate in the TUDCN general meetings. More than for its achievements (which are little known and understood), TUDCN mainly seems to be valued for the external funding it brings in in the ITUC.

When interviewing internal and external actors, the weak political support from the ITUC hierarchy, as well as the weak institutionalisation of the network within the ITUC, were among the most frequently mentioned weaknesses of the network, considered to jeopardize both its legitimacy and its sustainability in the longer term.

The way in which TUDCN has developed within the ITUC has a number of implications, which take the form of difficulties, threats and missed changes for the network:

* There is pressure to use TUDCN resources in function of the broader ITUC agenda. TUDCN has grown rapidly and disposes of important financial resources. Moreover it has established good connections with SSOs (which are seen as ‘donors’ rather than as co-actors on development by many ITUC staff) and has staff members with strong capacities both in advocacy and in project management. This provokes some jealousy from the other ITUC instances, and creates pressure to use part of these resources and capacities to strengthen the broader ITUC agenda and/or to support the activities of the different ITUC departments.
* Little structural co-thinking between TUDCN and the ITUC on development and the role of DC. While there is often overlap between the (advocacy) agenda of the TUDCN and the agenda of other ITUC departments, there are no structural mechanisms for joint reflection and coordination, which means that coordination mainly depends on the initiative of individuals.
* Under-utilisation of the advocacy potential of TUDCN. By having gained a position in international civil society forums and platforms, and through its connections with other civil society actors, TUDCN can be a useful tool to support the ITUC in its lobby on complex development issues and to make promotion for ITUC positions at the international level. This potential is presently under-utilised. The political role TUDCN is playing and the (potential) value of it for the ITUC seems on the contrary to a certain degree be ignored by the ITUC management.
* The difference between TUDCN and ITUC is not always clear, neither internally nor externally. This point might seem in contradiction with the previous points (i.e. the weak institutionalisation of TUDCN within the ITUC), but in fact is also related with the finding that the institutional relationship between TUDCN and the ITUC and the role of TUDCN within the ITUC are poorly defined. Many actors, both external and internal to the network, do not seem to make a distinction between TUDCN and the ITUC and/or confuse both. In external forums TUDCN representatives have been taking presently up different roles, as ITUC and as representative of the network. Till now, this has not caused any major problems, but it could become a problem when southern actors, GUFs, … start to get more involved in the advocacy.
* Sustainability. As there is little structural and institutional support for TUDCN, there is no clarity on what the ITUC would want to do with TUDCN if EU-funding would disappear.

From the survey results, it can be seen that 19 out of 31 of the respondents would like to see the TUDCN to become more strongly embedded in the ITUC; 8 respondents rather want TUDCN to develop as an independent network[[29]](#footnote-30), only 4 think that TUDCN should remain a temporary ad-hoc structure:

Figure 3

Several resource persons recommend that TUDCN would become a permanent department within the ITUC. This would guarantee political support, permanence and integration. However, this suggestion tends to disregard the fact that TUDCN is a network, not only including ITUC-affiliates but also SSOs, GUFs and regional organisations. As a network whose highest decision-making body is the General Meeting, the TUDCN should in the first place be accountable to its network participants, rather than to the ITUC hierarchy. Full integration in the ITUC structure would especially create difficulties with regard to the status of the GUFs participating in the network.

Whether or not TUDCN becomes a permanent ITUC-department, there is a broad agreement that stronger ITUC support is an important requirement for TUDCN to be able to fully develop. Ideally such political support would imply: recognition of DC as a core issue for the ITUC, political recognition of the role of TUDCN, clarification of the relationship between TUDCN and the ITUC, and political decision to institutionally support the further development of TUDCN.

## **5.2 Internal achievements**

### **5.2.1 Strengthened TU views on development cooperation policies and practices**

The network has undoubtedly contributed to strengthened TU views on development cooperation policies and practices. The major piece of work in this regard is related to the development of the *‘Trade Union Principles and Guidelines on Development Effectiveness’* which were developed in a consultative way but could make use of the results of the Open Forum on CSO Development Effectiveness in which the network also played a well appreciated role (see below, 5.3.4). As the principles and guidelines are both highly similar to the ‘overall’ CSO principles that stress the normative and value-driven dimensions of development effectiveness, but at the same time are specific to the TU identity, they allow TUs to both position themselves within the large CSO community *and* to articulate their specific identity. Many members referred to the principles as a tool providing them with something in common that strengthened their identity and confidence. Furthermore, the principles have also served as a basis for strengthening internal capacities related to DC and development issues at large (see also 5.2.4 below).

In addition, some cases have been documented where TUDCN’s work has clearly created effects beyond the level of its members. E.g. in Jordan the ‘eight principles’ have been translated and are now being diffused in the region; this initiative could bank on the fundamental changes in society after the ‘Arab Spring’, which have drastically expanded the political space for civil society actors.

Aside from agreeing on and internalising the principles, TU understanding of DC has also been strengthened through information exchange, network communications and joint reflections at meetings and seminars. This is confirmed by the questionnaire where *“My organization is better informed about development cooperation”* proves to be the most important impact achieved at organisational level (average score: 4,42 on a scale from 1 to 6).

The evaluation has not been able to assess how broad and deep the change process has been in this regard, but interviews with members virtually always have pointed to this issue as a major achievement of the network: *‘Work with TUDCN made us understand the wider development cooperation context*’; *‘Because of TUDCN we now have s stronger awareness and knowledge and understanding about development cooperation debates on the global level – now we can catch up!*’; and: *‘The network often has been proactive: briefing us on issues before we realised how important these are’*. The score in this regard is however not really outstanding: 3,97 (on a scale of 6) related to the statement: *TUs have internally strengthened their views and position related to development cooperation*.

The findings presented above should be put somewhat in perspective. First, for many TUs development cooperation is still a new domain. As such, achieving some results in terms of improved knowledge and understanding of DC might not have been that difficult. Second, the evaluation has mainly been in contact with those who within TUs are structurally dealing with DC. Most probably, they are not representative for their organisations so that their positive assessment does not necessarily imply true organisational change (see also next point). On the other side, creating an inroad for introducing a new debate in TUs should be considered as an achievement in itself.

### **5.2.2 Increased inclusion and ownership of development cooperation in TUs**

The image the evaluators have received is that of rather limited inclusion and ownership *within* the TU organisations themselves. Many TUs have ‘development cooperation partisans’ but they are not truly representative for their organisation. As such and apart from the SSOs that are structurally linked to the TUs, TUCDN seems to be the only forum/location in the TUs where development cooperation themes are structurally discussed and embedded. This is also confirmed by the survey results. The statements “*My organization integrates development cooperation better in its policies”* and “*My organization implements more activities related to development cooperation”* (both as a consequence of TUDCN’s influence) receive rather low scores:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Scale 1-6:1: Completely disagree ……..6: Completely agree | Average score |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| * My organisation implements more activities related to development cooperation
 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3,21 |
| * My organisation integrates development cooperation better in its policies
 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 3,27 |

Table

A factor complicating the process of inclusion of increased insights in DC in TU policies, is that there seems still to exist a lot of misunderstanding within TUs of what “development cooperation” is about, as already indicated in chapter 5.1.6 (DC is basically seen as “sending funds to projects in the South”). Development cooperation (or development as a global issue) is rarely seen as an issue to be mainstreamed in the TUs’ functioning and agendas. The situation is obviously different in the South where ‘development’ issues are often part and parcel of the TUs’ working agenda. But also here, ‘development cooperation’ as such seems to be often understood in the narrow sense of ‘getting access to DC funds’. Moreover, there is much strategic debate on the extent to which TU can/should adopt a ‘developmental’ approach which, it is considered, can both harm and nurture the ‘pure’ TU agenda[[30]](#footnote-31).

### **5.2.3 Increased coordination and coherence of TU development cooperation**

The lack of coordination among TU development initiatives, both in the North and the South, leading to duplication of efforts, inefficiency and even competition, has constituted one of the major reasons to create TUDCN. It is clear that the network has in various ways altered this problematic situation and that TUs active in development now have tools to better coordinate their actions, aim for more coherence and, in some cases, engage in operational cooperation to achieve bigger leverage and impact. Some of the resource persons contacted consider the changes brought by the network in this area as its major achievement.

Several mechanisms have played a role in this regard. First of all, the bare creation of the network with its corollaries in terms of meetings of members, workshops, exchange, … has created a first and rather unique TU platform for people to meet each other. While many members state that, for instance, General Meetings foresee too little time for internal and informal exchange, cases have been documented where like-minded members who met at such meetings later engaged in joint action. Others state that simply meeting each other and exchanging with others that are engaged in similar ventures, is to be considered as highly meaningful and encouraging.

Second, TUDCN has initiated the setup of a projects directory (see chapter 5.1.5) that has clearly is producing its intended effects. Many members stated they have provided their input for this directory and some confirm that they make often use of the directory, e.g. to verify which other TU or SSO are active in a particular geographical area and with whom they are cooperating.

Third, the principles of TU development cooperation developed under TUDCN’s impulse have certainly contributed to increased coherence and mutual understanding and, hence, facilitated exchange and are a good starting point for increased cooperation.

The findings above are confirmed by the high score in the questionnaire related to the statement “*My organisation exchanged more experiences, information and views with others*”. The score of 4,23 constitutes the second most important outcome at organisational level.

Whereas TUDCN has undoubtedly contributed to improved coordination and cooperation, the traditional pattern of ‘bilateral’ cooperation of a northern organisation with a southern TU partner still seems to prevail. Co-financing mechanisms in northern countries that implicitly lead to this type of partnerships constitute a major constraint in this regard and imply that further development of N – S partnerships towards multilateral settings remains an important challenge. Nevertheless, many organisations continue to strive in that direction as it would allow to better address global challenges, create more leverage and impact and further reduce overlap and inefficiency. From TUDCN’s point of view, it is however not clear to which point it should be the network’s responsibility to encourage its northern members to integrate their actions in a particular southern country.

TUDCN also contributed to improved cooperation among Southern members, but its specific impact in this area is difficult to assess. Developments in Africa, Asia and Latin America have been very different in this regard, because of major differences in the institutional contexts and history:

* Latin America presents an outstanding example of success, as a continental network for TU development cooperation has been created that in its objectives is highly similar to TUDCN, funded by ITUC but only operating on the level of the continent. The activities of the network, which is composed of TUs and SSOs, aim at stimulating the debate on international development issues, influencing regional and national policy making and at coordinating development projects. The network facilitates information exchange and organises one general meeting and usually two training seminars per year. It aims now to mainstream particular project management approaches all over the continent. The network is driven by an active and motivated group of TUs and enjoys high levels of participation of TUs in the region.
* Developments in Asia and the Pacific have remained very limited so far because of the limited interest from ITUC’s regional structures, which are supposed to act as an intermediary between TUDCN and southern TUs. Particular problems include the fact that many TUs are politicized or undergo strong government control; in addition the approach from the strong and influential Japanese TUs that differs substantially from TUDCN’s way of working constitutes an important impediment. The fact that Asia has both ‘developed’ and ‘developing’ countries, with TU members that take entirely different positions with regard to the relation between development (cooperation) and typical TU issues, constitutes an additional challenge. Some TUDCN members of the Philippines, Indonesia and Korea might provide in the future an important steppingstone for developing the network in the continent parallel to the vested ITUC structures.
* The situation in Africa has other particularities with TUs being historically linked to Pan African institutions. The ITUC regional office seems however determined in building up the regional network and stresses the need to work via a bottom-up approach at individual country level. TUDCN can play a role in supporting these dynamics. Some of its tools, such as the project directory, already help the local players to avoid duplication and identify opportunities to further expand their network.

### **5.2.4 Increased TU capacity and effectiveness of development action in the North and the South**

TUDCN has been instrumental in increasing TU capacity and effectiveness for development action. To start with, the achievements described in the previous sub-chapters (strengthened views on DC, increased inclusion and ownership of DC in TUs and, in more operational terms, increased coordination and cooperation) have pointed to various issues that, broadly, have created a fertile ground for enhancing capacity and effectiveness.

In addition to these achievements, the network has undertaken specific efforts to increase capacity and effectiveness in the technical sense. The work realised by the WG on development effectiveness (see chapter 5.1.4.4) has played a key role in this regard. The main products of the working group so far have been the “TU principles and guidelines” and the “TU Development Effectiveness Profile Tool (TUDEP)”. A guidance note for TUs on Monitoring and Evaluation at outcome and impact level is in preparation[[31]](#footnote-32):

The survey results show that the majority of the respondents consider these products “very useful” (in more than half of the cases) or “to some extent useful” for their organisations:

|  |
| --- |
| **Appreciation by survey respondents of the usefulness for of the following documents (for their organisation):**  |
|  **a. TU principles and guidelines on development effectiveness** | **b. TU Development Effectiveness Profile (TUDEP)** |
|  |  |

Figure 4

* The “principles and guidelines”, apart from having contributed to strengthened TU views on development cooperation policies and practices andtoincreased coherence (see previous subchapters), have had a positive effect in terms of capacity building. The ‘principles and guidelines’ have often been mentioned during the interviews as a document that helped to clarify and refine the own DC approach at organisational level.
* The TUDEP is a practical tool meant to support TUs in the application of the effectiveness principles in their everyday development cooperation practice. For many TUs it constitutes a welcome operational complement to the rather normative and conceptual way development effectiveness has been outlined in the TU principles and guidelines. The objective of the TUDEP tool is ‘to improve the quality and effectiveness of TU development cooperation by helping partners to reflect on their practice as well as on the principles and values that underpin their work’. It also helps to facilitate monitoring and evaluation of progress in the use of the principles and guidelines. The TUDEP is composed of a set of connected instruments: the tool as such, a manual, a slides presentation and a guidance note on how to make sense of the TUDEP-results. The tools allow rating an organisation’s effectiveness against the eight TU development effectiveness principles.

The TUDEP-tool is positively assessed by network members. It is seen as a useful and innovative instrument, not only for enhancing the quality of development cooperation projects, but also because of its quality of stimulating equal participation of northern and southern partners in the partnership debate. Some state that the tool has helped them to become more professional. Especially for members in the South, the tool helped to increase their confidence and, indirectly, their credibility.

* As the M&E guidelines are still being finalized, it is still too early to assess them. However, initial reactions on the document seem to be mixed. Some consider the document as very (too?) technical, others would have preferred to follow the initial proposal of focusing on the joint development of indicators related to aims and principles that are key in TU development cooperation, such as ‘decent work’. This would constitute a more direct help to many organisations in addressing the present donor demands. Still others stress that one doesn’t exclude the other. They consider the guidelines a first and necessary step to come to a shared TU vision on M&E (in analogy with the “principles and guidelines” on development effectiveness). Based on this, more practical tools can still be developed. The real value of the M&E guidelines will only become clear after the document has been presented, discussed and diffused to the broader group of members. However, it is clear that the work on M&E will not be finished with the diffusion of the guidelines, if TUDCN wants to fully address the multiple capacity strengthening demands that exist in this area.

TUDCN’s past, present and future role with regard to enhancing capacity building and development effectiveness should further be addressed against the following considerations:

* TUDCN has a broad and varied membership, which constitutes the core of its richness and uniqueness, but on the other hand implies the existence of a broad range of capacity building related needs and expectations. The present efforts aimed at improving the effectiveness of development cooperation, seem to have been mainly useful for TUs, rather than for SSOs, which is illustrated by the survey results shown below:

Figure 5

While one should be careful in interpreting these data (only 5 SSOs answered the questionnaire), the big difference in the scores seems to suggest that for more ‘professional’ SSOs the TUDCN tools have not been that meaningful. This is not a drama in itself, as SSOs only constitute a minority of TUDCN’s membership and might have fewer expectations towards TUDCN in terms of capacity building. It seems however to suggest that TUDCN preferably makes an explicit choice for supporting those members that still face basic weaknesses in terms of development cooperation management.

* Several resource persons have pointed to the major challenge of diffusing the tools in their organisations. This partially explains why the overall score related to TUDCN’s contribution to improved development cooperation management skills is among the weakest figuring in the survey (3,28 on a scale of 6), even when abstraction is made from the very low score of the SSOs (see graph above). As for the TUDEP-tool, for instance, only a limited number of TUDCN members (e.g. ACLVB, some Nordic organisations, …) seem to have effectively managed to integrate its use in their daily DC practices.

Some members facing difficulties in introducing tools in their organisations at least implicitly seek for TUDCN support in this regard. Obviously, they are not hoping TUDCN to actively promote the tools within their organisation, but rather to more explicitly encourage exchange and learning on appropriate diffusion strategies that can be adopted, and to provide support accordingly. The experience in Latin America might thereby serve as an example, as through awareness raising and training organised by the regional development cooperation network, important changes are claimed to have been created in many member organisations.

* Resource persons contacted have signalled additional capacity building needs in various areas such as advocacy and evaluation (in particular joint evaluation exercises, e.g. of TU activities in a particular country as a basis for eventual joint action). Apart from this, there are certainly many other capacity building needs. A major challenge in this regard is to develop a coherent capacity building strategy, and also to assess where it is necessary to develop TU specific tools and where use can be made of existing development cooperation management tools that are abundantly available and easily accessible.
* Related to the previous point, it seems that reflection on future capacity building strategies related to ‘development cooperation’ cannot be disconnected from what seem to happen internationally, i.e. the gradual shift in approach from ‘development cooperation’ to ‘development’ as such, which implies an increased focus on issues and values (related to democratisation, governance, equality, …) that are close to the core of the TU identity. This evolution might have implications for the shape of ‘development cooperation’ in the future and, hence, for the capacity building strategy to be developed, be it that, again, views and needs of the members (in the North and the South) can vary much in this regard.

## **5.3 External achievements**

### **5.3.1 Development of common TU positions**

In general, one might be inclined to think that is not evident for a worldwide network with such a diverse membership as TUDCN to come up with “common positions” that are shared by all members. However, in the case of TUDCN, many respondents confirm that till now there haven’t been real problems in this respect. This has to a certain degree been a surprise for the evaluators as the development of common positions is often a sensitive process and issue in CSO networks. Apparently there are several reasons for TUDCN’s success in this regard:

* The most important positions TUDCN had to define so far deal with ‘broad themes’ (e.g. related to decent work) for which there already exists a broad consensus and political support within the TU movement. Other positions related to rather technical issues (e.g. related to EU policy processes) and as such constitute less an issue of concern for many members.
* As already discussed under 5.1, good consultation mechanisms are in place; there is a feeling of transparency (positions are presented at General Meetings and are systematically published on the website; members are also systematically consulted and have the possibility to react to position papers). Moreover, there is a high level of confidence in the secretariat staff and the working groups. These factors create trust in what the network is doing.
* For many TU members, participation in the international development debate is something new. While some important successes can be noted (see 5.3 below), it remains a relatively minor area of preoccupation for most TUDCN members – especially in the South. Members find it important that TUs via TUDCN are present in these debates, but they are less concerned about the contents and readily give a mandate to the secretariat and working groups.
* Some respondents also suggested that the hierarchic structure and culture of the TU movement implies an easy acceptance of what is decided “at the top”.

While the global picture seems rather positive, it cannot be ignored that there are some threats that might grow in significance in the future:

* In the longer run, the present way of functioning might endanger the credibility of the network as a representative actor for the TU movement. Some key resource persons from the donor community shared their (critical) observations/doubts with regard to TUDCN’s role and position in particular in the policy dialogue with the EU, but to some extent also in relation to their position as CSO representative in the development effectiveness task group. TUDCN’s capacity to very quickly (as a membership-based organisation) prepare position papers and to react to developments in policy debates, created the impression that these were mainly the result of the work of the secretariat, without a proper process of consultation of members, certainly not at the global level[[32]](#footnote-33). Although the papers and other inputs were of good quality, this process indirectly affected the credibility of TUDCN as an actor representing the broad TU movement (at least in the eyes of some of our resource persons).

While dealing with ‘representation’ will always remain a challenge in networks but has not created major problems so far in TUDCN, the findings above are significant in the sense that they should encourage the network to reflect about what can done in the future to strengthen ‘representation’, so as to be prepared to deal with difficulties that sooner or later will come up.

* Another issue is linked to the previous one: there are no mechanisms to derive messages organically from the network members and the regions through a bottom-up approach. Instead the positions are first prepared by the secretariat and then sent for consultation to a selected group of members and/or presented for endorsement at the GM. This approach limits the depth of the messages (the contents of the messages relate mainly broad positions on which there is a general, political agreement) and also makes it difficult to proactively come up with issues determined by concrete needs and experiences from the field (most positions are now formulated in a reactive way as a response to external triggers).

Most probably, TUDCN will be faced with the challenge to deal more explicitly with this issue when it will endeavour to increase the role and influence of Southern TUs in the network.

* A third point is of a more specific nature. “Acceptance” of TUDCN’s positions and priorities is more difficult for associated partners having their own advocacy agenda. This is for instance the case for the GUFs, many of which have their own development agenda and a long tradition of development cooperation and advocacy. E.g. for Education International, the priority in the debates on MDGs, Post-Busan, …, is that more attention would be given to education in development cooperation. TUDCN from its side wants to address more general TU demands (that can be even contradictory with the EI agenda, as the focus on general issues may shift attention away from education issues). Also in the South, regional ITUC offices are not always on same line as EI members with regard to advocacy issues and priorities.

While this is just one concrete example, the challenge to come to joint priorities and positions might grow into an issue of bigger importance when TUDCN members grow further in ‘development maturity’ and start to develop their own advocacy agendas. Increased involvement of southern actors might provoke the same effect.

### **5.3.2 Increased visibility and recognition of TUs as development actors in their own right**[[33]](#footnote-34)

Ensuring increased visibility and recognition was a central consideration behind the network’s first major initiatives, in particular the organisation of high profile public events that were meant to reiterate the importance of TUs as actors in development cooperation. While the two major conferences organised in Sweden and Spain faced some difficulties and drained much energy from the secretariat, they succeeded in gaining recognition for the network and encouraging good quality exchange among the participants. In addition, they contributed to building trust among TUs that used to compete with each other and now could unite in a network to strive for their objectives via consolidated and concerted efforts. In addition and more recently, TUDCN’ study (carried out with the support of HIVA) on Donor Support systems for TU culminating in a TUDCN Development Paper, has also increased to the TUs visibility, among others via its successful presentation during a successful meeting with DAC members in October 2012 in Paris.

‘Increased visibility and recognition’ is generally considered as a major achievement of TUDCN. In interviews with TUDCN members, increased visibility is often spontaneously mentioned as an important (for some even the most important) achievement of the network. The survey findings point in the same direction. In the survey, *‘increased visibility in international development cooperation debates*’ receives an average score of 4,48 (on a scale from 1 to 6), which is the highest score among all “achievements” of the network.

It is useful to make a distinction between the international, regional and national level:

* *At international level.* The TUs’ increased visibility and recognition is to be situated first within the CSO family as such (where TUs are a relatively new actor) and within the broad range of development institutions.

TUDCN’s presence concerned various key international forums related to the development effectiveness debates that followed the Paris Declaration and Accra Agenda for Action (AAA) processes: TUs, via TUDCN in particular, were able to become part of the main CSO platforms (composed mainly of ‘traditional’ civil society actors) such as the BetterAid platform and the Open Forum on CSO Development Effectiveness. They also became part of the CSO representation in the Development Effectiveness Task Group. In these forums and platforms, the TU participants acted more as CSO representatives in general, without referring explicitly to their TU background.

The TUs also participated in the ‘Structured Dialogue’ process, the EU’s own initiative for organising its dialogue with civil society, where, contrary to their involvement in the development effectiveness debates, TU representatives could position themselves more clearly as participants defending the views and interests of TUs.

Finally, via its policy officer located at the TUAC, TUs had access to on-going policy discussions and reflections at OECD-DAC level, which they could effectively use in the structured dialogue and development effectiveness tracks.

While the effects of TUDCN’s presence in these forums will be addressed below, it should first be stated that they have largely contributed to the visibility and recognition of TUs as development actors in their own right. Actually, till a few years ago, TU presence in these high level forums was rather exceptional and marginal. TUDCN has proven an adequate tool for TUs to ensure for themselves a position in the debates and gain international recognition. This achievement might partially be attributed to the very nature of TUDCN and ITUC that represent more than 150 million workers worldwide and, hence, cannot be considered otherwise than a ‘heavy weight’. However, our interviews make us to believe that in particular the good quality of preparation and inputs, and the excellent capacity (to debate, defend positions, ...) of those representing the network (i.c. mainly its secretariat) are the main factors explaining the important achievements in terms of recognition and visibility[[34]](#footnote-35).

* *At regional level*, impact seems to be achieved mainly in Latin America, where via the regional development cooperation network Latin American TUs have become more present in the development debate, at national, continental and global level.
* *At the national level,* many have stated that TUs are now recognised as credible actor, mainly because the network helped them becoming more professional. For instance in Sweden, according to resource persons contacted ITUC has assisted TUs to enter into CSO circles; in Belgium the three Belgian TUs use TUDCN position papers and documents in national advocacy and in contacts with the Belgian government when defending their programs; this helped a lot to gain credibility. More in general, many members feel not isolated anymore, have gained more confidence in dealing with (e.g.) their government, and feel they are more viewed as belonging to a broader (more influential and capable) group.

To finish this section, it is worth paying some attention to the position of TUs in the broader CSO family. Apart from the TU contributions in the broad development debates (see next point), it should be underlined that the agenda’s of TUs are now better understood in CSO circles. Some prominent CSO representatives stated that this has been a welcome evolution as it provided them with access to many useful contacts around the world in TU circles that are connected to the Aid Industry. The importance of the development of such linkages could not be assessed by the evaluation, but one can presume that they constitute an important element of building a broader movement and dynamics.

An issue that might require reflexion in the future is related to the specific nature and interests of TUs within the broader CSO family. So far, the TU involvement in international forums seems not to have brought contradictory interests or views to the forefront. One might wonder whether this will always be the case in the future. In some instances, ‘regular’ NGOs and TUs might be tempted to each adopt more specific positions and go for separate representations and lobby strategies.

### **5.3.3 Increased Trade Union contributions to development debates and policies**

It is useful to make a conceptual distinction here between:

1. Participation of TU in development debates and policy formulation: is there political and institutional space for TU participation?
2. The actual influence of TUs on (the outcome of) the development debates and policies.

#### 5.3.3.1. Participation of TUs in development debates and policy formulation

This issue has been addressed already to some extent in the previous point, as it was explained that gaining ‘increased visibility and recognition’ went hand in hand with ‘increased participation in the development debates and policy formulation’ at the international level. In addition, our interviews generated various examples of success stories of TUs making tangible progress in participating in development debates at the national level, but also examples where particular constraints prevented effective participation. A few examples are presented below:

* In Italy, TUs participate in ten thematic working groups. Because of the inputs from TUDCN, TUs can anticipate the national decision-making processes;
* In Indonesia there has been a good cooperation with ILO on decent work, employment and worker rights and TUs have socialised the results of this cooperation;
* In Denmark TUs manage to mobilise additional support from DANIDA for participating in the work on the improvement of social dialogue in regional integration, one of DANIDA’s core priorities;
* In Latin America there is increased cooperation between TUs and CSOs on the post-Busan action plan;
* In Belgium TUs are more systematically consulted by their government to give their vision, e.g. in the preparation of the strategy notes on “LICs en MICs” and on “private sector and development cooperation”. Because of the inputs from TUDCN, TUs can now anticipate on national decision-making processes and have more influence on agenda-setting;
* In Togo, thanks to the network TUs are involved in discussions on development issues (e.g. MDGs); they are not only able to come up with critical points, but also propose alternatives;
* In France TUs experience difficulties in their relation with the government that has a very narrow view on ‘effectiveness’; there is much consultation between government and CSOs, but still mainly via regular CSO’s;
* In Spain, development cooperation suffers from big budget cuts, but good cooperation with NGOs could be developed;
* In Sweden as a result of the restructuring of SIDA, it is difficult for TUs to get access to the debates.

The survey results show relatively good scores regarding the degree to which, according to the respondents, TUs have increased their credibility and have been able to articulate their views in the international development debates. There is a lower score when it comes to increased TU participation in the development debate at national level, which can be explained by the existence of big differences between countries and between organisations, both in terms of their engagement in advocacy and in terms of their success in having strengthened their participation in the national debates:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Statement** | **Average score****(scale 1 – 6)** |
| TUs have increased their credibility in the international development debates | 4,17 |
| TUs have been able to better articulate their views in the international development debates | 4,23 |
| My organisation has been able to better articulate its view in the national development cooperation debate | 3,79 |

Table

#### 5.3.3.2. TU influence on development debates and policy formulation

Assessing the level of effective influence, via lobby and advocacy efforts, on the outcomes of development debates and policy formulation processes is a complex task, among others due to attribution problems. As such, the detailed analysis of the effects of increased TU participation at the national and regional level fell beyond the scope of this evaluation. This being said, it can safely be assumed that increased participation at these levels at has least led to ‘some’ effective influence on the outcomes of the development debates and policies. Several examples have been mentioned during the interviews. Also the answers on the survey suggest the existence of some TU influence on development debates and policy formulation, whereby it should be indicated that the scores here are significantly lower that those related to participation as such (‘increased visibility’, ‘increased recognition’, …) in these processes:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Statement** | **Average score****(scale 1 – 6)** |
| TU views and positions have been better taken into account *in international development cooperation policies* | 3,79 |
| TU views and positions have been better taken into account in the development cooperation policies *in my country* | 3,00 |
| Because of TUCN my organisation has become more influential *in the national development cooperation debate* | 3,50 |

Table

At the international level, TUDCN’s participation has been most prominent in the international discussion on development effectiveness and in the EU structured dialogue. There is strong evidence that in both cases, the network’s involvement has influenced the outcome of the process:

* As far as the process leading to the Busan declaration is concerned, TUs (via the TUDCN secretariat) have first played a positive role in consolidating the positions within the BetterAid platform, then in articulating the CSO points of view in the Development Effectiveness Task Team. It is claimed that, among others via these contributions, CSOs could bring renewed attention in the Declaration for ‘development values’ as well as the attention for decent work and social protection.
* With regard to the advocacy work geared to the EU (via the Structured Dialogue working group but also broader), some external observers state that the TUs have had a considerable impact, among others because its participation in the corresponding Working Group was of good quality, with various members already closely following up EU issues before. TU representatives managed to bring in ‘typical’ TU preoccupations such as decent work, labour issues and role of the private sector. These influenced the final communication with regard to the EU policy towards CSOs.

The fact that TUs pushed their own agenda, did not lead to tensions with ‘traditional’ NGOs, but had the rather important side effect that the EU is increasingly recognising the diversity within civil society.

While it is obvious that TUDCN (or the TUs) cannot solely claim these successes, it can be safely stated that TU representatives have been highly instrumental to achieving these. Resource persons quite unanimously stressed that TU representatives were very actively and skilfully involved in the processes, quickly assuming a leadership role and often taken a lead in the actual negotiation process.

There are a few remarks to end this sub-chapter:

* As already stated earlier, many of the debates have come from the outside to TUDCN and, hence, were not initiated by TUDCN. Consequently, TUDCN has acted rather reactively and not proactively. This should however be considered as quite normal at this stage in TUDCN’s institutional development.
* TUDCN succeeded in bringing in consistently the TU perspective in the high level fora mentioned above. Its advocacy efforts in this regard have been quite successful at the level of external parties. While this success is acclaimed by all, some state it has come at the expense of also working internally and that in the future a more adequate trade off is needed between ‘internal’ and ‘external’ work.
* Position papers that have been issued by TUDCN are considered as an efficient tool to influence decision-making processes in the European Parliament and EC, provided they are accompanied by targeted action to well chosen individuals. Some state that TUDCN should work out a more comprehensive campaigning strategy and thereby fully use its position as the network representing the ITUC.
* The position papers mentioned above have also been used at national level to influence national parliament and decision makers.
* It is expected that in future the relative important focus on EU might disappear for a broader approach, not only because the network is now well introduced in the EU and instruments for TU inclusion in EU platforms are in place, but also because there is an important challenge to broaden the TU influence to other international forums and institutions such as the World Bank, the G20 and UN institutions by liaising with the many CSO lobby groups/initiatives that already exist at these level.

### **5.3.4 Improved external networking and cooperation**

Improved external networking and cooperation has been both an effect *and* a cause of the other external achievements that have been described above. The most important achievements that can be mentioned in this regard can be summarized as follows:

* Overall, the network has been highly instrumental in engaging in structural cooperation with other civil society actors, development NGOs in particular. While till a few years ago TUs had been relatively absent in international development debates and policy processes, they now occupy an important position in many CSO platforms at the international and national level. So far, TUs seem to have found a good balance between promoting CSO interests and preoccupations at large and lobbying for their own specific interests.
* Similar developments are taking place at regional (in particular Latin America) and national level, where TUs are able to liaise increasingly with existing CSO platforms for joint action.

At least in the early stages of the network and cooperation building, it seems that the quality and consistency of the contributions of TU representatives – rather than the fact that they represented important mass organisations - have been key in the inclusion of TUs in the CSO networks and actions, certainly at the international level.

From the side of the CSOs, some observers point to the fact that the increased involvement of TUs has enriched the CSO movement and networks. Firstly, TUs adopt other approaches and bring in specific issues (decent work, social protection) and skills. Second, and more importantly, the increased participation and active role of TUs, women organisations, … in CSO networks has certainly added to the latters’ legitimacy. In the past, global processes used to be essentially steered by traditional NGOs, which actually constituted a major weakness in terms of representation and legitimacy. That being said, there is still much to be done in terms of increasing the focus on the South and involvement of Southern organisations in these processes. Grassroots organisations, indigenous people movements, etc. are still poorly represented.

# **6. Conclusion and lessons learned**

## **6.1. Conclusion**

Overall it can be concluded that TUDCN has succeeded to develop itself into a network that is fairly stable, inclusive, representative and legitimate. It clearly worked along its mandate to improve trade union development effectiveness and to ensure input of TU view in development policy debates, in particular concerning the inclusion of the decent work agenda and democratic ownership. There are in addition clear signs that TUDCN’s work in these areas has been effective to an important degree. Because of its unique nature, the network has created in that way a specific added value.

Moreover and while the achievements so far are already substantial, the network has the possibility to further develop the considerable potential of adequate involvement of TUs in development cooperation and, more generally, in promoting a more equal, democratic and sustainable development.

Whether or not the network will effectively be able to further expand its added value in the medium- and longer term and to fully realise the potential it has, will depend on various factors. The evaluation team wants to highlight the following points in this regard:

* **The sustainability of the network as such**. Whereas various factors have contributed to the successes achieved so far, the availability of external grants has been highly instrumental in this regard: while many of TUDCN members are strong and well structured organisations and movements, their contributions in terms of financial resources have remained minimal. In addition, TUDCN’s position under the ITUC umbrella is far from clear. If not addressed, these two challenges might jeopardise TUDCN’s sustainability on the medium term, notwithstanding the fact that its funding for the next four years seems to be ensured.
* **High level of dependence on individuals**. The evaluation has come across several situations where the role of individuals has been key to the network’s success. While capable staff is to be considered a key asset for all organisations, high levels of dependence on these staff make the organisation inevitably vulnerable. This seems to be the case at two levels at least. First, members of the secretariat have taken up roles and positions in international debates in a highly skilful way and, hence, gained much recognition and respect, which, we think, has been more the result of their individual qualities than because of the organisation they represent. Second, the evaluators have the impression that the situation is similar in many TUs where one or a small core of committed individuals embody the concern for development and development cooperation; notwithstanding their high levels of skills and commitment, they only to a limited extent succeed in mainstreaming their views in their organisation.
* **Representation and legitimacy**. Ensuring representation and legitimacy is core to long-term sustainability. So far and contrary to the situation in many other networks, TUDCN has succeeded in dealing fairly well with this issue, notwithstanding the fact that a major part of the representation work, of positions adopted, … is in the hand of a few individuals. So far, this has not created internal nor external problems, but there are some indications that this might change in the future. Overall, it can be stated that ‘representation and legitimacy’ will increasingly be under scrutiny by both external partners (as they might feel increasingly ‘embarrassed’ by TUDCN’s effectiveness) and by members (who will become more competent and thus potentially more critical towards the positions taken by network; effective representation will also become increasingly challenging as the network becomes more inclusive and hence more diverse).
* **The concern for long-term network development and sustainability**. So far, ‘sustainability’ has not really been an issue in the network. This is understandable as till now most energy has gone to the setup and initial development of the network, to the elaboration of services and products that benefit the members and, maybe above all, to a serious of concerted efforts ‘to put TU development cooperation on the map’, both internally within TUs and externally in the complex world of development cooperation. While there are still many challenges to be addressed, and while there are major ambitions to further expand the outreach and influence of the network, it will become increasingly important from now on to take sustainability considerations on board in any type of action. This might require a shift in the ‘activist’ culture of the network (i.e. a shift from a network geared towards ’fast action’, to a network that also puts a considerable part of its energy in working on its longer-term institutional and strategic development).

Overall it can be concluded that the important achievements reached by TUDCN remain vulnerable as long as the sustainability of the network and the mainstreaming of development cooperation at the level of TU members are not addressed more systematically.

## **6.3. Lessons learned**

The TUDCN experience is rather unique and many lessons can be learned from it, which might actually differ for each party interested in its development. For the evaluators, the following issues can be considered as interesting lessons:

* The development of an effective network is a complicated process that needs time, resources and, above all, strategic competence and direction. The TUDCN network could actually not benefit from longer-term financial resources in its early years and has been lucky to be able to mobilise these in due time. Without this initial “luck” (most probably attributable to its key promoters), the network might already have disappeared. On the other side, a clear strategy has been at the basis of the development of the network and implied that the necessary initial momentum could be gained both externally (via the organisation of high profile events) and internally (via work on TU principles and guidelines, and via the simple fact that the network filled in a big gap).

Notwithstanding these successes, after more than six years of good work, the network remains vulnerable, which is an illustration of the challenge and complexities involved in network development, rather than of the lack of strategic view of the network proponents.

* The TUDCN experience has proven that a network can explicitly combine internal (e.g. capacity building of members, network strengthening) and external (e.g. influence on development policies) objectives and that such a combination, when implemented adequately, can even produce synergic effects and, hence, become beneficial for both internal and external objectives. Such a choice brings however particular challenges in terms of finding a good balance between both types of objectives.
* Overall it seems that, certainly at the international level, and at least in the early stages of network and cooperation building, the quality and consistency of the contributions of network representatives is *the* key factor for success and recognition, rather than the fact that these individuals represent powerful mass organisations which out of their power might claim a certain level of influence.

# **7. recommendations**

1. Based on the conclusion that all components of TUDCN’s present programme are relevant and have created effects that (1) are significant but not yet sustainable and (2) show the potential for further expansion towards more leverage and impact, it is overall important for TUDCN to continue and even strategically expand and (in some cases) redirect its efforts with – at least – the same quality of involvement and mobilisation of resources, so as to maintain the momentum gained and to safeguard the achievements of the past.

More specifically this implies that:

1. In line with the declared intentions of the TUDCN leadership, concerted efforts should be undertaken to further expand the network in such a way that **southern membership** increases, the voice of the south is more consistently heard and mechanisms are developed to bring, via TUDCN, southern concerns and priorities on the agenda of international, regional and national forums. This will imply a pronounced decentralisation of the network (which might be implemented along different avenues in the three southern continents), the development of bottom-up approaches and a review of some internal consultation and decision-making mechanisms.
2. As a network, TUDCN should address more systematically the issue of **representation and legitimacy**:
3. First and in line with the previous recommendation, this should imply the increase and improvement of participation from the South, which would eventually reinforce the TUDCN support for its southern members in international and national forums (instead of being perceived – rightly or wrongly - as acting/speaking on their behalf).
4. Second, TUDCN key structures (secretariat, FSG) should further optimise internal consultation and representation mechanisms so as to be able to address internal or external attempts that question the legitimacy of the network as a whole or of its representatives.
5. Third, possibilities should be explored to increase GUF participation. It is recommended to organise a separate meeting with the GUFs, to clarify the GUFs’ concerns and expectations with regard to the network and to explore possibilities for coordination and participation, in such a way that a mutual added value is created.
6. *At the international level* and in the relation with governments and donors, TUs via TUDCN should **sustain their dynamic** **engagement and leadership role in the CSO forums and platforms**. This implies:
7. To continue to engage in issues that come up via international dynamics, thereby trying to become somewhat more proactive together with the CSO community at large;
8. To engage more consistently in country-level work (via the members), as it is at this level where principles, tools, declarations, … come merely to effect; indeed, when the achievements at international level are not followed up by efforts on the ground, their importance might be reduced to a symbolic level;
9. A critical analysis and identification of the issues and forums TUDCN should concentrate on. TUDCN’s intention to broaden institutional targets (aside from the EU and the post-Busan process) is endorsed, provided that this will not harm the key strengths of TUDCN’s involvement so far (i.c. quality and consistency). In terms of advocacy issues, TUDCN should limit itself to subjects that are close to its core as a TU network. This would imply, for instance, that ‘the role of the private sector in development cooperation’ is a key issue, while ‘conditionality and predictability of aid’ is less. It also implies that, overall, TUDCN might rather want to concentrate on issues related to ‘development’ than to ‘development cooperation management’ as such (if this direction is followed, clear agreements should be made with other TU actors active in global advocacy on development issues, particularly the ITUC itself and the GUFs, in terms of complementarity, coordination and role division).
10. While the combination of internal and external objectives undoubtedly has added to TUDCN uniqueness and effectiveness, it seems that over the last period the balance has tilted somewhat too far in the direction of advocacy work related to international issues. More attention should be given to **internal capacity building**, which should go beyond the (participatory) development of tools, guidelines and approaches but actually also support TU representatives in their efforts to mainstream and/or diffuse these tools, views and approaches within their organisations, their partnerships and at the level of country-based activities.
11. It is recommended that TUDCN would develop a **sustainability strategy** which should be comprehensive and, hence, address the organisational, institutional as well as financial dimensions of sustainability:
12. At organisational level, the network should be further consolidated in ‘technical’ terms (see operational recommendations below) via a concerted range of activities dealing with human resources, capitalisation of experiences, the optimisation of internal consultation and participation mechanisms, etc. The present over-dependence on some individuals is a specific key issue to be addressed in this regard.
13. At institutional level, there is a need to clarify the network’s position towards and within the ITUC. Ideally spoken the ITUC should provide the necessary institutional and financially stability and backing to TUDCN. Thereby it is important to guarantee that the distinction between ITUC and TUDCN becomes clearer to outsiders and that the ITUC-TUDCN link does not prevent non-ITUC members from joining the network.
14. Financially, TUDCN should invest in working out a strategy that allows it to gradually become less dependent on external funding. Now that TUDCN has proven its added value, the mobilisation of internal resources (human resources, funds) can be addressed in a more systematic way. TUDCN should preferably work out a clear plan including milestones towards increasing financial sustainability.
15. While TUDCN has been successful in international debates and also, indirectly, in the debates at regional and national level, it appears that its excellence in terms of technical and tactical contributions and negotiation skills is still insufficiently matched by a comprehensive **campaigning approach and strategy** that makes better use of the potential of its TU members. Bringing in the campaigning dimension in the advocacy process should therefore be more systematically considered in the future.
16. An issue that might require reflexion in the near future is related to the **specific nature and interests of TUs within the broader CSO family**. So far, the TU involvement in international forums seems not to have brought contradictory interests or views to the forefront. It can be assumed[[35]](#footnote-36) that this will not always be the case in the future, and that in some instances ‘regular’ NGOs and TUs will be tempted to defend more specific positions and go for separate representations and lobby strategies. While following a separate lobby strategy could be fruitful in some situations, in can be counterproductive in others. TUDCN should be prepared to deal with this dilemma and preferentially already clarify its strategy in this regard.
17. While the recommendations above mainly refer to the future strategic development of the network, simultaneous efforts are needed to **further consolidate and develop the network internally**. The following recommendations can be formulated in this regard:
18. To optimise and diversify internal consultation and participation mechanisms, so as to increase the possibilities for members to effectively participate in the network. This will also allow making better use of the large potential that presently exists within the network:
* To implement the already existing ideas of creating an online discussion forum and adding opinions page in the newsletter;
* To set up learning platforms or communities of practice around specific issues (e.g. on ‘how to mainstream tools in the organisation’);
* To stimulate and support the creation of working groups in the South, which should then focus on issues that are of particular interest for the region;
* To experiment with the creation of work streams around particular themes of interest which are led by one of the members instead of the secretariat;
* To continue with the organisation of seminars to stimulate exchange around specific issues considered relevant for the network.

Some of these suggestions (e.g. working groups in the South, work streams led by one of the members, …) ask for a ‘facilitating’ rather than a ‘coordinating’ role of the TUDCN secretariat. The secretariat furthermore plays an important role in scaling the outcomes of the different consultation and participation mechanisms up to the overall network level.

1. Related to the previous point, the General Meetings should go beyond information exchange and engage in true discussion on policy, organising the work, … and be used as a means to more actively engage members in some areas. This might also imply a higher involvement of members in the preparation of the meetings, e.g. by organising consultations on the agenda of the GM and by diffusing the agenda and the documents to be discussed well in advance, so that participants can prepare themselves better for the meeting;
2. The FSG should become a true ‘internal’ countervailing power (in the positive sense of the word) to the secretariat. The FSG should furthermore aim at an effective representation of the different member categories, as was the initial ambition when this group was created;
3. To be a bit more formal in membership management. A possibility could be to ask members to regularly (e.g. every two years) confirm their interest in being part of the network and receiving the network communications. Membership can be further formalised by asking small membership fees;
4. To give priority to making the mailing list up-to-date;
5. To continue to use short briefing papers to diffuse important network messages. Such briefing papers are more accessible than the longer documents, while at the same time they give a more ‘formal’ status to the messages than when the latter would simply be included in the newsletter or diffused via mail;
6. Till now, little attention has been given to the capitalisation of experiences within the network. One can think, for instance, of experiences with the use of the TUDEP-tool or experiences of successfully using the TUDCN positions in national advocacy. While asking the members to (formally) report on experiences might be asked too much for many, the secretariat could play a role in collecting experiences and documenting on them. It would be useful to create a separate space in the newsletter in this respect.
7. After presenting the ‘guidelines on monitoring and evaluation at outcome and impact level’, a reflection should take place on how to further proceed with the work on monitoring and evaluation. There still seems to be a high demand for the development of TU-specific, ready-to-use instruments and tools regarding M&E. Such a reflection should preferentially take place at the GM or through a broader member consultation, and not be confined to the WG (whose participants, as ‘technical experts in development cooperation’ might see other priorities than the broader group of members).
8. The implementation of many of the recommendations presented in this chapter implies an **increase in the resources of the network**. While contributions in kind from the members should be further promoted, an expansion of the network’s secretariat will probably be necessary to that effect.
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1. Background and justification

The evaluation is planned at the end of the second EU support project (2011-12) for the Trade Union Development Cooperation Network, in order to learn lessons for the new phase of the TUDCN (2013-2016).

The evaluation is foreseen as part of the 2011-12 project by the TUDCN itself. The Commission acknowledged the evaluation as a useful source to assess the relevance of its support to the TUDCN.

The evaluation should concentrate on the 2011-2012 timespan but contextualize its findings within the evolution of the network since 2006 (ITUC founding congress and mandate for development cooperation as a working area).

Special attention should be paid to the functioning of the network as the chosen working modality for the Trade Union Development Cooperation.

2. Evaluation aims

The aims of this evaluation are:

* to demonstrate to which extent the TUDCN has been able to produce *a specific added value* and has the potential to continue doing so in the future, in particular towards its donors and constituencies
* to account for the use of the resources towards the TUDCN member organisations, the ITUC, donors and the public at large;
* to learn lessons from the TUDCN activities, approach and results achieved with a view of improving future performance of the network, in particular in relation to the next project that is expected to start in April 2013.

3. Evaluation object and scope

# 3.1 Rationale (why has project been undertaken?) and main objectives

The international trade union movement represents 175 million workers in 153 countries. Affiliated national trade union centres, independent and democratically elected organisations, have for decades offered solidarity to and engaged with one another, at bilateral level or through regional groupings. A key area of solidarity and engagement is in development cooperation.

Following the 2006 founding congress of the ITUC in Vienna, a particular focus was demanded on the trade union development cooperation as part of the global trade union organising agenda (new trade union internationalism) on the one hand and as policy area for public involvement on the other hand.

The Trade Union Development Cooperation Network (TUDCN) was established formally in 2008 by the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) and further received the support of the EU Thematic Programme for Non State Actors (objective 3), with a first grant in 2009-2010 (Phase I) and a second grant in 2011-2012 (Phase II). The mandate of the TUDCN is (i) to improve trade union development cooperation effectiveness (cooperation and coordination) through sharing of information and practices and by stimulating improved impact and results of the solidarity efforts within the trade union movement; and (ii) to ensure input of trade union views in the development related policy debates and especially concerning the inclusion of the decent work agenda, and democratic ownership in development as key issues for sustainable development strategies.

# 3.2 Institutional framework

Today the TUDCN has become a unique trade union platform for development cooperation bringing together the affiliates of the ITUC, the regional organisations[[36]](#footnote-37) from Africa, America, Asia-Pacific and Europe, the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC), the Trade Union Solidarity Support Organisations[[37]](#footnote-38), the Global Union Federations[[38]](#footnote-39), the Trade Union Advisory Committee to the OECD (TUAC)[[39]](#footnote-40) and other interested trade union based organisations. It is understood that each of the constituents is responsible towards its own constituency along the lines that they have defined themselves. For the ITUC, reporting on the work of the TUDCN takes place in the yearly General Council of the ITUC. One of the Deputy Secretary Generals is in charge of development cooperation including the follow up of the TUDCN.

The TUDCN is organised in a plenary meeting called “TUDCN general meeting” (GM) that took place 2 a year in the last 2 years. The work of the TUDCN is organised by targeted working groups (WG) around the broad objectives of the TUDCN:

* WG on development effectiveness, looking at aspects of cooperation including principles for TUDC, relationships between partners, methodology for cooperation, M&E, …
* WG on EU policies: looking at all aspects of EU development policies including structured dialogue and policy forum for development, contact with the DG DEVCO and other relevant EU departments, the EP, the EESC, the EEAS, …
* Policy Working Group: looking at specifics of the international development agenda: HLF Busan, the OECD DAC, the UN DCF, … including representation and cooperation with civil society platforms.

Seminars complete the instruments of the TUDCN and are convened around matters as defined by the GM: south-south cooperation, development education, trade union support systems, M&E, +2015 and SDG, etc in order to deepen aspects of trade union development cooperation and/or formulation of policy positions.

A small secretariat composed of 1 coordinator, 1 policy officer, 1 outreach officer and part time secretariat support ensures the preparation and logistics for the meetings; organises research and publications (regular newsletter and thematic “development papers”) and supports the representation of the Network towards relevant European and international institutions.

A Facilitation and Steering Group has been formed with representatives of each of the constituencies (ITUC, regions, SSO, GUF, …) and has as task to monitor the implementation of the TUDCN plan of action and assist the secretariat in between the General Meetings.

# 3.3 Beneficiaries

The work of the TUDCN targets a mix of development practitioners and policy makers, based on their commitment in their organisations of origin (a trade union confederation is represented differently than an SSO and/or GUF, …). This diversity is enriching but at the same time can be a source of uneven progress and participation within the network. The direct beneficiaries are therefore the focal persons in the different organisations that are in charge of development cooperation. Indirect beneficiaries are the members of the affiliated organisations that are partner in the cooperation.

# 3.4 Main results so far

The programme has so far achieved the recognition of the **Trade Unions as development actors in their own right and of the particular role they play as a social partner in the development strategies based on inclusive growth.**

Trade Unions engaged in the main development processes and international frameworks with a special attention for representation and inclusion of the developing countries representatives in international and European level debates (Financing for Development Doha 2009; LDC IV 2010; Busan HLF 4, 2011; UNCTAD XIII, 2012; G-8/20) and claimed their place defending sustainable development based on economic, social and environmental justice, through the promotion of decent work, green jobs, social protection floor and adequate financial instruments for development.

At EU level, in the Structured Dialogue process, they claimed a dialogue and actor based approach in the support modalities for working with CSOs as development actors in their own right. The Network contributed to the different consultations on EU Communications (Agenda for Change, Social Protection, CSOs in development); to the monitoring and policy preparation of the AAPs, midterm reviews and evaluations of thematic programmes; and to debates on MFF and the DCI at the EP and the EESC. Trade unions also took up leading roles in Civil Society platforms such as BetterAid and the Open Forum for CSO Effectiveness. This has contributed to an increased focus in development policies on social sustainability and rights based approaches to development. In particular the decent work agenda (jobs, rights, social protection and social dialogue) and democratic ownership in development has been central in the TUDCN's demands as well as an inclusive strategy towards economic growth and private sector involvement in development cooperation through social dialogue recognition of social partners engagement as development actors in their own right and the promotion of an enabling environment for civil society organisations.

Principles and Guidelines for trade union development effectiveness were elaborated in order to improve cooperation and coherence within the trade unions' development cooperation efforts with the trade union in developing countries. The Trade Union Development effectiveness Profile (TUDEP) was developed as a learning tool to support trade union development actors in putting the Principles in practices and facilitating the monitoring and evaluation of their implementation. Being in its early stage, the TUDEP needs to be promoted at regional and national level.

A major achievement of the TUDCN has been to provide a common field for the trade union partners in development to allow shared approaches and views towards the trade union development cooperation experience.

Due to the limitation of the past programme it has only been able to give a limited place to the partner organisations in the South. Empowering the latter was pointed out as the main challenge for the trade union cooperation in general and for the TUDCN in particular.

# 3.5 Time frame

The following milestones will guide the evaluation process:

* Evaluation Progress report for discussion by the Facilitation and Steering Group 29-30/1/2013
* Draft of the final report by March 20, 2013;
* Reactions on draft final report received by end-March
* Final report ready by April 10
* Discussion of conclusions at the April 2013 General Meeting.

4. Main evaluation questions

**SUGGESTED MAIN QUESTIONS:**

* What has the network changed for you at national/regional level?
* What is the value added of the network?
* Is there any unexplored potential in the network?
* Could you imagine any changes in terms of your contribution to the network?

Sub-questions:

1. To which extent did the network reach its objectives (as outlined in the EU funded proposal)?
2. To which extent have members from the New Member States and from the South been involved in the Network

**QUESTIONS PERTAINING TO NETWORK STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONING:**

* TUDN secretariat
* Facilitation and Steering Group
* General Meeting
* TUCDN working groups
* Decision making process
* Communication

5. Evaluation methodology

* phases in the evaluation (see timeline above)
* persons/institutions to be contacted
	1. TUDCN secretariat
	2. TUDCN constituents (representative sample of each of the “constituent groups”: ITUC affiliates, SSO, regions, GUF and TUAC)
* feedback moments during implementation
	1. see timeline
* participation in key events
	1. General Meeting Paris November 2012
	2. FSG: January 2013
	3. General Meeting April 2013
* measures to ensure evaluation utilization
	1. writing up of summary of findings and recommendations
	2. publishing as Development Papers (linked to activity report)

Three major data collection tools will be used for this evaluation:

1. An electronic survey (can be sent to a representative sample or all constituent groups)
2. Discussions with a selected number of representatives from the TUDCN constituents (preferably once the main results of the survey have been processed)
3. Focus Group Discussions in a few selected locations (in as far as feasible).

6. Expertise required

* Methodological expertise (on CV and institutional references)
* Knowledge of sector, of institutional setting, ... (previous evaluation experiences in social and trade union field)
* Knowledge of languages: active English, French and Spanish
* (indications on) composition of evaluation team and task division (tbd)

7. Steering mechanism

* Steering Group: composition, role, frequency of meetings, ... : FSG serves as reference group, see timeline for face to face meetings and further online consultations to take place at relevant moments of progress
* At least: Evaluation manager (ITUC DCE/TUDCN coordinating staff)
	+ Jan Dereymaeker
	+ Paola Simonetti

8. Reporting requirements

* Language: final report in English, translations secured by TUDCN
* Desired length of report including Executive Summary 32 pages max (10.000 words), annexes not included.
* To be published in Development papers format. Additional information online available.
* Annexes to be included (methodological framework, persons met, bibliography)

9. Obligations of contracting parties

* Commissioner of evaluation: access to key documentation, facilitation of access to all relevant stakeholders, ...tbd
* Evaluator: confidentiality, impartiality, ... (reference to code of ethics) tb included
* Working days: 40
* Budget and payment modalities will be described in the evaluation contract

1O. Bibliography

* List of key documents

# Annex 2. Methodological instruments

## 2.1. Evaluation framework

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Main evaluation questions and judgment criteria** | **Detailed evaluation questions and indicators** |
|  |  |
| **Main questions (further operationalized)** |
| Results of the program, according to the stakeholders | * What do you consider as the most important results achieved till now?
* Internal (e.g. capacity strengthening of the members, improved functioning of the network, …)
* External (e.g. policy changes, increased democratic space, …)
* Which (planned) results could not be achieved? How can this be explained?
* Which unexpected and/or unintended results and effects did occur?
* Has the network produced any added value for your organisation:
* in terms of improving the performance of your organisation (via collective action, sharing of information, …
* in terms of using alternative approaches based on new ways of understanding (up-streamed performance
* in terms of being heard/exerting influence at higher (national, global) levels
 |
| Increased ownership of TU development cooperation | Has TU development cooperation become more coherent, effective and inclusive:* Has the level/number of development cooperation activities by TU partners increased?
* Has coordination improved and are more synergies (among members, between members and secretariat) achieved?
* Have trade unions improved their engagement (at national level) in development policy formulation?
* Has the network participation (in quantity and quality) of members from new member states increased?
* Has the network participation (in quantity and quality) of members from the South increased?
 |
| Increased capacity for TU development action in South and North | * To which extent are TU development networks better organised in the South (regional, sub-regional)?
* To which extent has cooperation among TU partners on common capacity development programmes increased?
* To which extent have coordination and synergies in project/programmes increased (among partners in the North and the South)?
* To which extent have relationships with donors (of SSO, of TU development cooperation sections) improved?
* To which extent have support modalities for CSOs been modified in view of including trade union specific support (taking into account the specific role and potential of TUs)?
 |
| TU views on cooperation policies and practices developed | * To which extent have TU network partners agreed on common positions?
* To which extent are TU activists better acquainted with policy challenges related to development cooperation?
* To which extent do development institutions’ policies and practices better reflect TU views (related to decent work, democratic governance, …)
* To which extent do CSOs recognise the specific TU contribution to policy agendas and promote common action?
 |
|  |  |
| ***The network structure and functioning*** |
| *Clear, shared vision and goals*  | * *How are the vision and goals of the TUDCN network formulated?*
* *To what degree are the vision and goals clear to and shared by network members?*
* *Which added value do members expect to get from the network (in terms of added value for their own organisation)?*
* *Do the present vision and goals correspond with members' expectations towards the network?*
 |
| *Participation and democracy* | * *How are different members presently participating in the network (in general meetings, working groups, facilitation and steering group, communication, …)?*
* *How do the members perceive their (present and potential) role and participation in the network?*
* *Do members have the possibility to participate in the network according to their own capacities, possibilities and priorities? (so that complementarities are optimally made use of and so that also weaker members have the possibility to contribute). Is TUDCN optimally making use of the expertise and experience present in the network?*
* *Are there differences between different (categories) of members in terms of involvement and participation in TUDCN? How can these differences be explained?*
* *What are the present mechanisms of decision-making within TUDCN? Make a decision between strategic decision-making (e.g. on overall goals, strategies and priorities), decision-making on a daily basis (e.g. on the organisation of a seminar), decision-making within working groups, etc.*
* *How (through which mechanisms) and at which levels have members the possibility to participate in decision-making? How is this participation in decision-making valued by network members?*
* *Is there a feeling of ownership of the network amongst network members?*
 |
| *Trust among network members* | * *Is there trust between the members of the network: a) to share information, b) to undertake joint action?*
* *Is there trust between the members and the TUDCN secretariat?*
* *How do these relations effect the functioning of TUDCN?*
* *Which factors have had a positive influence on trust building (e.g. through general meetings, communication, working together in working groups, …)?*
* *Which factors did have a negative influence on trust building?*
 |
| *Good quality leadership*  | * *How is the coordination of TUDCN presently taken up (tasks and role of the TUDCN secretariat, the facilitation and steering group) ?*
* *How is the leadership and coordination (by the TUDCN secretariat/ the facilitation and steering group) perceived by network members?*
* *Are roles and functions of the TUDCN secretariat/ the facilitation and steering group sufficiently clear?*
* *Is leadership stimulating the members to actively participate?*
* *How is coordination of the working groups organised? How is this perceived by the working group participants?*
 |
| *Efficiency issues* | * *Quality of planning:*
	+ *What are the strengths and weaknesses of the way in which objectives are defined and activities are planned?*
* *Quality of monitoring, evaluation and lessons learning:*
	+ *Which (formal and informal) mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation are in place?*
	+ *How are the results of monitoring and evaluation used for the revision of planning and for lessons learning?*
	+ *To what degree do the present follow-up and planning mechanisms allow to be flexible, in order to quickly respond to changing context factors? What are the procedures in this case?*
* *Time investment vs. activities and results:*
	+ *How much time is invested in TUDCN by the different members of the network?*
	+ *To what degree is this time investment in proportion to the outputs and added value created by TUDCN?*
* *Costs vs. activities and results:*
	+ *What was the (financial) cost of the program and the different activities?*
	+ *Did members financially contribute to the network? How much?*
	+ *To what degree is the cost of TUDCN operation in proportion to the outputs and added value created by TUDCN?*
 |
| *Structure adapted to the objectives of the network (including communication mechanisms)* | * *Is the present structure (secretariat, facilitation and steering group, general meetings, working groups) adequate with respect to the objectives of the TUDCN network?*
* *What are the positive aspects of the present structure? What could be improved?*
* *Which communication mechanisms are in place within the TUDCN network?*
* *To what degree do TUDCN members respond to communication (mails, questions, …) coming from the network?*
* *How do network members perceive the quality of communication mechanisms and information sharing? How can it be improved?*
 |
| *Diversity and dynamism*  | * *Is the composition of the network (type of members, geographical coverage, …) adequate and adapted to the purpose and priorities of TUDCN?*
* *Are membership criteria clear and shared?*
* *Is there a good balance between diversity (of membership) and workability?*
 |
| *Working groups* | *Specific attention/questions needed?* |
| **Quality of external networking** |
| *The quality of external networking*  | * *Which other international networks or coalitions exist, working on similar issues?*
* *How is the complementarity / coordination between the TUDCN activities and these other initiatives? How could this complementarity/coordination be improved?*
* *Which alliances would be relevant in the future?*
 |
|  |  |
| ***External factors*** |
| *Influence of external factors on program implementation and results* | * *Which (unforeseen) social, economic and political context factors influenced the way in which planned activities have been undertaken? (to be answered in general + for each of the working groups)*
* *What was the influence on program implementation and results?*
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| ***Future developments*** |
| * *Is there any unexplored potential in the network? If so, how could it be better made use of?*
* *Can members imagine any changes in terms of their contribution to the network? If so, what changes?*
* *How should the composition of TUDCN further evolve in the future?*
* *What is the members’ vision on how the network should further develop in the future? Is this vision shared?*
* *What do you consider as the most important DO’s and DON’Ts for the next period?*
 |

## 2.2. Interview checklist for members

1. Short **description** of:
* Your organisation and function
* The history of your participation in TUDCN (conferences, working groups, …)
1. **Expectations** towards TUDCN: what expectations did you have when TUDCN was created (or when you first joined TUDCN):
* a) in terms of the role TUDCN would take up
* b) in terms of potential added-value for yourself and/or your organisation?
1. **Results achieved and added value created**
* What do you consider as the most important results achieved till now? Think of:
* Internal results (e.g. capacity strengthening of the members, improved functioning of the network, …)
* Results in terms of:
* Increased coherence, effectiveness and inclusiveness of TU development cooperation
* Increased capacity for TU development action in South and North
* TU views on cooperation policies and practices developed
* Advocacy results (e.g. policy changes, increased democratic space, …)
* Other?
* Has the network produced any added value for your organisation? If so, in what sense? Does this correspond with the expectations you had when you joined the network?
1. Which do you consider to have been the principal **success factors** of TUDCN so far (factors that had a positive influence on results achievement)?
2. Which have been the principal **factors blocking or complicating results achievement**?
3. What is your opinion on (in terms of strong and weak points, recommendations, ….):
* The present structure of TUDCN (with a secretariat, FSG, 2 working groups, general meeting);
* The present composition of TUDCN (organisations participating in the network);
* The possibilities members have to actively contribute to the network;
* The way in which decisions are taken?
* The functioning of the TUDCN secretariat;
* The TUDCN website
* The quality of internal communication: between members; secretariat and members?
1. Which do you consider as the principle **challenges for the future** for TUDCN?
2. **Additional questions or remarks**?

## 2.3. Interview checklist for non-members

1. Short **description** of:
* Your organisation and function
* The history of your cooperation with TUDCN
1. **Results achieved and added value created**
* What do you consider as the most important results achieved till now? Think of:
* Internal results (e.g. capacity strengthening of the members, improved functioning of the network, …)
* Results in terms of:
* Increased coherence, effectiveness and inclusiveness of TU development cooperation
* Increased capacity for TU development action in South and North
* TU views on cooperation policies and practices developed
* Advocacy results (e.g. policy changes, increased democratic space, …)
* Other?
* Has the network produced any added value for your organisation? If so, in what sense? Does this correspond with the expectations you had when you joined the network?
1. Which do you consider to have been the principal **success factors** of TUDCN so far (factors that had a positive influence on results achievement)?
2. Which have been the principal **factors blocking or complicating results achievement**?
3. What is your opinion on (in terms of strong and weak points, recommendations, ….):
* The present composition of TUDCN (organisations participating in the network);
* The functioning of the TUDCN secretariat;
* The TUDCN website
1. Which do you consider as the principle **challenges for the future** for TUDCN?
2. **Additional questions or remarks**?

# ANNEX 3. List of persons interviewed

| Type | Organization | Name |
| --- | --- | --- |
| TUDCN | TUDCN | Jan Dereymaeker |
|  | TUDCN | Paola Simonetti |
| Government | EU | Erika Pasquini |
|   | OECD-DAC | Eduardo Gonzalez |
|   | Sweden, SIDA | Karin Fallman |
|   | Office of the Minister of Integration and Development Cooperation of Italy | Lacopo Viciani |
| CSO platforms at global and EU level |  IBON | Antonio Tujan Jr. |
|   |  CCIC  | Brian Tomlinson |
|   |  EURODAD | Jeroen Kwakkenbos |
| HIVA |  HIVA | Huub Huyse |
| ITUC secretariat | ITUC DGS | Wellington Chibebe |
|   | ITUC DGS | Jaap Wienen  |
|   | ITUC (regional coordinator) | Isabelle Hoferlin |
|   | ITUC (regional coordinator) | Mamadou Diallo |
| ITUC partner organisation | TUAC | Matt Simonds |
| ITUC regional organisation | ITUC Africa | Adrien Akouete |
|    | TUCA | Martha Ayala |
| TU | ACV-CSC | Stijn Sintubin |
|  | CFDT  | Maurice Bossuat |
|  | ACLVB | Maresa Le Roux |
|  | ACLVB | Dominique Roland |
|  | FNV Mondial | Tjalling Postma |
| SSO / TU | CISL / ISCOS | Gemma Arpaia |
|  | USO / SOTERMUN | Santiago González |
| GUF | Education International | Richards, Nicolas |
|   | Education International | Delphine Sanglan |
|   | ITF | Ascott Christine |

# ANNEX 4. Survey Results

# 1. Characteristics of the respondents

The questionnaire has been sent to 245 recipients. 21 completed the questionnaire, which gives a response rate of 8,6%.

Table 1: Number of respondents

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **English** | **French** | **Spanish** | **TOTAL** |
| # respondents | 24 | 7 | 5 | 36 |
| # blanco | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| # valid | 21 | 6 | 4 | 31 |

|  |
| --- |
| 1.1. Characteristics of the organisation |
| Graph 1. Region: |  |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Old EU member state | 12 | 39% |
| New EU member state | 2 | 6% |
| Other European | 3 | 10% |
| North America  | 2 | 6% |
| Latin America  | 4 | 13% |
| Africa | 5 | 16% |
| Asia | 1 | 3% |
| Oceania | 1 | 3% |
| No Answer  | 1 | 3% |
| Total | 31 | 100% |

 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Graph 3. Type of organisation: |  |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| National TU centre | 3 | 10% |
| TU confederation | 18 | 58% |
| Global Union Federation | 1 | 3% |
| Solidarity Support Organization | 5 | 16% |
| Other | 1 | 3% |
| No Answer | 3 | 10% |
| Total | 31 | 100% |

 |
| Graph 4. Year in which the organisation joined TUDCN: |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2006 | 8 | 26% |
| 2007 | 2 | 6% |
| 2008 | 3 | 10% |
| 2009 | 3 | 10% |
| 2010 | 2 | 6% |
| 2011 | 2 | 6% |
| 2012 | 1 | 3% |
| Don't know / no answer | 10 | 32% |
| Total | 31 | 100% |

 |
| Graph 5. How would the respondents describe the involvement of their organisation in TUDCN? |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Active member | 9 | 29% |
| Moderately active member | 10 | 32% |
| Rather passive member | 7 | 23% |
| No Answer | 5 | 16% |
| Total | 31 | 100% |

 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Graph 6. Does the organisation participate in any of the TUDCN working groups?** |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | 19 | 61% |
| No | 7 | 23% |
| Don't know / no answer | 5 | 16% |
| Total | 31 | 100% |

 |
|  |  |
| 1.2. Characteristics of the person completing the questionnaire |
| **Graph 7. What is your position in the organisation?** |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Senior level | 17 | 55% |
| Middle level | 12 | 39% |
| Junior level | 0 | 0% |
| No Answer  | 2 | 6% |
| Total | 31 | 100% |

 |
| **Graph 8. How would you describe yourself?** |  |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Rather as a trade union activist  | 9 | 29% |
| Rather as a development practitioner | 5 | 16% |
| As a trade union activist AND development practitioner | 12 | 39% |
| None of these | 3 | 10% |
| No Answer | 2 | 6% |
| Total | 31 | 100% |

 |
|  |  |

# 2. Expectations towards TUDCN

## 2.1. Detailed results

### Table 2. What expectations did your organization have at the moment it joined TUDCN?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Importance of the expectation=> Scale 1-6:1: Was not an expectation ……..6: Was a strong expectation | Average score |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| * To be better informed about development cooperation issues at international level
 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 12 | 8 | 4,58 |
| * To exchange experiences, information and views with others
 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 15 | 8 | 4,84 |
| * To expand our organizational network
 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 4,48 |
| * To enhance our capacities in terms of development project management
 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 9 | 3 | 3,90 |
| * To enhance direct or indirect access to funding
 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 4 | 3 | 3,45 |
| * The development of a common vision and strategies for TU development cooperation
 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 12 | 7 | 4,65 |
| * Enhanced efficiency of TU development cooperation by improving operational coordination and coherence
 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 13 | 6 | 4,61 |
| * Increased visibility of TU development cooperation
 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 9 | 9 | 4,81 |
| * A stronger TU presence and position in the international development cooperation debate
 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 10 | 5,00 |

### Table 3. Now that you have a better understanding of TUDCN, what are your organization’s expectations from TUDCN towards the future?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Importance of the expectation=> Scale 1-6:1: Is not an expectation ……..6: Is a strong expectation | Average score |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| * To be better informed about development cooperation issues at international level
 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 10 | **4,77** |
| * To exchange experiences, information and views with others
 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 17 | 7 | **4,74** |
| * To expand our organizational network
 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 6 | 9 | **4,47** |
| * To enhance our capacities in terms of development project management
 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 9 | 5 | 6 | **3,87** |
| * To enhance direct or indirect access to funding
 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 3 | **3,45** |
| * The development of a common vision and strategies for TU development cooperation
 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 12 | 8 | **4,71** |
| * Enhanced efficiency of TU development cooperation by improving operational coordination and coherence
 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 8 | **4,52** |
| * Increased visibility of TU development cooperation
 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 15 | 5 | **4,65** |
| * A stronger TU presence and position in the international development cooperation debate
 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 12 | **4,97** |

## 2.2. Graph 9: Overview

## 2.3. Additional expectations

### Did your organization have any other expectations when joining TUDCN?

* Use position papers and proposal by domesticating them at the East African Level, and making it easy for affiliates to identify with the positions developed at the TUDCN and regional level.
* The above sentences broadly cover our initial and on going expectations.
* To enforce these items at regional level.
* To deepen cooperation between different stakeholders in the field of TU development cooperation, considering that not only trade unions but also "solidarity support organisations" work together with trade unions around the world.
* For us, it is also important to deepen cooperation between trade unions and other social or workers movements. TUDCN could be a platform that stimulates this kind of cooperation.
* To combine our financial and technical resources with other trade union organisation that work in development cooperation
* I participated in the network and my expectations were fulfilled. But we have limited resources and therefore I cannot participate in all meetings.
* To develop cooperation from our own trade union organisation.
* To achieve a better integration with cooperation networks.
* To order the chaos and anarchy that existed within union cooperation at all levels, in such a way that bilateral cooperation would be coherent, with a defined strategy at both regional and global level.
* To establish a participatory and coordinated system of trade union cooperation, to strengthen trade unions, their activities and their autonomy.
* To achieve that ITUC would be better coordinated internally, between departments at central level, with a real relation with and participation from the regional offices.
* To define a trade union cooperation strategy, and to integrate it in the context of international cooperation.
* To plan programs, projects, actions and campaigns in a coordinated way among affiliates and to present proposals for co-financing to funding agencies.

### Does your organization has any other expectations towards its future membership of TUDCN?

* The TUCN could provide preferably instead of a 'general and broad ' input for project management and efficiency/effectiveness (The Handbook) of union development cooperation practice a more specific approach of how union solidarity support activities could lead to more Decent Work. The ILO definition of DW is too complicated and leads easily to a scientific approach of Decent Work monitoring. Trade Union (solidarity support organizations) need a more applied model to monitor and grasp needed, desired changes to achieve more Decent Work.
* Where necessary to come up with proposals and positions that suit specific regions in regards to levels of development e.g. Post 2015 the proposals for TUs is developing countries might need specific proposals that might not be priority to developed countries.
* To get stronger engagement of ITUC/TUCA members at regional level.
* TUDCN should strive to foster and, where possible, deepen cooperation between trade unions and other social movements. Obviously, different organisations have different roles, but there is room for complementing each other's strengths.
* Expand the net with the inclusion of more TUs.
* Strengthen the "south-south" - cooperation and the triangular cooperation between TUs;
* Idem to question 1: To combine our financial and technical resource with other trade union organisations that offer cooperation.
* ITUC should be able to sustain the participation of all delegates, independent from their region of origin.
* To strengthen the trade union and social networks.
* To insist with regard to our initial expectations, that are now even more urgent than before.
* To achieve coordinated action at all levels: ITUC, ITUC regional offices, bilateral cooperation.
* To construct alliances with social actors to share cooperation strategies.

# 3. Results ACHIEVED AND ADDED VALUE CREATED

## **3.1. Detailed results**

**Table 4. Complete: Because of TUDCN …..**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Scale 1-6:1: Completely disagree ……..6: Completely agree | Average score |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| * TUs have internally strengthened their views and position related to development cooperation
 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 13 | 6 | 2 | 3,97 |
| * TUs have increased their visibility in the international development cooperation debates
 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 4,48 |
| * TUs have increased their credibility in the international development cooperation debates
 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 11 | 7 | 4 | 4,17 |
| * TUs have been able to better articulate their views in the international development cooperation debates
 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 11 | 2 | 4,23 |
| * TU views and positions are have been better taken into account in international development cooperation policies
 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 11 | 6 | 1 | 3,79 |
| * TU views and positions have been better taken into account in the development cooperation policies in my country
 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 3,00 |

**Table 5. Complete: Because of TUDCN, my organization …..**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Scale 1-6:1: Completely disagree ……..6: Completely agree | Average score |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| * Implements more activities related to development cooperation
 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3,21 |
| * Integrates development cooperation better in it’s policies
 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 3,27 |
| * Has a lobby and advocacy agenda that reflects TUDCN’s views and positions
 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 3 | 4 | 3,67 |
| * Has been able to better articulate its views in the national development cooperation debate
 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 3,79 |
| * Has become more influential in the national development cooperation debate
 | 5 | 1 | 9 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 3,50 |
| * Is better informed about development cooperation issues at international level
 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 4,42 |
| * Exchanged more experiences, information and views with others
 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 5 | 4,23 |
| * Has been able to strengthen its external network
 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 3,93 |
| * Improved its skills in managing development cooperation activities
 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 3,28 |
| * Is better equipped to gain access to funding for development actions
 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2,83 |

## **3.2. Graph 10. Results achieved and added value: overview**

`

# 4. THE TUDCN GENERAL MEETINGS

## **4.1. Graph 11. Participation of the respondents in the General Meetings: overview**

The respondents attended on average 1,77 General Meetings (graph 12):

## **4.2. Assessment of the quality of the General meetings**

#### 4.2.1. Detailed Results

**Table 6. Kindly give your opinion on the latest meeting your organization attended:**

*Note: this question was only answered by the 25 respondents who attended at least 1 General Meeting. They where asked to answer the question for the last General Meetings they attended. For 19 of the 25 respondents, this was the General Meeting in Paris, for 3 respondents Helsingor, for 3 respondents Brussels. In the figures, the different results are grouped: the numbers of respondents who answered the questions for the GM in Helsingor or Brussels was too low for making a valid separate assessment.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Scale 1-6:1: Completely disagree ……..6: Completely agree | Average score |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| * Overall the meeting was well prepared
 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 4,44 |
| * The issues on the agenda were relevant for the network
 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 11 | 3 | 4,44 |
| * The issues on the agenda were relevant for my organization
 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 1 | 4,08 |
| * There was an adequate time allocation for the different agenda points
 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 3,80 |
| * There was a balanced participation of those attending the meeting
 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3,60 |

#### 4.2.2. Graph 13. Overview

## **4.3. Overall satisfaction with the outcomes of the General meetings**

(This question was only answered by the 25 respondents who attended at least 1 General Meeting)

#### 4.3.1. Table 7. Detailed results

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| In view of the time and resources spent, the outcomes of the meeting were satisfactory .... | Scale 1-6:1: Completely disagree ……..6: Completely agree | Average score |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| a. For TUDCN, its objectives and program | 0 | 3 | 2 | 14 | 4 | 2 | 4,00 |
| b. For my organization | 0 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 3,92 |
| c. For myself | 0 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 4,00 |

#### 4.3.2. Graph 14. Overview

## **4.4. Table 8. Reasons for not participating in the General meetings**

*This question was only answered by the 6 respondents who attended none of teh General Meetings.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Nb of respondents for whom this was a constraint |
| Financial constraints | 3 |
| No time | 1 |
| Limited interest in TUDCN | 0 |
| Agenda not attractive | 0 |
| No agreement from hierarchy in my organization | 0 |
| Other, please specify:* had to give priority to other international meetings
* agenda conflict
* because of quota given to our regional organization
 | 3 |

## 4.4. Do you have any comments or suggestions with regard to the general meetings?

* Just to inform your that from questions raised to the Danida representative in Denmark my organisation is currently negotiating for support of Danida on Improvement of Social dialogue in regional integration. We are happy that the Danida representative actually took up the matter and raised it to the relevant officer on why Danida was not supporting TU on social dialogue yet its one of Danida's core priority.
* Members specifically from Africa do not have strong regional connections that would start up discussions to fit into the general meetings
* TUDCN must find ways to increase the participation and engagement of GUF and other TU actors outside ITUC otherwise the TUDCN will lose its legitimacy.
* They can be more practical and invite experts or have thematic issues
* More time may be required, participants could be better involved in the choice of issues for discussion.
* It will be good if my organisation can be represented in these meetings.
* Is important to expand the, invitations for more TUs, especially the south.
* It would be good to receive the agenda and documents in advance.
* To increase the number if participants per region
* To broaden the base of regional representation by adding as the Arab world as a region in its own right
* To organise round-tables to exchange on TU projects and practices in the field of development cooperation
* To look for financing for the participation of all.
* Working documents should be sent a couple of days in advance.
* It is necessary to coordinate actions to have more influence at national and continental level
* To thank the work group that really ensures active presence and the coordination of the network.
* Before fixing the dates of the GM: consult the participants so that we have the opportunity to participate in a better way.
* To ensure that these GM do not fall on the same dates as other meetings of the TU movement.
* No, because the level of organisation is good. The critical point is political; therefore this is part of the mandate of the General Meeting.

# 5. THE WORKING Groups

## **5.1. Development effectiveness working group**

#### 5.2.1. Table 9. Detailed results

**Indicate on a scale from 1 to 6 in how far you agree with the following statements regarding the Development Effectiveness working group:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Scale 1-6:1: Completely disagree ……..6: Completely agree | No ans-wer | Average score |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| * The issues dealt with by the working group are relevant for my organization
 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 11 | 5 | 6(19%) | 4,40 |
| * The working group communicates well on its activities
 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 9(29%) | 4,36 |
| * TUDCN members are adequately consulted by the working group
 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 9(29%) | 4,45 |

#### 5.1.2. Graph 15. Overview: assessment of the development effectiveness working group (only including respondents that answered this question)

#### 5.1.3. Do you have any comments or suggestions with regard to the development effectiveness working group?

* There could be more relevant information on the website re interesting events (a calendar) and on trainings or other
* We have not been involved in this Working Group. So we cannot provide any relevant feedback.
* Good consultation approach, but all versions should follow the English version.

## 5.2. EU working group

#### 5.2.1. Detailed results

**Table 10. Indicate on a scale from 1 to 6 in how far you agree with the following statements regarding the EU working group:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Scale 1-6:1: Completely disagree ……..6: Completely agree | No ans-wer | Average score |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| * The issues dealt with by the working group are relevant for my organization
 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 9(29%) | 4,45 |
| * The working group communicates well on its activities
 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 10(32%) | 4,19 |
| * TUDCN members are adequately consulted by the working group
 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 10(32%) | 4,19 |
| * The products of the working group are of good quality
 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 3 | 12(39%) | 4,47 |
| * My organisation is making use of the products of the working group
 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 10(32%) | 3,67 |

#### 5.2.2. Graph 16. Overview: assessment of the EU working group (only including respondents that answered this question)

#### 5.2.3. Do you have any comments or suggestions with regard to the EU working group?

* Can not give an opinion here because my colleague was there.
* Offer links to trainings re EU funding.
* The thematic of the working groups should be sent together with the agenda.
* This Working Group has delivered good results. Joint positions were taken, and should sometimes also reflect the views of solidarity support organisations.
* Preparations would benefit from being better refined amongst participants.

# 6. Information and Communication

## 6.1. Graph 17. How often have you visited the TUDCN website during the past 3 months?

## 6.2. Graph 18. Are you using the Trade Union Development projects directory?

## 6.3. What is your opinion on the quality of the TUDCN website (indicate on a scale from 1 to 6)?

#### 6.3.1. Detailed results

**Table 11. Indicate on a scale from 1 to 6 in how far you agree with the following statements:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Scale 1-6:1: Completely disagree ……..6: Completely agree | No ans-wer | Average score |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| * The website is user-friendly
 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 5(16%) | 4,31 |
| * The website is up-to-date
 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 5(16%) | 4,27 |
| * The information published on the website is relevant for my organization
 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5(16%) | 4,27 |
| * The information on the website is of good quality
 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 7 | 5(16%) | 4,69 |

#### 6.3.2. Graph 19. Overview

## 6.4. Graph 20. Do you read the monthly TUDCN newsletter “Trade Union Focus on Development”?

## 6.5. Do you have any comments or suggestions with regard to the TUDCN website?

* Could be more user-friendly with links to trainings, events, documents, member sites
* I suggest that more language must be used on the website especially Greek
* We have not used the website so far. We should use it more though in order to familiarise ourselves more with the work of the other working groups.
* Our organisation sometimes contribute to this newsletter
* I should familiarise myself with this website.
* Good in general.

## 6.6. To what degree have the following TUDCN documents been useful for your organization?

|  |
| --- |
| **Graph 21. TU Development Effectiveness Profile (TUDEP)**  |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Not useful | 2 | 6% |
| To some extent useful | 9 | 29% |
| Very useful | 15 | 48% |
| I don't know this document | 3 | 10% |
| No Answer | 2 | 6% |
| Total | 31 | 100% |

 |
| **Graph 22. TUDCN development paper (2011/1): Trade union principles and guidelines on development effectiveness**  |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Not useful | 2 | 6% |
| To some extent useful | 8 | 26% |
| Very useful | 17 | 55% |
| I don't know this document | 2 | 6% |
| No Answer | 2 | 6% |
| Total | 31 | 100% |

 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Graph 23. TUDCN development paper (2011/2): Towards a comprehensive paradigm for decent work and development effectiveness**  |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Not useful | 2 | 6% |
| To some extent useful | 6 | 19% |
| Very useful | 17 | 55% |
| I don't know this document | 3 | 10% |
| No Answer | 3 | 10% |
| Total | 31 | 100% |

 |
| **Graph 24. ITUC briefing note on the Post-2015 development framework**  |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Not useful | 1 | 3% |
| To some extent useful | 6 | 19% |
| Very useful | 21 | 68% |
| I don't know this document | 1 | 3% |
| No Answer | 2 | 6% |
| Total | 31 | 100% |

 |
| **Graph 25. ITUC briefing note on decent work in the post-2015 development agenda**  |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Not useful | 1 | 3% |
| To some extent useful | 7 | 23% |
| Very useful | 21 | 68% |
| I don't know this document | 1 | 3% |
| No Answer | 1 | 3% |
| Total | 31 | 100% |

 |
| **Graph 26. ITUC briefing note: Post-2015 UN development agenda: towards decent work for all and universal social protection**  |
|  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Not useful | 1 | 3% |
| To some extent useful | 5 | 16% |
| Very useful | 23 | 74% |
| I don't know this document | 1 | 3% |
| No Answer | 1 | 3% |
| Total | 31 | 100% |

 |

# 7. TUDCN Internal structure and functioning

## 7.1. Detailed results

**Table 12. Indicate on a scale from 1 to 6 in how far you agree with the following statements:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Scale 1-6:1: Completely disagree ……..6: Completely agree | No ans-wer | Average score |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| * I’m satisfied with the work of the TUDCN secretariat
 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 12 | 8 | 0(0%) | 4,61 |
| * The role of the TUDCN secretariat is clear to me
 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 6 | 1(3%) | 4,30 |
| * The role of the Facilitation and Steering Group (FSG) is clear to me
 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 11 | 5 | 1 | 2(6%) | 3,52 |
| * The present structure of TUDCN (secretariat, FSG, general meeting, 2 working groups) fits the purpose of the network
 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 8 | 2 | 2(6%) | 4,03 |
| * Present TUDCN members are representative for international TU development cooperation
 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 1(3%) | 3,70 |
| * Members have sufficient possibilities to contribute information to the network
 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 15 | 2 | 0(0%) | 4,29 |
| * TUDCN sufficiently consults its members
 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 0(0%) | 4,45 |
| * If they want, members can have an input in decision-making (on priorities, activities, …)
 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 4 | 1(3%) | 4,23 |

## Graph 27. Assessment of the internal structure and functioning of TUDCN: overview

### 7.3. Do you have any comments or suggestions with regard to the structure and internal functioning of TUDCN?

* More Focus on Regional structures, currently its more Organisation to TUDCN
* No legitimacy for TUDCN if the GUFs are not involved, engaged and active.
* More regional focus from now on.
* The representativeness of the network definitely is an issue. But something we can work in the years to come. The role of the FSG is not clear to us.
* It seems difficult to become part of, or an "insider" in, the TUDCN if you don't have the opportunity to take full part in the TUDCN activities.
* As an instrument I find it opportune and appropriate. To be further consolidated by strengthening its capacities.
* I find it necessary that the hierarchic structure of ITUC would take up and value the role of TUDCN. Moreover, ITUC should make use of the knowledge and contacts of the TUDCN secretariat, so that would strengthen the activity and resources of other departments, in particular the departments on “TU rights”, “environment”, ..
* The secretariat does a good job, the staff is competent, fulfils its tasks and informs members.
* The structure of the network is still very weak. Very probably, this has to do with the weak political mandate. The regional organisations of ITUC, partially in Latin America as well, do not participate and do not contribute anything. We didn’t manage to integrate the big actors of TU cooperation.
* There is a need for reviewing the tasks and responsibilities within the network, to stimulate participation, so that there is a feeling of “participating in a process” and not only be a participant.

# 8. Expectations/potential for the future development of tudcn

## 8.1. Graph 28. How should TUDCN institutionally develop in the future?

## 8.2. Graph 29. How should TUDCN preferably generate its funding?

## **8.3. Preparedness of TUDCN members to invest in the network**

Indicate on a scale from 1 to 6 to which degree and how your organization is prepared to invest in the network in the coming years?

#### 8.3.1. Table 13. Detailed results

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Scale 1-6:1: low preparedness ……..6: high preparedness | No ans-wer | Average score |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| * Contribution with own funds
 | 12 | 10 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1,86 |
| * Contribution with funds mobilised via donors in my country
 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2,41 |
| * Contribution in human resources
 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 10 | 4 | 3 | 3,86 |
| * Readiness to host meetings, seminars, ..
 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3,54 |

#### 8.3.1. Graph 30. Overview

## **8.4. Constraints for investing more stroongly in the network**

**Graph 31. Which of the following constraints are preventing you from investing more strongly in TUDCN?**
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Development paper 1: *Trade Union Principles and Guidelines on Development Effectiveness.* March 2011.

Development paper 2: *Towards a Comprehensive Paradigm for Decent Work and Development Effectiveness.* September 2011.

TU Development Effectiveness Profile: TUDEP tool; TUDEP manual; TUDEP in 7 slides; Guidance note: “*how to make sense of TUDEP results*?”.

Guidance Note for trade unions. *Monitoring & Evaluation at outcome & impact level.* HIVA, commissioned by the TUDCN. Draft 4.0, December 2012.

**TUDCN planning and monitoring documents**

*TUDCN Mission, structures and workplan*. Revised discussion paper. November 2010
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**TUDCN website**

Several documents have been consulted on the TUDCN website (<http://www.ituc-csi.org/development-cooperation>), including:
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Agenda, reports and background documents of the TUDCN General Meetings (Brussels, Florence, Helsingor, Paris)
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**Other**

ITUC website: <http://www.ituc-csi.org/>

Website Structured Dialogue (EU): <http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/who/partners/civil-society/structured-dialogue_en.htm>

BetterAid. *CSOs on the Road from Accra to Busan. CSO initiatives to strengthen development effectiveness*. June 2012.

1. Figures of 2012, as mentioned on the ITUC website. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. The project period has in the meanwhile been extended till April 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. For Europe Aid, evaluation should aim at rendering accounts to the public on the results and impacts of activites financed by EC funds and drawing lessons on what has worked and what has not. The importance of evaluation has been underlined in several Communications by the Commission (see http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/how/evaluation). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. ‘South’ and ‘Southern’ refer in this evaluation report to the so-called developing countries. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. The TOR are attached in annex 1. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. See annex 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. The list of persons interviewed is included in annex 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. See annex 2 also. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. The consolidated results of the survey are presented in annex 4. Key results of the survey are integrated in the main report. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Figures of 2012, as mentioned on the ITUC website. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. For example, the adequate functioning of the network has allowed it to be present prominently in international debates, which has contributed to increased recognition of TUs as development actors in their own right, which on its turn has facilitated the network members’ access to and influence on their respective governments and enhanced external networking and cooperation. But reversely, such facilitated access to key decision making processes and improved networking have nurtured on their turn the TU recognition and visibility as development actors and further improved the functioning of the network. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. ‘Increased coordination’ is also repeatedly mentioned when members are asked about their ‘additional expectations’ towards the network (open question in the questionnaire). [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. See also below, when we deal more extensively with the issue of legitimacy and representation [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. The GUFs interviewed see TUDCN basically as a project of the ITUC (of which the GUF are not member) rather than as a semi-independent network with broader membership. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. 78% of the survey respondents gave a score ranging from 4 to 6 (on a scale from 1 to 6) to their satisfaction with the work of the TUDCN secretariat. 22% gave a score lower than 4. The motives for the lower satisfaction of this last group of respondents could not be analysed. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. Respondents who consider the role of the secretariat as less clear, are mainly those who describe themselves as “rather passive” network members. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. According to the 2010 document: 2 co-chairs from ITUC affiliates, 1 co-chair from the SSO, 1 co-chair from each of the ITUC regions and 1 co-chair from the GUF. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. Three FSG meetings in 2011, two in 2012 and one in January 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. There has been no representation of the GUFs in the FSG meetings so far; participation from the ITUC regions was initially low, but improved during the last meeting held in 2012-2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. Till 2010 there was a frequency of 3 GM per year, which proved to be too time-consuming for many participants. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. Then referred to as “work stream” [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. Some wanted to focus on the development of TU-specific indicators to be used in M&E, e.g. indicators to measure decent work; while others felt there was first of all a need to clarify the overall principles and guidelines for M&E within TUDCN. The latter finally prevailed. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. This seminar provided input for the work on M&E by the Development Effectiveness WG. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. Some efforts have been done to get input from the South. E.g. at the seminar on outcome and impact measurement, in 2012, which provided inputs for the WG on development effectiveness, 50% of the participants in this seminar were from the South. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. 89% used the English version of the projects directory, 2% the Spanish version and 8% the French version. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. Many factors can distort the results, e.g. an IP number which is in use for several computers. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. See annex 4, chapter 6. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
28. E.g. the Human and Trade Unions Rights department provided an input for the TUDCN position on ‘employment centred growth’ presented at BUSAN. The External Relations department is involved in the preparatory work on the Post-2015 UN development agenda; TUDCN will do the advocacy. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
29. One respondent adds: “independent but still embedded in ITUC”. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
30. This issue has not been addressed by the evaluation. It can however be expected that the articulation between development cooperation/development and the (more specific) TU agenda will come more to the forefront in the future when TUDCN realises its ambition to give a more prominent voice and position to the South. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
31. This last document is still not yet finalised but draft have been circulated already. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
32. On the other hand, our resource persons recognised that the consultation process is often that tight that it becomes very difficult for the participants to organize proper consultations with their constituents. Both In the case of the Development Effectiveness Task Group, a highly complex negotiation process, and in the case of the EU Structured Dialogue, it was openly recognised that the CSO representatives could only act on the basis of a broad mandate that included a high level of trust from their constituents. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
33. Already in our introduction we pointed out that this evaluation is not confined to the 2011-12 period, but looks at results that have been achieved over the entire period of existence of the network. This applies in particular to the effects related to visibility and recognition, which are the result of prolonged efforts in various domains over a longer period of time. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
34. As mentioned in the previous point, the drawback of prominent role of secretariat members in these forums is that it has to some extent raised representation concerns. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
35. Especially if taking into consideration the shift in focus from ‘development cooperation’ to ‘development’, which offers interesting perspectives for TUs. [↑](#footnote-ref-36)
36. ITUC Africa, ITUC Asia Pacific, Trade Union Confederation of the Americas and the Pan European Regional Council (PERC). [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
37. LO-TCO (SE), LO/FTF Council (DK), SASK (FI), FES (DE), IIAV-IIEO (B), ISVI-IFSI (B), BIS-MSI (B), FNV Mondiaal (NL), CNV Internationaal (NL), Institut Belleville (FR), ISCOS (IT), Progetto Sviluppo (IT) Progetto Sud (IT), ISCOD (ES), Paz y Solidaridad (ES), SOTERMUN (ES), GARAPENA (ES), Solidarity Center (US); … [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
38. <http://www.global-unions.org/about-us.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
39. [www.tuac.org](http://www.tuac.org) [↑](#footnote-ref-40)