

Investing in Women Mid- Term Review

Pathway 1 Review Report

10 July 2021

Author: Felicity Pascoe

The opinions expressed in the report are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Australian Government or Investing in Women

CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
Review Recommendations	6
LIST OF ACRONYMS	8
INTRODUCTION.....	10
1.1 Background and Context	10
1.2 Program and Pathway Overview	10
2. MTR APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY	12
2.1 Evaluation Purpose and Scope	12
2.2 Ethics and Principles.....	12
2.3 Key Evaluation Questions.....	13
2.4 Stakeholder Analysis	13
2.5 Data Sources and Analysis.....	13
2.6 Limitations.....	15
3. MTR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	16
3.1 Relevance	16
3.2 Effectiveness.....	17
3.3 Efficiency.....	29
3.4 MEL and Research	31
4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WEE PROGRAM.....	33
APPENDIX A: DETAILED EVALUATION FRAMEWORK.....	35
APPENDIX B: DATA SOURCES	42
APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW GUIDES	46

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Investing in Women (IW) is a 7-year, \$102 million (AUD) Australian Government initiative in Southeast Asia that seeks to improve women's economic participation as employees and as entrepreneurs and influence the enabling environment to promote Women's Economic Empowerment (WEE). The Program operates in the Philippines, Indonesia, Vietnam, and Myanmar.

IW consists of three pathways, with each pathway contributing to improvements in the enabling environment for WEE by supporting the removal of barriers to women's full economic participation. This report presents findings and recommendations from the Mid-Term Review of Pathway 1 (P1) focused on Workplace Gender Equality (WGE). Under P1, IW supports Business Coalitions (BCs) that work with influential businesses on shifting workplace cultures, practices, and policy barriers to achieve WGE. During Phase 1 (2016 - 2019), IW established the Indonesia Business Coalition for Women Empowerment (IBCWE) and the Philippines Business Coalition for Women Empowerment (PBCWE) in 2017. In 2018, IW P1 established the Business Coalition for Gender Equality (BCGE) in Myanmar and the Vietnam Business Coalition for Women Empowerment (VBCWE).

The P1 End of Program Outcome (EOPO) states that *Businesses supported by the BC and in the wider ecosystem improve gender equality in their workplaces*. P1 aims to establish a proof of concept regarding the commercial merits of WGE by supporting BCs to become Centres of Excellence in delivering WGE services to the private sector to improve business outcomes, WGE, and in influencing the ecosystem. At this time, the mid-point in Phase 2, this review concludes that with its current planned approach and rigor in learning and adapting, P1 is likely to achieve its EOPO by 2023. However, significant work is required to demonstrate the proof of concept of the BC model as a driver for WGE outcomes, business outcomes, and as influencers in the private sector ecosystem.

IW's P1 work is strategic and relevant to DFAT policy priorities related to women's economic empowerment, private sector development, and the COVID-19 (CV-19) response and recovery efforts in the four IW-supported countries. DFAT at Posts values engagement with BCs because they provide access to high-profile CEOs and contribute to public diplomacy efforts. There is interest from Posts to engage in IW more closely and leverage and promote the relationship as an element of the bilateral partnerships.

Learning within IW has confirmed how challenging and complex it is to improve WGE in the private sector in Southeast Asia. Awareness regarding gender relations remains low for much of the population, and gender equality is not seen as an urgent issue. Political will has not galvanised around issues of WGE and therefore regulatory reform to create a conducive enabling environment has not materialised resulting in few incentives for businesses to address WGE.

CV-19 impacts have significantly affected P1 as businesses switched to survival mode and an already low demand for WGE further decreased. This has affected sales of WGE services, BC revenue targets, and P1 plans to generate the data needed to build a credible body of evidence to demonstrate the business benefits for WGE in SEA. This notwithstanding, P1 has adapted well, shifting training and resources online, developing new resources that respond to business needs in the CV-19 context, and forging strong local partnerships to strengthen efforts to support businesses and influence policy reform for WGE.

Within this challenging context, this review found P1 to have achieved some promising results:

- During Phase 2, all BCs recruited new members and either doubled or tripled their membership since establishment.
- There is evidence that businesses have improved their policies for WGE focused primarily on recruitment, promotion, flexible work arrangements, and care support.
- BCs are supporting a total of 82 businesses that have committed to 380 actions to improve their HR policies and procedures for WGE.
- Despite the constraints of CV-19, midway through Phase 2, 37% of planned WGE actions have been completed/near complete.¹
- P1's client surveys show more than 90% of the responding businesses are satisfied with BC support, would recommend them to other businesses, and regard them as credible WGE providers.

BCs have started to build a profile and are increasingly invited to speak publicly, provide advice to the government and the private sector, and share their research. Three of the BCs have strategically focused their policy reform work on corporate sustainability reporting by advocating for the inclusion of WGE in reporting requirements. For example, because of VBCWE advocacy, 6 WGE inclusions have been added to the corporate sustainability reporting requirements in Vietnam in 2020. In 2020, some of these 6 inclusions have been amalgamated and one more will be added in 2021.

The early establishment of BCs saw partnerships with international organisations such as the International Labour Organisation (ILO), UN Women, and International Finance Corporation (IFC) help to build BCs' expertise in WGE, and build their credibility, exposure and profile through joint research and events. These partnerships have led to mutual gains for both parties, such as collaboration with UN Women on the Women's Empowerment Principles (WEPs) Awards with PBCWE and IBCWE being the custodians of the WGE category contributing WGE expertise and local data. Increasingly, BCs have shifted to strategic local partnerships with NGOs, governments, and particularly with business associations that have helped the BCs to access a pipeline of potential members and advance policy reform work.

Despite good progress, this review confirms P1's assessment that BC staff still require significant support to build their WGE expertise, as well as marketing and sales. BCs need to strengthen their operational backbone and become more efficient in WGE service delivery if they are to grow and become sustainable. Although IW Phase 2 anticipated BCs would be financially sustainable by 2023, BC current revenue equates to between 3.2% and 6.4% of their annual operating costs. Projections developed by P1 with the BCs anticipate they may break even by 2028-2030, however, their future is uncertain. Boards agree with this assessment and are focused on their funding beyond 2023 and the future expansion of BC reach. They see a need to bring in local business consultants to develop longer-term roadmaps towards sustainability.

It is evident that the Boards have strong ownership of, and commitment to, the BCs. This commitment is an important foundation for sustainability and reflects well on P1 relationships and approaches. The fact that the BC Boards view BCs first and foremost as *their* business coalition and put time and energy into

¹ BCGE clients developed their action plans with significant duplication. An effort to review their action plans is underway and will halve the total number of actions. This would raise the percentage of complete or nearly complete to 56%.

planning for their BCs, is a significant success for P1. The IW P1 team has had to balance investment in delivering on IW outcomes and targets as per their contract, with their commitment to BCs independence and longevity. The BC Boards acknowledge this tension, and whilst they value both the donor funds and the expertise that IW brings to their work, it was noted that they would, if permitted, manage the BCs from a different business angle.²

IW's position in the Gender Equality Branch has safeguarded P1's focus on a proof-of-concept model to progress WGE in SEA. The strategic vision to drive evidence-based change for WGE in SEA has strong champions from the highest levels, from Australia's Ambassador for Gender Equality and at senior levels within DFAT. There is some interest in strengthening ties to bilateral programs to better leverage and showcase the work of IW. It is not yet clear whether DFAT would prefer to keep the focus on the current mandate of BCs (focused on WGE in the private sector) or expand their mandate to include a broader WEE agenda informed by Posts. It may be useful for DFAT and IW to engage in an open dialogue with BCs on options for future support and what it would mean in terms of DFAT funding.

The program management for P1 overall has been effective and the resourcing appropriate. The IW P1 team has built open and trusted relationships with BCs and Boards and is regarded as valued partners and critical friends. The review also found strong working relationships and alignment between DFAT GEB and IW's CEO. P1's WGE tools have evolved appropriately to meet the specific business needs of the BC's markets. The shift from an initial focus on EDGE certification to a partnership with WGEA to develop a broader set of tools and services has enabled BC's access to expand their reach and better price their services in the SEA markets. The IW P1 team has been responsive to BC feedback for example by streamlining reporting and administration. This review encourages P1 to continue efforts to generate efficiencies particularly related to auditing cycles for nationally registered companies and DFAT.

P1's MEL system is fit-for-purpose and has evolved appropriately to meet program needs. P1's continuous cycle of review, reflection, learning, and improvement is a good practice approach. Adjustments made to the P1 Theory of Change and targets in early 2021 were appropriate and responsive to the changes in the operating environment and P1's learning from testing assumptions. Revised targets should be achievable by 2023. P1 has generated some quality research and analytics including timely analysis on the impacts of CV-19 to employees, and country case studies with ILO on the business case for women in business and management. P1's data and evidence on WGE in SEA is regarded by BC partners as unique and valuable in driving change in the private sector and the ecosystem.

For the remaining two years of Phase 2, P1 should continue its planned focus outlined in its current work plan prioritising the strengthening of WGE tools and capability of BCs to provide effective support to clients. Strengthening their technical capacity, operational competencies, and efficiencies is critical to expand their memberships and services and sustain growth. An early indication from DFAT of plans for a new phase and funding would assist BCs and Boards to plan and prepare for change. If DFAT were to discontinue funding, the more forewarning the better chances of sustainability. If DFAT were to continue funding under a third phase, DFAT and IW should consider engaging in an open dialogue with BCs and

² Individuals interviewed from the BCs and BC Boards made references to how they may do things differently and these included: in some cases, less ambitious KPIs and/or targets; ensuring tools and services were suited to how businesses work; the need for stronger business acumen in building sustainable independent businesses; and less of a focus on annual workplans and annual budget cycles with more of a focus on longer term objectives.

their Boards on the most appropriate funding model that will support BCs in their growth as independent businesses.

REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS

Review recommendations are presented in two groups and are numbered sequentially below as they appear in the findings section of this report.

The first group are recommendations that propose new or enhanced focus on particular aspects of implementation related to relevance and effectiveness. These are presented below and the first five listed are considered priority recommendations for DFAT and the IW team.

Relevance

Recommendation 1: P1 should consider developing a 6-monthly Communications Plan for DFAT Posts outlining research, publications, events, and other opportunities. This will enable Posts to better leverage opportunities to engage in P1 work and the BCs. The Program Manager in GEB could play a role to package this information (perhaps across all Pathways) for senior management, and the Country Managers could play a key role in engaging with DFAT and facilitating this information sharing.

Effectiveness

Recommendation 2: DFAT should consider providing BCs and Boards with an early indication of a commitment to a continued phase beyond mid-2023. This will provide reassurance to BCs and Boards, reduce the immediate need for BCs to mobilise alternative funds, and enable IW, DFAT, and BCs to better plan for sustainability beyond 2023.

Recommendation 3: Following an indication from DFAT to continue funding beyond mid-2023, P1 should consider facilitating local business advisors to work with BCs and their Board to develop roadmaps towards sustainability tailored to the country-specific economic and business environments.

Recommendation 4: P1 to consider working with BCs and Board Chairs to conduct a governance review for each BC (noting that there would likely be some standards but also some local tailoring), with a focus on the Board membership and governing arrangements that are fit-for-purpose to deliver BC growth and sustainability.

Recommendation 14: Following DFAT's commitment to design a continued phase beyond mid-2023, IW and DFAT to consider engaging in an open dialogue with BCs on models of future support from a business angle, and what it would mean in terms of DFAT support and funding.

Recommendation 7: P1 could facilitate learning between P1 and P3 on influencing gender norms and WGE. This could help to build a knowledge base to inform the design of activities in a future phase to address gender and social norms within the workplace. Any opportunities within current plans to integrate P3 gender and social norms work within P1 should be taken up.

Recommendation 9: If P1 were to increase its focus on policy reform in Vietnam, given expressed interest from Post, it would be appropriate for the Post to resource this work and this may have implications for the contract that would need to be considered by GEB. P1 could consider a strengthened role for the Country Manager to support this work given her networks and expertise.

The second group are recommendations that confirm a continued focus on current plan and priorities in the mid-2021 to mid-2023 workplan. These relate to effectiveness, efficiency and MEL work and are presented below.

Effectiveness

Recommendation 5: P1 to continue its focus on strengthening BCs as Centres of Excellence targeting technical capacity, operational competencies, and efficiencies. This focus is critical if BCs are to expand their membership and services and sustain growth.

Recommendation 6: P1 team should continue its focus on delivering the Client Engagement Framework (CEF) that will help to streamline and strengthen BC services, and gather data and evidence to build evidence on the business case for WGE. As the CEF is just being rolled out, seeking feedback from businesses will be important to ensure it is fit-for-purpose in a business context.

Recommendation 8: P1 to maintain the current focus of policy reform work on corporate sustainability reporting and plan for follow-through support. The expected work that will flow from this includes encouraging members (and other businesses) to report voluntarily and providing technical support to businesses to enable them to do so. P1 could explore ways to promote businesses that adopt voluntary WGE reporting, building their status and profile to incentivise other businesses.

Recommendation 10: P1 to continue to operate flexibly and responsively to support BCs as they navigate uncertainties in the coming period.

Recommendation 11: P1 to continue its focus on deepening local partnerships and strengthening those with the most potential to support BC membership growth and build influence.

Efficiency

Recommendation 12: P1 to continue efforts to bring about operational efficiencies that will help BCs expand and strengthen, particularly in delivering the CEF. Good examples to date include the recent automation of BC client data, to reduce workload and enable BCs to support more firms at scale. IW's panel of local WGE experts is another good example of building efficiencies.

Recommendation 13: The IW P1 team to identify ways to further streamline and find efficiencies in program administration, reporting, and communications. P1 could review audit timing to align DFAT audits with local audit cycles.

MEL and Research

Recommendation 15: P1 to continue its strong MEL support to BCs on the CEF MEL requirements. As implementation progresses, P1 should continue to work with the BCs to identify ways to refine and simplify the CEF MEL based on feedback from firms.

Recommendation 16: P1 to continue efforts to support cross-BC learning and sharing of good practices, which could be facilitated through a shared platform. P1 also to continue developing case studies and analysis that contribute to the WGE business case, and work with BCs and Boards to package and communicate these in a business setting.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AES	Australian Evaluation Society
BC	Business Coalitions
BCGE	Business Coalition for Gender Equality (Myanmar)
CEF	Client Engagement Framework
CEFIA	Client Engagement Framework Implementation Advisors
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CSI	Corporate Sustainability Index
CV	Coronavirus
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
D&I	Diversity & Inclusion
EAP	East Asia and the Pacific
EDGE	Economic Dividends for Gender Equality
EOPO	End of Program Outcome
FY	Financial Year
GCN	Global Compact Network
GEARS	Gender Equality Assessment Results and Strategy
GEB	Gender Equality Branch
GESSA	Gender Equality Staff Survey Assessment
GRI	Global Reporting Initiative
IBCWE	Indonesia Business Coalition for Women Empowerment
IDX	Indonesia Stock Exchange
IFC	International Finance Corporation
IGCN	Indonesia Global Compact Network
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IW	Investing in Women
KEQ	Key evaluation question
NGO	Non-government organisation
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning

MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
OECD/DAC	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development/ Development Assistance Committee
PBCWE	Philippine Business Coalition for Women Empowerment
PMAP	People Management Association of the Philippines
SEA	Southeast Asia
SEC	Philippines Securities and Exchange Commission
SME	Small and medium enterprises
SNAP	Social Norms Attitudes and Practices
STIR	Sustainable Trade and Investment Reporting
TOC	Theory of change
UNW	UN Women
VBCWE	Vietnam Business Coalition for Women Empowerment
VBCSD	Vietnam Business Council for Sustainable Development
VCCI	Vietnam Chamber of Commerce and Industry
WEE	Women's economic empowerment
WGE	Workplace gender equality
WGEA	Workplace Gender Equality Agency

INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Investing in Women (IW) is a 7-year, \$102 million (AUD) Australian Government initiative in Southeast Asia that seeks to improve women’s economic participation as employees and as entrepreneurs and influence the enabling environment to promote Women’s Economic Empowerment (WEE). The Program operates in the Philippines, Indonesia, Vietnam, and Myanmar. It is implemented by Abt Associates and managed out of the Gender Equality Branch (GEB) of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT) in Canberra.

IW upholds that WEE is not only fundamental to the realisation of gender equality, which remains a significant challenge in Southeast Asia, but is vital to enhancing business competitiveness and fuelling inclusive economic growth. Progress towards WEE has been held back by social norms, attitudes, and practices that restrict women’s participation in the economy. Leading businesses have significant power and responsibility to effect change and influence society towards gender equality, which also carries substantial benefits for companies, including increased staff motivation; better talent management; higher productivity and performance; and improved reputation.

Phase 1 of IW ran from April 2016 to June 2019. Phase 1 was reviewed in late 2018 and the program underwent a design ‘refresh’ before Phase 2, which is expected to finish in June 2023. IW revised its Theory of Change (TOC) in April 2021 to account for lessons learned during implementation and to reflect the impact of the CV-19 pandemic on the operating environment. This revision has better aligned the envisioned program outcomes to what is realistic and achievable. Midway through Phase 2, DFAT commissioned a review of the progress of IW since the start of its second phase. The purpose of the review was to inform refinements of the program and explore the rationale and options for a potential new women’s economic empowerment program post-June 2023.

1.2 PROGRAM AND PATHWAY OVERVIEW

Investing in Women consists of three pathways, with each pathway contributing to improvements in the enabling environment to WEE by supporting the removal of barriers to women’s full economic participation. The three pathways are:

Pathway 1: Workplace Gender Equality (WGE) – IW supports Business Coalitions that work with influential businesses on shifting workplace cultures, practices, and policy barriers to achieve WGE.

Pathway 2: Impact Investment for Women’s SMEs – IW partners with Impact Investors and ecosystem builders to expand market opportunities for women, to incentivise and catalyse access to capital for small and medium enterprises (SMEs) - led by and responsive to the needs of women; and

Pathway 3: Influencing Gender Norms – IW works with partners to positively shift attitudes and practices to support women in the world of work.

All three pathways are developing models which others can learn from, adapt, or emulate in support of women’s economic empowerment. Each pathway is being reviewed separately and will feed into an

overarching review of the IW program. This report presents the findings from the review of the Pathway 1 Review and was conducted by Alinea-Whitelum.

Pathway 1: Workplace Gender Equality

Pathway 1 supports WEE and expands women's economic participation in formal sector employment by improving policies and practices related to workplace gender equality within firms. This pathway supported the establishment of Business Coalitions (BCs) in each target country. BCs were formed as member organisations for firms with an interest in progressing WGE to combine and coordinate their efforts towards shifting workplace cultures, practices, and policy barriers. Each BC has a Secretariat with skills, capacity, and resources to further this agenda. The Indonesia Business Coalition for Women Empowerment (IBCWE) and the Philippines Business Coalition for Women Empowerment (PBCWE) were established in 2017. The Business Coalition for Gender Equality (BCGE) in Myanmar and the Vietnam Business Coalition for Women Empowerment (VBCWE) were established in 2018.

BCs provide advice and support to companies seeking to improve WGE and benefit from its positive impacts. Services provided by BCs include:

- Gender assessments to identify strengths and weaknesses in firms' approaches to WGE and formulate action plans to address priority areas for improvement;
- Training on topics relevant to business's needs for addressing WGE; and
- Provision of other targeted support including technical advice, referrals, and consultancy services.

BCs drive change from the top, working with CEOs to make organizational commitments to gender equality actions, such as implementing flexible work arrangements, changes in recruitment and promotion practices, equal pay, and creating an environment where women have as much opportunity as their male counterparts. Companies hold themselves accountable by measuring their progress against their commitments.

BC members and Secretariats also undertake advocacy on WGE and its benefits for employees and employers, working across the private sector and with other stakeholders to advance public policy reforms that remove barriers to workplace gender equality. Through these efforts, member companies are increasingly regarded as leading players in the gender equality journey, as well as gender equality role models in their sector and country. BC member companies together employ more than 800,000 people and are leading the way in their businesses and acting as important advocates for women's economic empowerment.

2. MTR APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

2.1 EVALUATION PURPOSE AND SCOPE

This mid-term review of Pathway 1 focuses on the progress of IW since the start of the program's second phase in July 2019. The outcomes of the review will inform the development of an investment concept note that will outline the rationale and options for a possible subsequent women's economic empowerment program, for DFAT's consideration. Data and findings from this Pathway, together with the reviews of P2 and P3, informed an overall program review. All three pathway reviews, and the overarching review, took place simultaneously.

The review took place between March and July 2021 and covered Pathway 1 progress in all four implementing countries: the Philippines, Indonesia, Myanmar, and Vietnam. The scope of this review for Myanmar was reduced due to the ongoing instability in country.

2.2 ETHICS AND PRINCIPLES

The review conformed with OECD/DAC (2010) Quality Standards for Evaluation, the DFAT (2017) Monitoring and Evaluation Standards, and the Australian Evaluation Society (AES) Code of Ethical Conduct and Guidelines. The reviews were carried out with consideration of safeguarding issues throughout the review process and risks were identified and discussed as they arose. As outlined in the detailed MTR methodology document, the review process and product was underpinned by the following principles:

Utilisation-focused: Keeping a line of sight to the key users of the evaluation and their knowledge needs to ensure the evaluation serves its original purposes.

Strengths-based: Identifying what has worked well and why, and focusing on how to build on these strengths to overcome any challenges encountered.

Participatory and inclusive: Key IW stakeholders will be involved and consulted throughout the evaluation. DFAT and IW will be briefed on preliminary findings and invited to help shape recommendations.

Learning-orientated: The review will seek to identify why particular outcomes were achieved (or not), and what can be learned from experiences to inform future programming.

Independent: The review team's independence provides legitimacy to the review and reduces the potential for conflict of interest which could arise if policy makers and managers were solely responsible for reviewing their activities.

Complementarities: A desk review of the project and related documentation will be complemented by data collected through key informant interviews, with the full range of stakeholders to ensure a comprehensive data set and a full range of perspectives are considered.

Commonality: Common review questions will inform data collection tools/guides to ensure consistency of inquiry, comparability of data, and transparency with regard to the lines of inquiry.

2.3 KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

A set of common key evaluation questions (KEQs) were agreed with IW and DFAT³ and applied across all four reviews, this enabling consolidation of findings across pathways for higher-order analysis. The KEQs tailored to Pathway 1 are:

Table 1: Pathway 1 Review Key Evaluation Questions

Key Evaluation Area	Pathway 1: Workplace Gender Equality (WGE)
Relevance	KEQ1 How relevant and strategic is Pathway 1 to DFAT policy priorities?
Effectiveness	KEQ 2 To what extent is Pathway 1 likely to meet its End of Program Outcomes?
	KEQ 3: How effectively has Pathway 1 adapted to CV-19?
	KEQ 4: How effectively has P1 collaborated and coordinated within DFAT, with other programs, and with external organisations?
Efficiency	KEQ 5 How effective and efficient is the program management by the P1 team?
	KEQ 6 How appropriate is the Phase 2 Budget and resourcing to meet End of Program Outcomes?
Future Recommendation	KEQ 7 How should any future WEE program expand or change?
MEL	KEQ 8 How appropriate is the MEL for supporting Pathway 1 monitoring and learning?
	KEQ 9 How effective has MEL been in demonstrating results and supporting internal learning?
	KEQ 10 How have MEL products and research supported program implementation and beyond IW?

Appendix A provides the detailed evaluation framework used in the review of Pathway 1.

2.4 STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

Stakeholders engaged in the review of Pathway 1 included DFAT Gender Branch in Canberra and DFAT Embassies in Myanmar, Indonesia, Philippines, and Vietnam, IW staff and advisors working on Pathway 1, the Indonesia Business Coalition for Women’s Empowerment (IBCWE), the Philippines Business Coalition for Women’s Empowerment (PBCWE), the Vietnam Business Coalition for Women’s Empowerment (VBCWE), UN Women, the Workplace Gender Equality Agency, and the International Financial Corporation (IFC).

2.5 DATA SOURCES AND ANALYSIS

The methodology consisted of three elements of data collection:

Document Analysis: A desk review of all program documentation, including the following documents. A full list is provided in Appendix B.

³ The Review Methodology was submitted to IW and DFAT on 15 April 2021 and approved.

Table 2: Pathway 1 Documents Reviewed

Pathway 1 Documents
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IW Phase 1 Review and Phase 2 Design Update • IW Progress Reports • Revised MEL Framework • MEL Rapid Review Report 2020 • Pathway 1 Results Framework • Pathway 1 BC Annual Plans and BC Progress Reports • Pathway 1 WGE tools, tool assessments, and tool evaluations, and BC systems monitoring tools • Pathway 1 Policy Dialogue Matrix • WGEA Diagnostics Tool, Strategy Guide • Pathway 1 learning memos, assessment reports, firm case studies, BC newsletters, MEL Review, BC synthesis • Analytics and research: ILO Country Briefs, CV-19 Impact Studies, CV-19 Employee Surveys • Pathway 1 Partner MOUs and sample BC Grant Agreement

Key informant interviews: Semi-structured interviews were held in April and May 2021. The list of stakeholders interviewed with dates of interviews is provided in Appendix B and the interview guides are provided in Appendix C.

Interview guides were developed based on the review KEQs and focused on seeking to understand the operating environment, progress, and achievements and to draw out learning, challenges, and examples of best practices. All interviewees received the interview guide in advance, participated voluntarily, and gave verbal consent to be interviewed and recorded. The Review Lead was careful to ensure interviews were well coordinated to prevent stakeholders relevant to multiple pathways from being overburdened through multiple interviews with different team members.

Validation Workshop: Sense-making/reflection workshops held with IW and DFAT. These workshops presented preliminary findings and identified areas for further exploration. These workshops added depth to conclusions and recommendations and built ownership and utility of results.

Data were analysed using Nvivo qualitative data analysis software. Data was coded against the KEQs, the three Mid-Phase 2 Outcomes, and other key issues and themes of Pathway 1 work. The Pathway 1 Evaluation Framework also guided this analysis and is attached in Appendix A.

2.6 LIMITATIONS

Several limitations were present within the review process specifically for Pathway 1. These limitations are connected with issues impacting the reviews of other pathways and the overall IW program, and included:

- **Documentary sources:** the review relied on pre-existing documentation provided by the IW and P1. Documents may vary in quality and level of objectivity in how they report on the progress of the program and pathways. Extensive consultation with stakeholders and triangulation of data sources sought to overcome any potential bias in the documentation.
- **Remote interviews:** Due to travel restrictions in place as a result of the CV-19 pandemic, all review activities were conducted remotely without any in-country time. Interviews were conducted via Zoom/Webex, which presents challenges both for helping respondents feel at ease and for interpreting non-verbal communication which face-to-face engagement supports.
- **Interview gaps.** Interviews were not able to be carried out with BC member firms who were noted as busy and less available due to CV-19. Also, WGEA was not able to be reached as the Head of Agency who was involved in Pathway 1 work has left the agency and they were not able to provide someone to talk with who was familiar with the IW and WGEA partnership.
- **Myanmar:** The current situation in Myanmar with ongoing unrest and uncertainty meant DFAT and IW decided the review will not undertake the scope of interviews with those based in Myanmar as was carried out with the other countries. Only two consultations took place. One was with a representative from the Australian Embassy in Yangon, and one with the BCGE Chair. Program progress in Myanmar was therefore primarily assessed through written documentation and discussion with the P1 team. All efforts were made to triangulate information across information sources available, noting there are likely some gaps in perspective given stakeholders based in Myanmar could not be consulted.
- **Assessing progress:** the review was required to draw judgment on the overall progress noting that there were some differing views (although often not too significant) between countries, BCs, the BC Boards and teams on the progress in each country case. This has made drawing a conclusion on progress overall somewhat challenging.

3. MTR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 RELEVANCE

Pathway 1 is regarded by DFAT as relevant and strategic. It aligns with the Australian Foreign Policy White Paper, which stipulates that improving access to jobs for women, supporting women’s leadership, and strengthening the private sector are priorities for Australia. P1 also aligns with Australia’s Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment Strategy which prioritises women’s economic empowerment including through women’s workforce participation and advancement in the private sector. DFAT at Posts noted the BCs provided something ‘tangible’. They value the access BCs provide to high-profile CEOs to contribute to public diplomacy efforts and Heads and Deputies Heads of Mission have been actively engaged in BC launches and events. Some junior staff at Embassy Posts were familiar with BC activities to progress WGE. However, many senior DFAT staff consulted for this review were aware that the program was about women’s economic empowerment and WGE in general but were less familiar with BC work related on WGE specifically particularly the complexities P1 faces in addressing WGE in SEA.

P1’s work contributes to the *Partnerships for Recovery: Australia’s COVID-19 Development Response* and the development response plans of the four IW-focus countries. The *COVID-19 Development Response Plans* for the Philippines, Indonesia, and Vietnam place women’s economic empowerment as a key priority for economic recovery. Additionally, the Philippines, Vietnam, and Myanmar Plans have a strong emphasis on tackling inequalities in the workplace and supporting women-led businesses. The Business Coalitions are also helping to address exacerbated gender inequality that results from working remotely and tackling online sexual harassment through their support to members. Additionally, through the BCs, Australia is assisting companies to adapt their businesses to the CV-19 context.

Leveraging the expertise of the Australia Workplace Gender Equality Agency (WGEA) has helped to showcase Australia’s expertise and WGE progress. WGEA has provided advice to the Business Coalitions on workplace gender equality, including criteria for corporate reporting and relationships with regulators. These Business Coalitions using adapted versions of the WGEA WGE tools have the potential to multiply Australia’s impact by providing services to companies on organisational culture and gender equality policies based on Australian practice.

DFAT at Posts is interested in more ways to connect with the work of BCs and to identify synergies with other programs within the bilateral program. Several senior staff consulted at Post noted their main engagement with IW related to events and there was interest in connecting more substantially and strategically. DFAT, especially the Manila Post, felt they needed more information and updates on IW beyond events and lunch opportunities. The launch of BCs and other high-profile events⁴ were seen as good public diplomacy opportunities and were keen for more follow-on updates or engagement post the event. The review picked up on strong and positive engagement between Posts and the Country Managers, particularly in Vietnam and Indonesia. Strengthening Post relations with the Country Managers and providing more in-depth information to Posts may assist.

⁴ DFAT Manila Post mentioned the launch of the Macquarie Group Foundation-IW RISE Fund under P2.

Recommendation 1: P1 should consider developing a 6-monthly Communications Plan for DFAT Posts outlining research, publications, events, and other opportunities. This will enable Posts to better leverage opportunities to engage in P1 work and the BCs. The Program Manager in GEB could play a role to packaging this information (perhaps across all Pathways) for senior management, and the Country Managers could play a key role in engaging with DFAT and facilitating this information sharing.

3.2 EFFECTIVENESS

Achievement of Outcomes

The End of Program Outcome (EOPO) for P1 states that *Businesses supported by the BC and in the wider ecosystem improve gender equality in their workplaces*. The review concludes that with its current planned approach and rigor in learning and adapting, P1 is likely to achieve its EOPO by 2023 related to bringing about benefits for businesses. However, significant work is still required to demonstrate the proof of concept of the BC model as being able to drive WGE improvements to influence the ecosystem.

In support of this judgment, the review has gathered evidence and information against each of the Logic Chains Mid-Phase 2 Outcomes and used this to draw judgment about progress to date in achieving each Mid-Phase 2 Outcome. There are three Mid-Phase 2 Outcomes as follows:

Logic Chain 1: Business Coalitions.

- Mid-Phase 2 Outcome: A growing clientele demand BC services and BCs are progressing towards financial sustainability, and BCs having industry credibility and being recognised as WGE Centres of Excellence.

Logic Chain 2: Workplace Gender Equality within Businesses.

- Mid-Phase 2 Outcome: Business benefits result from organisational change and BC-supported firms' outcomes are documented and contribute to a SEA evidence base for advocacy.

Logic Chain 3: Policy Reform.

- Mid-Phase 2 Outcome WGE related policy reform is progressed.

Analysis of findings and recommendations against each of the Logic Chains is presented below.

Logic Chain 1: Business Coalitions

Mid-P2 Outcome: A growing clientele demand BC services and BCs are progressing towards financial sustainability, and BCs having industry credibility and being recognised as WGE Centres of Excellence.

Judgment: The review found that Pathway 1 is progressing well towards this outcome.

P1 is testing a proof of concept which is a business coalition model to deliver services to the private sector to progress WGE and influence the ecosystem. In testing this, P1 has uncovered how complex and difficult it is to work on WGE in Southeast Asia (SEA). The government and institutional contexts in Indonesia, Myanmar, Vietnam, and the Philippines currently do not provide a strong incentive for businesses to improve WGE (such as requirements or incentives to report the numbers of women on boards). Within these societies, there is low public awareness and support for gender equality and therefore less demand for WGE from the public and employees. This is confirmed by IW's market research in Indonesia that showed no - or limited - acknowledgment that WGE is an issue and no motivation to address the issue. In the Philippines, there is a general sense that gender equality within society and WGE is not an issue.⁵

The CV-19 pandemic has severely impacted P1's work and made it difficult to predict when demand for WGE will significantly increase. As CV-19 impacts unfolded in 2020, the private sector went into survival mode. WGE was not a priority and this made it challenging for BCs to manage and maintain relations online. In the early months of CV-19, BCs cancelled events and activities, and businesses delayed or put on hold the completion of WGE actions. This affected P1's WGE data that was critical to build the business case, market and sell WGE services, and grow BC membership. Impacts were more severely felt in the Philippines and Myanmar. CV-19 further reduced the relevance of EDGE as an income source for BCs, although the balance of EDGE versus other services was already shifting in P1 when CV-19 hit.⁶ While BCs have continued to deliver training courses, many have been delivered free of charge or as part of membership packages. Whether businesses are willing to pay for these trainings remains largely untested. The BCGE Board Chair expects more businesses to reduce staffing soon and IBCWE expects 1 or 2 members to discontinue. All Boards remain confident the market will pick up, however they acknowledge growth and recovery will be slow. The review found that efforts to reprice and expand BC services to reach a broader market, to strengthen WGE tools and BC WGE expertise, coupled with their success attracting new members in 2020 and 2021 (all described below) growth in demand from clientele in the coming two years is likely, although it will be smaller than initially anticipated at the beginning of Phase 2.

Within these constraints, P1 has worked hard to build and refine BC services and strengthen BC capacity to deliver WGE services. During Phase 2, all BCs recruited new members including during CV-19. Since Phase 1, VBCWE and PBCWE have doubled their membership, and BCGE and IBCWE

⁵ Investing in Women (Jun 2020) Internal Report. *The Evaluation on the use of EDGE Tool.*

⁶ Investing in Women (Jun 2020) Internal Report. *The Evaluation on the use of EDGE Tool.*

have increased theirs by three-fold. PBCWE, guided by their Board, has deliberately targeted the top businesses in each sector and recruited them as ‘early adopters’ to influence other businesses in their sectors. This has proven effective in SEA markets. P1’s Annual Client Satisfaction Survey with BC members in late 2020 in the Philippines, Indonesia, and Vietnam confirms that firms are very satisfied/satisfied with BC support, would recommend BCs to others, and view the BCs as credible organisations.⁷ While many members publicly promote BCs and the importance of WGE at events, P1 believes that a more visible public commitment to WGE would help to popularise WGE and influence the ecosystem. For example, displaying BC membership and WGE commitments on businesses’ websites.

“Gender equality in Myanmar - especially for the private sector - is not a topic people are discussing or interested in...Back in 2018, we began with only a few founding members. During Phase 2, even with the impacts of COVID, we have managed to bring in seven more members and our total membership is now 25. These businesses are not just there to be members. They are interested to improve in their organisation and are seeking advice from BCGE. They are motivated to create a better workplace to nurture and empower women and create an environment for women to excel in management positions... I am proud of our membership and the interest we have generated in the private sector. ”

BCGE Board member, Myanmar

P1 has evolved the BC WGE toolbox to suit the SEA markets as BCs have learned about their market needs. Early in Phase 2, it was evident that EDGE was not a cost-effective tool in SEA and had limitations in driving broad change on WGE. EDGE was critical initially to position BCs as credible organisations in using a gold standard certification and to develop BC skills to accredit firms to the EDGE standard.⁸ Post 2023, EDGE is most likely best suited to a small niche market of businesses with more resources to invest in WGE. While it would unlikely be a central offering given the current low demand and perceived high cost for SEA, it would be worthwhile continuing to have EDGE available for those larger companies seeking formal accreditation. P1 pivoted well to partner with WGEA and adapt its tools to suit the SEA context.⁹ UN Women, International Finance Corporation (IFC), and the Vietnam Chamber of Commerce and Industry (VCCI) noted during the review that the BC tools are of high quality. BCs and their Boards confirmed GEARS are well suited to their markets. The coming two years will be critical to focus on developing BC staff capacity to effectively use these tools.

BCs are slowly raising their profile as advocates and continuing to develop their profile as service providers. Although other providers are delivering WGE services in Indonesia, the Philippines, and Vietnam, BCs have created their niche in delivering ongoing engagement and support.¹⁰ Partners consulted during this review confirmed this. In Myanmar, BCGE is the first and only non-profit association

⁷ Of the respondents to the CSS in Philippines and Indonesia 100% agreed or strongly agreed with statements related to the quality of support, that they would recommend the BC to others, and that the BC was credible. Of the respondents to the VBCWE CSS, on average 90% agreed or strongly agreed to these statements with around 10% neither agreeing nor disagreeing.

⁸ Investing in Women (Jun 2020) Internal Report. *The Evaluation on the use of EDGE Tool.*

⁹ The Gender Equality Assessment Results and Strategy (GEARS) tool and Gender Equality Staff Survey Assessment (GESSA)

¹⁰ For example, PMAP in the Philippines provides trainings and workshops on WGE provided by consultants available to its membership of 2,200; IGCN offers free WGE self-surveys and training to its business members of around 100; and IFC delivers EDGE certification to its clients.

and coalition of businesses working towards WGE. BCs noted that until early Phase 2 they invested heavily in raising awareness within the private sector about their existence. The review found countless examples of BCs now being invited to speak, provide advice and share their research. This year IBCWE has become an advocate for G20 Empower and will represent Indonesia alongside other business leaders at the G20 Forum, hosted by Indonesia. In positioning themselves as Centres of Excellence, P1 made a strategic move to appoint high-profile CEOs to the Board. (Active) board members are playing a key role in advocating publicly and using their high-profile status to attract members. BCs are increasingly introducing WGE through the Diversity and Inclusion (D&I) lens and this has improved their client engagement. BCGE has worked with other organisations with expertise in other aspects of D&I such as disability inclusion, and this strategy could be considered by other BCs in the future.

BCs acknowledge that they need to improve their capacity and competencies to become Centres of Excellence. P1's current focus on building BC WGE expertise and generating data from their services to build the WGE business case is appropriate. When establishing the BCs, IW deliberately recruited individuals with expertise in business and an understanding of how the private sector worked, not those with expertise in gender equality.¹¹ P1 has had to invest heavily in building BC WGE capacity and their ability to deliver WGE services to the private sector. P1 has systematically tracked BC capacity and competencies through annual Capacity Assessments. Assessments show a slow but steady increase in BC capacity but confirm BCs still require substantial technical and operational support. Capacity has been affected by the low demand for services in 2020 and 2021 reducing the frequency of staff using the tools. BCs feel they will require more technical support from P1 early on to implement the CEF and P1 has recently recruited local CEF advisors to support each BC with the CEF.

"I am really impressed with the work of P1 team to develop the Client Engagement Framework. It is logical and will provide us with strong support so we can work more effectively with our clients."

Hang Le, Executive Director VBCWE

Strengthening BC's capacities to deliver WGE tools will also promote efficiencies which are critical if BCs are to grow membership and become sustainable. The current ratio of BC staff to members is around 1:2. All BCs noted that providing support to individual businesses was time-consuming. IBCWE noted if they were to increase their membership, they would need more staff. P1 is aware that this current ratio of staff to members is not sustainable or scalable. PBCWE felt that as they delivered more services their capacity improved, and they became more efficient. IW is currently developing a local expert panel to assist in delivering services that will create efficiencies and reduce overheads. P1 has recommended other BCs do the same. Other initiatives that promote BC efficiency include the development of a platform to automate GEARS data which will save time by generating reports automatically. Building further efficiencies, coupled with improving BC technical capacities will be important if BCs are to grow membership in a cost-efficient and sustainable way.

¹¹ Investing in Women (Jun 2020) Internal Report. *The Evaluation on the use of EDGE Tool.*

Financial sustainability

Given the impacts of CV-19 on declining (an already small level of) private sector demand it is difficult to predict how long it will take BCs to break even. It is also difficult to determine if they will be able to cover operating costs with the revenue from membership fees and services alone, or will need to raise funds (donor funds, sponsorship, grants). The initial design for Investing in Women anticipated BCs would be financially sustainable by 2023. Currently, BC revenue from membership and sales equates to between 3.2% and 6.4% of their operating costs.¹² This is much lower than the Phase 2 target (set before CV-19) that anticipated BCs would be covering 80% of their operating costs in FY20-21. Projections prepared by P1 with BCs indicate they may break even by 2028-2030. The Boards echo this projection.

Despite an uncertain operating environment, the next two years should help to indicate the ability of BCs to generate income and eventually break even. P1 has set a target for BCs to mobilise A\$50,000 by the end of FY22 and A\$100,000 by end of FY23. P1 has supported BCs to develop sustainability plans which have been relatively short-term - less than 5 years. BCs and Boards are keen for local business experts in each country who are familiar with the business climate and opportunities to help develop 10-year roadmaps to become sustainable. While P1 team is focused on delivering the EOPOs by 2023, Boards are also focused on their independence and generating revenue. The review supports the MEL team's plan¹³ to develop principles for BCs to help decision-making involving trade-offs between the goals of securing WGE impacts and improving BC's financial sustainability.

Survival beyond 2023 means BCs and Boards are equally focused on diversifying funding streams and strengthening WGE expertise. Although P1 has continued funding 95% of operating costs in FY20-21 and 80% in FY23, BCs and Boards are thinking beyond this timeframe noting the lead-in time required to mobilise resources. If the next two years are to focus on achieving the EOPO, BCs and Boards will require some indication of DFAT's commitment to continue funding beyond 2023. Following this commitment, they should develop longer-term plans to guide short-term planning towards sustainability.

BC Governance

P1 will need to ensure BC governance arrangements are fit-for-purpose to support growth and BC sustainability. Founding Board Members of BCs¹⁴ were given free membership and were funded by IW to obtain EDGE certification. This decision made sense at the time. It incentivised members to develop their WGE expertise to build their credibility and to understand the EDGE certification process. The review found that some founding members are more active, but a number are not. Given they do not pay membership and receive services this is a cost to the BCs. Unpaying founding members account for one-third of BC membership, which is a substantial loss of income for BCs. IW is aware of this and plan to work with Boards to develop a clear policy about fees and membership. An updated review of P1's BC Governance Reviews in 2019 would help to assess how fit-for-purpose the governing arrangements are and modifications needed. A review would include assessing Board size, renewal, role, member

¹² The percentage of income compared to operating costs for each BC is as follows: IBCWE (3.5%), BCGE (4%), VBCWE (3.2%) and PBCWE (6.4%). Operating costs are defined as staffing costs, overheads and activity costs.

¹³ As noted in the IW (2021) BC Synthesis Report to DFAT.

¹⁴ IBCWE and PBCWE were established in 2017 and VBCWE and BCWE in 2018. IBCWE, PBCWE and VBCWE all have 7 founding members and BCGE has 6.

contributions to BC strengthening, and would consider phasing in payments for some services received by future Board membership.

Recommendation 2: DFAT should consider providing BCs and Boards with an early indication of a commitment to a continued phase beyond mid-2023. This will provide reassurance to BCs and Boards, reduce the immediate need for BCs to mobilise alternative funds, and enable IW, DFAT, and BCs to better plan for sustainability beyond 2023.

Recommendation 3: Following an indication from DFAT to continue funding beyond mid-2023, P1 should consider facilitating local business advisors to work with BCs and their Board to develop roadmaps towards sustainability tailored to the country-specific economic and business environments.

Recommendation 4: P1 to consider working with BCs and Board Chairs to conduct a governance review, with a focus on the Board membership and governing arrangements for each BC (noting that there would likely be some standards but also some local tailoring) that are fit-for-purpose to deliver BC growth and sustainability.

Recommendation 5: P1 to continue its focus on strengthening BCs as Centres of Excellence targeting technical capacity, operational competencies, and efficiencies. This focus is critical if BCs are to expand their membership and services and sustain growth.

Logic Chain 2: Firms and Workplace Gender Equality

Mid-P2 Outcome: Business benefits result from organisational change and BC-supported firms' outcomes are documented and contribute to a SEA evidence base for advocacy.

Judgment mid-2021: The review found that Pathway 1 is progressing towards this outcome.

BCs WGE services to members (albeit on a small scale) have led to improved policies and procedures within businesses for WGE. Improving policies and procedures is an important first step towards business benefits. BCs are currently supporting a total of 82 businesses that are working towards the completion of a total of 380 WGE Actions. To date, 37% of the WGE Actions have either been completed or are near complete. Half of the completed actions relate to improvements to recruitment, selection, and promotion processes and support flexible work and caring (seen as a priority in the CV-19 context). In total 43 businesses have completed EDGE certification in Phase 1 and Phase 2, and in Phase 2 one of these has been recertified. P1 reports note that the most important support they receive from BC in response to CV-19 is for flexible work arrangements. Other priority areas of support in responding to CV-19 relate to mental health and anti-sexual harassment. Due to the challenges noted in the above section, initial targets for Phase 2 related to membership growth, completed actions, and EDGE recertification has not been met and was revised with the MEL team in the first half of 2021. The

review found that the revised targets are more realistic to meet by mid-2023, although there remain concerns from some BCs about their ability to meet income targets by 2023.

“We cannot push companies to meet our timelines and targets for our program goals. Yes, they are our members, but they often see this relationship differently. From their perspective, we are helping them to build their journey and profile as committed to WGE. We need to follow their agenda, not the other way around. We move back three steps to move forward two steps – it’s like a dance with the businesses to work within their perspective to meet our targets.”

Maya Juwita, Executive Director, IBCWE

P1 is yet to build a credible body of evidence on the business benefits, and this will need to remain a focus for the remainder of the program. As noted in the Logic Chain 1 section above, the current demand for WGE and incentives for businesses to address WGE remains low. Further, the impacts of CV-19 have reduced business demand for WGE services as businesses remain focused on their survival. A slowing down of WGE Actions, as well as low numbers of EDGE re-certification, slowed the data coming into P1 to build the WGE business case. In addition, P1 initially relied on EDGE as the main tool to gather WGE data that would build the business case. As BCs do not yet have country-level evidence on the business benefits, they are relying on business case evidence that is currently available on WGE benefits. P1’s newly developed Client Engagement Framework (CEF) is a good example of program adaptation and will help to build a body of evidence on the business case P1 will use to develop case studies over the coming 2 years, including on the positive impacts of flexible work during CV-19. Data from the CEF will also enable an analysis of what drives organizational change for WGE (leadership, accountability, policies, programs, employee training, companies using data and communicating with employees) and this will contribute to advocacy efforts in the broader ecosystem.

P1 learning has shown that changes in HR policies and procedures alone will have limited effect on WGE unless cultural and social norms change. Case study analysis conducted early in Phase 2 confirmed WGE-related issues were often deeply rooted in cultural norms including gender stereotypes, informal gender preferences, sexual harassment, gender imbalances in specific roles, and unequal distribution of domestic labour between men and women.¹⁵ There are a couple of examples of efforts to address underlying gender norms. PBCWE developed a Family Leadership Program and IBCWE has conducted several events looking at aspects of gender norms. Given the critical link between gender norms and effective WGE, any work BCs can do within their current plans to identify and work with champions in member businesses and tapping into existing opportunities to integrate a focus on addressing gender and social norms should be encouraged.

¹⁵ Investing in Women (Aug 2019), Internal report, BC Case Study Synthesis.

Recommendation 6: P1 team should continue its focus on delivering the Client Engagement Framework that will help to streamline and strengthen BC services, and gather data and evidence to build evidence on the business case for WGE. As the CEF is just being rolled out, seeking feedback from businesses will be important to ensure the CEF is fit-for-purpose in a business context.

Recommendation 7: P1 could facilitate learning between P1 and P3 on influencing gender norms and WGE. This could help to build a knowledge base to inform the design of activities in a future phase to address gender and social norms within the workplace. Any opportunities within current plans to integrate P3 gender and social norms work within P1 should be taken up.

Logic Chain 3: Policy Reform

Mid-P2 Outcome: WGE related policy reform is progressed.

Judgment: The review found that this mid-phase 2 outcome has been achieved.

During Phase 2 BCs have focused policy reform on corporate sustainability reporting. This is strategic because it nudges change in the broader ecosystem towards WGE and should help increase demand for WGE services. VBCWE, PBCWE, and IBCWE have all laid firm foundations related to this reform and have developed strategic partnerships with organisations connected to government and decision-makers. In 2020, VBCWE has successfully had 6 WGE recommendations incorporated into the Corporate Sustainability Index (CSI) and one new one will be added this year. Their strategic partnership with the Vietnam Chamber of Commerce and Industry (VCCI) and Vietnam Business Council for Sustainable Development (VBCSD) leading on this work helped VBCWE's influence. IBCWE and PBCWE are progressing in their influence. IBCWE has made the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX), which oversees more than 700 publicly listed companies, their "honorary member" and is working with IDX to influence sustainability reporting requirements of the Financial Services Authority (OJK). PBCWE is working with the Philippines Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) a national regulator, to influence newly regulated sustainability reporting for publicly listed companies. At the regional level, P1 has also developed synergies with DFAT's Sustainable Trade and Investment Reporting (STIR) to help integrate gender into their Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) reporting requirements which have the potential for broad-reaching impacts over time if this work progresses well. BCGE is not engaging in policy reform work.

Continuing a focus on corporate sustainability reporting for the remainder of the program is strategic. Requirements in sustainability reporting to report WGE data may help to incentivise businesses to improve their WGE. It is expected mandatory and voluntary reporting would increase demand for BC services over time and may help to influence the broader ecosystem in these countries. Mandatory reporting only affects publicly listed companies and at this point, most of the companies P1 is working with are not publicly listed. However, if BCs can encourage their members to complete voluntary reporting this is a positive step to help popularise WGE reporting in the broader ecosystem.

While the initial focus of this policy work is to influence the reporting requirements, the tail of the work that would follow is much longer. There will be a role for BCs to engage with policy actors and partners to help understand reported WGE data that comes in from businesses and to generate WGE analysis. Beyond this, there will also be advocacy work to member businesses and other businesses to encourage voluntary reporting, and support services to businesses both completing mandatory reporting (a potential membership pipeline) and voluntary reporting. Given the potential for broader and long-term benefits of this work, it is a strategic area of focus for the remainder of the program. The review found a balance of 20% focus on policy reform work as appropriate.

DFAT at Post in Hanoi expressed interest in exploring greater involvement of IW in policy reform efforts linked to the bilateral program, beyond the current scope of VBCWE's work. With the upcoming Gender Equality Law and recent revisions to the Labor Code, DFAT felt VBCWE could become more involved in policy work. If this were to happen this would shift the balance of VBCWE's work and redirect resources away from the core planned work for Phase 2. VBCWE's expertise would need to be assessed to be able to play a stronger policy engagement role. If this is to be pursued more discussion would be needed on resourcing this work. If IW/BCs became more active in policy reform work IW could consider expanding the Country Manager's role to support this given her connections and expertise.

Recommendation 8: P1 to maintain the current focus of policy reform work on corporate sustainability reporting and plan for follow-through support. The expected work that will flow from this includes encouraging members (and other businesses) to report voluntarily and providing technical support to businesses to enable them to do so. P1 could explore ways to promote businesses that adopt voluntary WGE reporting, building their status and profile to incentivise other businesses.

Recommendation 9: If P1 were to increase its focus on policy reform in Vietnam, given expressed interest from Post, it would be appropriate for the Post to resource this work and this may have implications for the contract that would need to be considered by GEB. P1 could consider a strengthened role for the Country Manager to support this work given her networks and expertise.

CV-19 Adaptation

“Gender-sensitive recovery strategies will be critical in making up ground lost during 2020 to prevent long-term scarring in the labour market. Leaders have an unprecedented opportunity to build more resilient and gender-equal economies by investing in inclusive workplaces, creating more equitable care systems, advancing women’s rise to leadership positions.”

Global Gender Gap Report 2021, p4.

As noted above, CV-19 impacted P1 activity plans, targets, and expected results during Phase 2. Within this uncertain environment, P1 has adapted extremely well to continue delivering its work plan. Effective adaptation has enabled BCs to maintain a presence and remain relevant to members. As BCs continued to deliver their work plans they had to find new ways to deliver activities and remain engaged and relevant in a changed context. The following adaptations are evidence of this:

- **Shifting existing learning and training materials online.** P1 supported BCs to move training and resources online and strengthened BC capacity to deliver remote training and services.
- **Moving rapidly to survey the situation.** IBCWE and PBCWE conducted employee surveys on the impacts of CV-19 and discussed findings with firms to tailor services to business needs.
- **Refining and adapting existing tools to respond to the CV-19 context.** Based on feedback from member businesses, P1 helped BCs to adapted GEARS modules to respond to CV-19 and the *Resourcing for the Future* was created. BCGE maximised the value of GEARS for CV-19 and VBCWE progressed EDGE certification amidst lockdown.
- **Creating new resources to meet business needs in responding to CV-19.** This included the development of a flexible working toolkit developed specifically for CV-19. BCs found new ways to engage, for example, IBCWE introduced “coffee talk” a series to discuss issues such as sexual harassment.
- **Strengthening strategic local partnerships.** BCGE and PBCWE developed new channels and networks to discuss CV-19 impacts, and IBCWE and VBCWE strengthened existing ones. BCs shared approaches and demonstrated the relevance of policies that support WGE during CV-19.
- **Re-pricing fees and services.** BCs adjusted their pricing structures to accommodate the financial constraints of members. BCGE offered a 30% discount on membership fees and introduced an “observer” tier of membership for the first year (anticipating this may translate to membership in the second year). PBCWE introduced tiered membership fees for different types of services and benefits. VBCWE extended payment due dates.

“IBCWE has this agility and flexibility to adjust to the context and they have made sure they remain relevant to their members.”

MOU Partner, Indonesia.

At the program level, the P1 team supported the above efforts by revising expectations in light of the changed context. During Phase 2, P1 initially planned to gradually taper off funding to BCs expecting that by mid-2023 BCs would be financially sustainable. In the context of CV-19, P1 revised grant agreement financing to cover 95% of operating costs in FY20-21 and 80% in FY22-23. The intention was that BCs could remain focused on delivering WGE services and strengthening their capacity. IW drew from an underspend in travel and events to finance this. P1 also revised the Theory of Change that was approved by DFAT in April 2021 to revise end of program expectations aligned with new realities. Initial membership and income targets were revised by BCs with the MEL team to what they considered to be more realistic targets.

Recommendation 10: P1 to continue to operate flexibly and responsively to support BCs as they navigate uncertainties in the coming period.

Coordination and Collaboration

P1 has forged strategic partnerships with international organisations that have contributed to strengthening the BCs. In 2019, P1 signed MOUs with the International Labor Organisation (ILO), IFC, UN Women, and WGEA. These partnerships have helped build BCs expertise in WGE, broaden networks for advocacy, and build credibility. The IFC partnership was strongest in Phase 1 as BCs were being trained in EDGE certification, particularly to BCGE in Myanmar. IFC has referred non-IFC clients interested in WGE to BCs, helping to raise awareness in the private sector, and build potential pipelines. ILO has been a strategic partner for BCs in raising profiles through analytics. The joint publication of Country Briefs helped to raise BC profile in the advocacy space and as an expert in WGE. WGEA, as noted in the sections above, has been a strategic partner in the provision of WGE tools easily tailored to BC markets, WGE expertise, and advice to BCs in engaging with regulators. Finally, UN Women continues to be an important partner in all four countries, particularly for BCs collaborating on the Women's Empowerment Principles (WEPS). UN Women has benefitted from the WGE expertise of IW/BC and local data generated by BCs through their WGE services to clients. This partnership has helped to build a profile for BCs in each country. MOUs with these international partners were important early in Phase 2 to outline the comparative advantage of each partner, to reduce overlap, to identify areas of common interest, and to flag potential areas of collaboration. The review found the partnership with UNW the most active and the most strategic, followed by the ILO partnership on joint research. The review found a few areas of collaboration with IFC, and it was noted by IFC there was limited scope in future for engagement given IFC priorities. As BCs are increasing their focus on national partnerships, IW could consider whether it is critical to continue all existing MOUs in the future in order to collaborate with these partners, or if perhaps only the work with UNW requires a formal MOU.

During Phase 2, local partnerships have helped BCs to raise their profile, build credibility and expanded their business networks. This strategic shift towards greater investment in closer partnerships with local organisations has helped BCs broaden their networks in the private sector and advance their policy reform work. Building on their partnership with VBCSD, VBCWE is sponsoring a WGE Award as part of VBCSD's CSI Awards that benchmark the 100 top sustainable businesses in Vietnam and exposing them to VBCSD's reach of over 2,000 businesses. IBCWE has a broad range of partnerships, including with government agencies for policy influencing as well as the Indonesia Global Compact Network (IGCN) on the WEPS, alongside UNW. PBCWE has a broad range of partners and is partnering with several business associations. The People Management Association of the Philippines (PMAP) has elevated PBCWE's policy engagement and exposed PBCWE to its 2,000+ business members. BCGE has worked with the Myanmar Women Entrepreneur Network, part of a growing movement for supporting women in business and gender equality more broadly in Myanmar. Some of these partnerships, such as PMAP and IGCN, consulted as part of this review saw opportunities to deepen existing BC partnerships for mutual benefit. BCs have built partnerships with key players and through these partners are able to access other actors (for example key ministries). The current partnerships, and balance between national and international partnerships is appropriate.

“PBCWE has a strategic function to perform to improve the working conditions of women, especially in these times of the pandemic. We need to work together to build alliances with strategic organisations that are also pushing government and businesses for workplace gender equality. Aside from us in PMAP PBCWE is partnering with other organisations in this space. Together our voice is stronger. We are not in competition.”

Sarah Niguas, People Management Association of the Philippines

While P1 has shared information and updates with Pathway 2 and 3, the interaction between activities has been limited. For P2, this is understandable given that the pathways were not designed to connect to achieve each pathway outcome. Interaction between P1 and P2 has been to share invites, event updates, and networks but not much beyond this. At the beginning of Phase 2, IW’s Annual Workplan and MEL envisaged a greater intersection between P1 and P3 activities on gender norms in the workplace responding to a growing awareness of the need to address gender norms to progress WGE. The review found good communication on events, plans, and the sharing of P3 resources with P1. However, the intersection between P1 and P3 activities is limited. The review found one example of IBCWE collaborating and sharing resources with two P3 partners, Yayasan Pulih and Magdalena Magazine.

Some BCs expressed interest to co-create materials or campaigns with P3 in the future on gender norms and WGE. PBCWE is piloting a new Family Leadership Program working with employees and their families on divisions of roles and responsibilities in the home. PBCWE noted other members have expressed interest in this program. There is potential to share learning and may be potential to collaborate with P3’s materials and resources to support this work. Although the review acknowledges opportunities are likely limited for the current phase given P3 partners are selected and their campaigns are underway focused on millennials and gender norms in communities and the household.

P1 has engaged with DFAT programs where objectives align, and the partnership contribute towards achieving P1 outcomes. The review found two examples of P1 collaboration with other DFAT programs. In Indonesia, IBCWE is engaging with DFAT’s PROSPERA program to develop childcare support guidelines for private sector companies. This work draws on IBCWE’s strengths and may help to expand IBCWE’s business networks once the guidelines are disseminated. At the regional level, P1 engagement with STIR to contribute gender inputs to the GRI ASEAN Hub work plan which BCs are well placed to provide input. DFAT Posts, particularly in Indonesia, noted sharing of information between IW and other programs, with P1 and Posts identifying specific points of collaboration where they help advance P1 objectives is appropriate.

Recommendation 11: P1 to continue its focus on deepening local partnerships and strengthening those with the most potential to support BC membership growth and build influence.

3.3 EFFICIENCY

Program Management

P1 has built strong relationships with BCs and Boards characterised by trust, openness, and healthy debate. BCs and the Boards noted the positive working relationships between their team and P1. P1 team, especially the Director, are seen by BCs and the Boards as a valued critical friend. BCs and Boards are comfortable debating and disagree with P1 and do not see this as a risk (to funding). Given the donor-grantee relationship is not an equal one, the P1 team's ability to build open and trusting relationships is a strong achievement. It was noted that P1 team staff changes have affected consistency in some approaches and engagement over the past 4 years but BCs/Boards noted the consistent leadership of the Director has been a strength.

"We really value our relationship with the P1 Director. The best thing about working with her is she knows how to listen. We may not agree all the time but she will take in different perspectives and talk things through to reach a solution."

Julia Abad, Executive Director, PBCWE

P1 has streamlined reporting and administration throughout Phase 2. BCs and Boards feel more could be done to find further efficiencies. BC staff acknowledged that the P1 team is responsive to their feedback and streamlined several reporting requirements, consolidated regular meetings, and improved some templates. Some BC staff commented that the two-weekly and monthly reporting requirements could be better streamlined. The MEL Coordinators noted that the creation of a shared platform may create efficiencies and promote more cross-learning. Currently, BCs operate in Google Drive, whereas IW uses Microsoft. The current practice is for BCs to request access to IW's Microsoft folders, but the access expires every two months. BCs, therefore, noted they do not have ongoing access to shared information across P1. BCs also noted that timing of DFAT audits (with financial year ending 30 June) and the timing of audits in their country (with financial year ending 31 December) resulted in audits every 6 months which were time-consuming and costly.

It is evident that the Boards have strong ownership of, and commitment to, the BCs. This commitment is an important foundation for sustainability and reflects well on P1 relationships and approaches. Projects that establish new entities to take forward a donor-driven agenda run the risk that the new entity does not achieve sufficient buy-in and ownership by their boards. This inevitably results in the closure of the entity following the closure of the project. The fact that the BC Boards view BCs first and foremost as *their* business coalition and put time and energy into planning for their BCs, is a significant success for P1. The IW P1 team has had to balance investment in delivering on IW outcomes and targets as per their contract, with their commitment to BCs independence and longevity. The risk remains that pressure to deliver on project-related work for the donor outstrips IW investments in fuelling BCs long-term viability and independence. The BC Boards acknowledge this tension, and whilst they value both the donor funds and the expertise that IW brings to their work, it was noted that they would if

permitted, manage some aspects of the BCs differently.¹⁶ One of the roots of this tension lies in the fundamental difference between running an organisation as a donor project versus running an organisation as a business.

Finally, IW's position in the Gender Equality Branch has safeguarded P1's focus on a proof-of-concept model of BCs to progress WGE in SEA. The strategic vision to drive evidence-based change for WGE in SEA has strong champions from the highest levels, from Australia's Ambassador for Gender Equality and supported at senior levels within DFAT from Ambassadors consulted and Canberra senior executive staff. IW's positioning within the GEB (rather than spread across four bilateral programs) has safeguarded this focus and is guided by a strong working relationship and alignment between DFAT GEB and IW's CEO. DFAT's interest at Post to engage IW within the bilateral program within the current phase could lead to refined areas of focus for BCs aligned with the bilateral partnership. For example, the Post in Vietnam has a strong policy and advocacy focus that would see the BCs increase their policy influencing and government-related reform work. This, in turn, would take away from the BCs WGE work with companies. It is not yet clear whether DFAT would prefer i) BCs that are driven more by Post preferences and could therefore take on a broader WEE agenda or ii) BCs that are all focused on WGE with private sector companies in keeping with their original mandate. A third option is to allow BCs to drive their agenda which would see different BCs engage in different types of WEE work (and may even result in a shift away from WGE to other areas such as supporting women-led microenterprises). It may be useful for DFAT and IW to engage in an open dialogue with BCs on these options and what it would mean in terms of DFAT funding.

Budget and Resourcing

The P1 budget is appropriate given the current scope of work and intensity of technical support provided to BCs. P1 has kept a relatively small team of technical experts and support staff and contracted short-term advisors to provide specific and time-bound support to the program. P1 has made some important staff movements within the existing staff envelope that will help to ensure P1 can provide strong support to BCs for the remainder of the program. These are the recruitment of nationally based Client Engagement Framework Implementation Advisors (CEFIA) in each country; a Deputy Director to support the P1 Director; and embedding the MEL Manager in the P1 team. The role of the Country Manager focuses on liaison with the Embassy Post and in Phase 1 these staff in Indonesia and Vietnam provided strong support to establish BCs. Country Managers were appreciated by BCs and DFAT, and particular reference was made by the Hanoi and Jakarta Posts to the strong technical competencies and networks of the Country Managers. The review found potential in future for these staff to engage more strategically with staff at Posts and to help IW to identify local opportunities to raise IW's visibility. The review confirmed DFAT GEB is comfortable with the current resourcing as well as the program set-up with the team based in Canberra and Manila. This is seen as a more cost-effective option compared to having a full team based in Australia. It has also helped the IW team to build relationships in Manila and, before CV-19, travel easily around the region to support BCs. However, continued travel restrictions may affect this going forward if senior staff are not able to be based in Manila. Staffing arrangements and

¹⁶ Individuals interviewed from the BCs and BC Boards made references to how they may do things differently and these included: in some cases, less ambitious KPIs and/or targets; ensuring tools and services were suited to how businesses work; the need for stronger business acumen in building sustainable independent businesses; and less of a focus on annual workplans and annual budget cycles with more of a focus on longer term objectives.

budget would need to be revisited if additional work (such as an increased policy scope) were to be added in a future phase.

The review found the BCs grant amounts are appropriate with salaries that are comparable to the private sector market. BCs regarded their grant size as sufficient for current activities. Supporting BCs to scale while maintaining a similar budget in the future will be important to drive greater efficiencies in the BC model. A promising example of efficiencies in resourcing is IW's development of a local panel of experts that will help scale their work without increasing overheads. The review found salaries of BC staff to be aligned with private sector salary brackets, rather than NGO salaries. This is appropriate to attract the calibre of staff with higher capacity and experience to effectively engage with senior businesspeople. The review supports P1's decision to continue financing BCs without tapering off completely by 2023 to support BCs to focus on building WGE expertise and delivering WGE services to a growing membership.

Recommendation 12: P1 to continue efforts to bring about operational efficiencies help BCs expand and strengthen, particularly in delivering the CEF. Good examples to date include the recent automation of BC client data, to reduce workload and enable BCs to support more firms at scale. IW's panel of local WGE experts is another good example of building efficiencies.

Recommendation 13: The IW P1 team to identify ways to further streamline and find efficiencies in program administration, reporting, and communications. P1 could review audit timing to align DFAT audits with local audit cycles.

Recommendation 14: Following DFAT commitment to design a continued phase beyond mid-2023, IW and DFAT to consider engaging in an open dialogue with BCs on models of future support from a business angle, and what it would mean in terms of DFAT support and funding.

3.4 MEL AND RESEARCH

The updated TOC, approved by DFAT in April 2021, represents an appropriate level of ambition. IW's Phase 2 Design Document contained an initial TOC which was then further refined by IW and approved by DFAT in October 2019. With the onset of CV-19 in March 2020, it was agreed by both parties to continue with the October 2019 TOC and then review and refine the TOC before the end of FY21 in line with the changing environment for the remainder of Phase 2. Refinements to the Pathway logic presented in the April 2021 TOC reflect shifts in assumptions that are in part due to CV-19 impacts, and in part due to IW and BC experience and learning during Phase 2 about private sector demand for WGE and the pace of change in the four IW countries. The shifts in expectation of the project by mid-2023 related to BCs achieving financial sustainability are appropriate. A greater understanding of the interlinkages between the three P1 logic chains (strengthening BCs, improving WGE in firms, and influencing policy reform) is reflected in the revised TOC and this appropriately reflects the learning and experience of P1 team and BCs.

P1's MEL system is fit-for-purpose and has evolved appropriately to meet program needs in capturing results going forward. At the beginning of Phase 2, IW revised the MEL framework to better respond to the evolving context and implementation. This included specific Key Evaluation Questions to

review progress against what was planned and to test assumptions. The review found these KEQs and their assumptions have been periodically tested and implementation refined throughout Phase 2. P1's data management system is based on Excel sheets in Google Drive accessible to the IW team and BCs. This is relatively simple yet proven to be effective to capture quantitative data on BC activities, WGE actions, as well as qualitative information captured in the P1 tools. MEL Coordinators and some BC staff have noted the current system makes data accessible to BC staff and easily consolidated at various levels of the program for analytical and reporting purposes.

MEL has effectively pivoted to generate data and evidence needed to build the WGE business case with a shift in P1 tools and approach. The MEL system at the beginning of Phase 2 relied on EDGE certification and recertification to generate data and evidence to build the WGE business case. Before CV-19 affected demand for WGE services, P1 was already starting to learn that EDGE was unlikely to be cost-effective and sustainable in the SEA markets as the sole tool to drive WGE. P1 has used learning to make an appropriate shift to developing the CEF. The CEF draws in WGE data from across EDGE, GEARS, and GESSA to help fill data and evidence gaps and is expected to meet data needs going forward. BC MEL Coordinators consulted as part of this review noted they were less confident in their ability to use the CEF and expected they would need additional MEL support. P1's decision to embed the MEL Manager in P1 is appropriate and will help to ensure BCs have the continued support they need. They were also unsure how the previous EDGE data would sync with new CEF data for each firm and across the BCs. At the time of this review, IW was about to start orientation sessions with BCs on the CEF so some of these uncertainties may now have been resolved.

The review found that P1 operates effectively as a learning organization with structured consistent processes and periodic reviews that guide refinements and improvement. These processes are inclusive and participatory with BCs and Boards, reflecting P1's partnership approach. P1's suite of annual tools includes the client satisfaction surveys, BC and Board interviews, learning memos, and annual synthesis on BC progress, and the policy matrix. These tools align and complement one another and help the team generate and reflect on performance consistently and systematically. The MEL annual BC Learning Memos are an example of good practice. The MEL team acts as a critical friend facilitating a process of reflection with BCs and Boards structured around three KEQ in the MEL framework. Findings and suggested ways forward are discussed to map improvements going forward. In this way, P1 periodically tests the TOC and its assumptions at the BC level and uses evidence and learning for improvements. The process is inclusive and participatory reflecting P1's partnership approach. BCs commented that the annual Learning Events were effective and engaging forums for sharing learning, tools and practice between BCs. They had found it challenging to reach the same level of engagement in these forums online and were keen for more frequent ways for sharing and learning. One option suggested by staff from two BCs was a shared platform to access tools and products across BCs.

MEL team has generated internal reviews and evaluations that have been critical to supporting P1 to learn and adapt to improve implementation. For example, Phase 2 involved a significant shift from EDGE as the sole tool, to introducing GEARS and developing GEARS 1 and GEARS 2 adapted to meet BC's needs. As part of this process, P1 commissioned an evaluation of EDGE in 2020 to test assumptions around the cost-effectiveness and appropriateness of EDGE for SEA markets. This informed

the development of GEARS¹⁷ as a lighter touch, lower-cost assessment mechanism that would help firms prioritise WGE actions. P1 also reviewed GEARS in February 2021 to assess the appropriateness of the tools and the BC capacity to use them, before scaling their use. The review found this commitment to continuous review and reflection strength of the MEL. MEL also conducted a rapid review of the impacts of CV-19 in mid-2020 that was tabled within IW to discuss the impacts, work of BCs, risks, and challenges and helped to guide future P1 support and to discuss BC strategies.

MEL products have supported BCs in their engagement with businesses and for advocacy efforts more broadly in the ecosystem. In mid-2020, P1 surveyed businesses on the impacts of CV-19 on employees. The survey data was used to develop brief fact sheets that were then used by BCs to discuss business responses and BC support. These surveys were regarded by BCs as extremely supportive to enable them access to businesses when the engagement was challenging, to deliver demand-driven advice, and to then pivot their activities to remain relevant to members. MEL has also developed WGE Factsheets to support BC staff in their engagement with businesses defining WGE, the benefits, and draws on evidence from the region. P1 partnered with International Labor Organisation (ILO) to prepare Country Briefs on the business case for women in business in the Philippines, Indonesia, and Vietnam. The briefs were used by BCs to engage business leaders as part of advocacy and policy engagement.

The review received positive feedback from partners on some of the analytics, with the most referred to being WGE data for SEA. There was strong interest from a range of partners (IFC, UNW, PMAP, IGCN) consulted in this review for more evidence and data on WGE in SEA. This was seen as a unique value add of IW and relevance to other partners, such as IW and UNW in their work. The most referred to MEL product, although not from P1, was the Social Norms Attitudes and Practices (SNAP) Survey IW commissioned under P3 in 2020. IFC noted they had used this in their childcare work and hoped that IW would produce more analysis and evidence in the future that combined gender norms in the workplace.

Recommendation 15: P1 to continue its strong MEL support to BCs on the CEF MEL requirements. As implementation progresses, P1 should continue to work with the BCs to identify ways to refine and simplify the CEF MEL based on feedback from firms.

Recommendation 16: P1 to continue efforts to support cross-BC learning and sharing of good practices, which could be facilitated through a shared platform. P1 also to continue developing case studies and analysis that contribute to the WGE business case, and work with BCs and Boards to package and communicate these in a business setting.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WEE PROGRAM

This section outlines some considerations for a future WEE program that maintains a focus on strengthening the BCs to progress WGE. It is intended that these ideas be further explored and contextualised within broader discussions and evidence building including DFAT Canberra priorities for a

¹⁷ GEARS is used in two stages: first to provide a basic diagnostic of a company's maturity in relation to WGE (GEARS 1) and then to provide deeper analysis of specific WGE areas identified as requiring improvement during the initial diagnostic exercise and offer specific solutions (GEARS 2)

WEE regional program, and bilateral priorities in each of the four countries related to WEE. These ideas have been developed with the assumption that P1 achieves its EOPO and has demonstrated proof of concept with the BC model. With this in mind, DFAT may consider:

- **A continued technical focus on strengthening BCs as membership associations and as service providers.** By the end of Phase 2, P1 expects to have a proof of concept for a BC model that can progress WGE in businesses and influence the private sector ecosystem. Particularly in the context of economic recovery from CV-19, BCs membership growth and demand for their services will rely upon evidence that demonstrates the economic benefits of WGE. The models and approaches in each country would likely have the same core component of works. However, they may vary based on local contexts, refinements, and would ideally be guided by local roadmaps developed for BCs by local business experts. This may mean that the balance of selling WGE services, and broader advocacy may slightly vary.
- **Design a more integrated component of work on gender and social norms to progress WGE.** P1 learning has confirmed WGE progress is constrained by deeply rooted cultural norms and gender stereotypes. BCs have explored how to address gender and social norms through some of their services and engagement with businesses. A continued phase could draw in learning from P1 and P3 and include an outcome pathway that from co-creation of content and campaigns between P3 and P1 towards improved WGE outcomes.
- **Deepen investments in the existing countries, rather than geographic expansion but this still needs to be tested through consultations on a future WEE program.** The review did not find a strong demand from DFAT or the Pathway 1 team for geographic expansion to other countries in the region. Instead, there was some interest to deepen investments in the existing locations. It was suggested by the Deputy Head of Mission in Jakarta to “go deeper, not wider” within the existing countries. This may involve expanding BC WGE services to central business regions outside the current cities, for example, Ho Chi Minh in Vietnam, Surabaya in Indonesia, and areas with large industries (Cagayan de Oro, Davao, Subic, Baguio) in the Philippines.
- **Increasingly shift towards a business model for working with BCs (as opposed to a donor project model).** Given the interest of Boards to take a stronger business focus, this next phase of IW should reflect a shift in IW’s role with BCs and begin transitioning out of intensive support to a more sustainable arrangement. For example, rather than supply technical advisors to BCs, PI could support BCs to source local consultants, business advisors, and researchers/analysts to support their activities.
- **Explore regional networking and influence for WGE in SEA. This could align with DFAT’s interest in building a women’s regional dialogue.** The core focus of a continued phase of support to BCs should remain on national efforts to build BCs as Centres of Excellence, to expand their delivery of WGE services, and to generate evidence on the local business case for WGE. However, a regional element to this work would support BCs and their businesses to promote WGE in the region for broader influence. BCs noted their interest to engage in other regional efforts, for example, further strengthening linkages with Global Compact Network (GCN) and UNW. This regional work could draw upon and promote WGEA expertise, to amplify Australia’s success and expand Australia’s influence. WGEA has the advantage of being Australian government funded. Continued engagement with WGEA may help to expand their reach and influence outside of Australia, with a stronger Australian-centric approach to supporting WGE in the region.

APPENDIX A: DETAILED EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Key Evaluation Area	Key Evaluation Question	Pathway 1: Workplace Gender Equality (WGE)	Data sources	Methodology
		Sub questions/Lines of Inquiry		
Relevance	1. How relevant and strategic is IW to DFAT policy priorities?	<p>P1 KEQ1 How relevant and strategic is Pathway 1 to DFAT policy priorities?</p> <p>P1 1.1 The relevance and contribution of P1 to DFAT policy priorities.</p> <p>P1 1.2 The extent to which P1 has demonstrated Australia's value and maximised Australia's influence.</p> <p>P1 1.3 Any recommendations to improve the contribution of Pathway 1 to DFAT policy priorities or maximizing Australia's influence.</p>	<p>Primary: DFAT, IW and BCs</p> <p>Secondary: DFAT's Partnership for Recovery Policy; Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment Strategy; Progress Reports; Knowledge products.</p>	<p>Desk review of DFAT policies and program documentation.</p> <p>Interviews with IW, Pathway and BC teams to discuss policy relevance and contribution as well as any ideas on future positioning.</p>
Effectiveness	2. To what extent is IW likely to meet its End of Program Outcomes?	<p>P1 KEQ 2 To what extent is Pathway 1 likely to meet its End of Program Outcomes?</p> <p>P1 2.1 Perspectives on Pathway 1 achievements under activity areas (under each logic chain) and the contributing factors to change within each BC context.</p> <p>P1 2.2 Analyse the growth in demand for BC services and evidence of increase in their industry credibility.</p>	<p>Primary: DFAT, IW and Pathway 1 staff and advisors BC staff and Board representatives</p> <p>Secondary: BC Annual Plans Progress Reports IW Progress Reports Learning Memos</p>	<p>Review program documentation and other literature and knowledge products.</p> <p>Collect evidence against the rubric – using monitoring data, interviews and desk review of available documents.</p>

		<p>P1 2.3 Analyse the extent to which the BCs are progressing towards financial sustainability.</p> <p>P1 2.4 Analyse the extent to which Pathway 3 resources have been used by Pathway 1.</p> <p>P1 2.5 Analyse the extent to which firms have implemented WGE and how this has benefitted firms.</p> <p>P1 2.6 Analyse the extent to which IW/BCs have influenced policy actors towards WGE related reforms</p> <p>P1 2.7 Identification of key learnings and insights from Pathway 1 work that will increase effectiveness of WGE work in the last 2 years of the Program.</p>	<p>WGE diagnostics, monitoring and assessment tools GEARS and EDGE Certification documents IW Master Tracker Policy Dialogue matrix; ILO Country Briefs; Sustainability reporting Partner MOUs; Knowledge and other products prepared through the partnerships; Policy Briefs and other relevant knowledge products and materials on case studies and policy engagement. Firm case studies synthesis</p>	<p>Present assessment of performance by BC for the 3 Logic Chains coupled with narrative analysis on the rationale.</p>
	<p>3. How effectively has the program adapted to CV-19?</p>	<p>P1 KEQ 3: How effectively has Pathway 1 adapted to CV-19?</p> <p>P1 3.1 Perspectives from BCs and Pathway 1 staff on the impacts of CV-19 to the program and how they have adapted.</p> <p>P1 3.2 Identification and analysis of changes to work plans and budgets of BCs and Pathway 1, challenges, set-</p>	<p>Primary: DFAT, IW, Pathway 1 staff, BC team, Boards representatives, Partners</p> <p>Secondary: Annual Plans and Progress Reports 2020</p>	<p>Desk review of available program documents and DFAT's Partnership for Recovery policy response.</p> <p>Interviews with team members and key</p>

		<p>backs and results (expected and unexpected).</p> <p>P1 3.3 Identification of learning from various teams/stakeholders (Pathway 1 team and BC staff).</p> <p>P3.4 Any recommendations to improve the effectiveness of P1's response to CV-19.</p>	<p>CV-19 Employee Surveys</p>	<p>stakeholders to understand impacts to different BCs and members, and to explore subsequent adjustments to plans and budgets.</p>
	<p>4. How effectively has IW collaborated and coordinated within DFAT, with other programs and with external organisations?</p>	<p>P1 KEQ 4: How effectively has P1 collaborated and coordinated within DFAT, with other programs and with external organisations?</p> <p>P1 4.1 Identification of collaboration with other DFAT programs and private sector and identification of key achievements from partnerships towards outcomes.</p> <p>P1 4.2 Identification of the role of DFAT in supporting coordination and information sharing and learning with other DFAT programs, and where relevant other organisations</p> <p>P1 4.3 Comment on the importance of DFAT bilateral program buy in (in particular by the embassies) to the effectiveness of Pathway 1</p> <p>P1 4.4 Any recommendations to improve collaboration with DFAT, embassies,</p>	<p>Primary: DFAT, IW, Pathway 1 staff, BC team, partners</p> <p>Secondary: Annual Plans and Progress Reports 2020, MOUs, analytical work prepared with partners.</p>	<p>Desk review of available program documents.</p> <p>Interviews with team members, DFAT, BCs and partners to understand how P1 and BCs have worked with other programs and partners, current working relationships and engagement between P1 and other pathways and cross check and triangulate data and information.</p>

		other DFAT programs or with external organisations.		
Efficiency	5. How effective and efficient are program management arrangements?	<p>P1 KEQ 5 How effective and efficient is the program management by the P1 team?</p> <p>P1 5.1 Perspectives on program management, staff resourcing, support provided by IW, including MEL support.</p> <p>P1 5.2 Analysis of staff resourcing of P1 and types of support provided by IW.</p> <p>P1 5.3 Analysis of the current arrangements for P1 engaging with DFAT Canberra and embassies</p> <p>P1 5.4 Any recommendations to improve the effectiveness and/ or efficiency of Pathway 1 team's program management.</p>	<p>Primary: IW staff, DFAT, Pathway 1 staff, BC, Board representatives, partners</p> <p>Secondary: IW Progress Reports BC Progress Reports Learning Memos Analytical products</p>	<p>Desk review of available documents including Pathway reports and grant agreements.</p> <p>Interviews with team members and key stakeholders to explore aspects of support further and to cross check and triangulate data and information.</p>
	6. How appropriate is the Phase 2 Budget and resourcing to meet End of Program Outcomes?	<p>P1 KEQ 6 How appropriate is the Phase 2 Budget and resourcing to meet End of Program Outcomes?</p> <p>P1 6.1 Perspective on the budget and resourcing for Pathway 1 – is it enough, too much, too little?</p> <p>P1 6.2 Analysis of the grant provided to each BC, proportion of grant to each area of work and comments on whether this is just right, too much, too little in size and composition.</p>	<p>Primary: IW staff, DFAT Pathway 1 staff, BC. Board representatives</p> <p>Secondary: BC Assessment Reports IW Progress Reports BC Progress Reports Budget information</p>	<p>Desk review of available documents including Pathway reports and grant agreements.</p> <p>Interviews with team members and key stakeholders to explore aspects of support further and to</p>

		P1 6.3 Any recommendations on the budget and resourcing for Pathway 1.	Grant agreements	cross check and triangulate data and information.
Future Recommendations	7. How should any future WEE program expand or change?	<p>P1 KEQ 7 How should any future WEE program expand or change?</p> <p>P1 7.1 Recommend any adjustments or new areas of work that could be explored in a future WEE program.</p> <p>P1 7.2 Evidence and analysis that will help to consider options for closer relationships particularly with Australian entities such as the Workplace Gender Equality Agency (WGEA) – currently and in any future program.</p> <p>P1 7.3 Comment on the appropriateness and feasibility of a geographical expansion for any new WEE program.</p>	<p>Primary: IW staff including IW MEL, BC staff, Board representatives, partners</p> <p>Secondary: Progress Reports of IW and BCs</p>	<p>Desk review of available documents including Pathway reports and grant agreements.</p> <p>Interviews with team members, BCs and Boards and partners to explore aspects of support further and to cross check and triangulate data and information.</p>
MEL	8. How appropriate is the MEL for supporting monitoring and learning?	<p>P1 KEQ 8 How appropriate is the MEL for supporting Pathway 1 monitoring and learning?</p> <p>P1 8.1 Comment on the adequacy and appropriateness of the MEL Framework and TOC for Pathway 1.</p> <p>P1 8.2 Comment on the effectiveness of MEL's collaboration with P1 BCs to strengthen their capacity.</p> <p>P1 8.3 Identification of CV-19 impacts</p>	<p>Primary: IW staff including IW MEL, BC staff</p> <p>Secondary: IW MEL Framework Progress Reports of IW and BCs, MEL Reviews Knowledge products and communication materials</p>	<p>Desk review of available documents including reports and grant agreements.</p> <p>Interviews with team members, BCs to explore aspects of support further and to cross check and</p>

		<p>and analysis of how this may or may not have affected the logic.</p> <p>P1 8.4 Any recommendations on improving MEL support to Pathway 2 monitoring and learning.</p>	CV-19 Employee Surveys	triangulate data and information.
	<p>9. How effective has MEL been in demonstrating results and supporting internal learning?</p>	<p>P1 KEQ 9 How effective has MEL been in demonstrating results and supporting internal learning?</p> <p>P1 9.1 Perceptions on how supportive the MEL system (its data, products, processes etc) for learning and activity support towards outcomes.</p> <p>P1 9.2 Perceptions on how effective the MEL system has been in demonstrating results.</p> <p>P1 9.3 Any recommendations on improving MEL support to Pathway 1 in demonstrating results and supporting internal learning.</p>	<p>Primary: IW staff including IW MEL, BC staff</p> <p>Secondary: IW MEL Framework Progress Reports of IW and BCs, MEL Reviews</p>	<p>Desk review of available documents.</p> <p>Interviews with team members to explore aspects of support further and to cross check and triangulate data and information.</p>
	<p>10. How have MEL products and research supported program implementation beyond IW?</p>	<p>P1 KEQ 10 How have MEL products and research supported program implementation and beyond IW?</p> <p>P1 10.1 Identification of how research products under Pathway 1 have been used by P1 and beyond.</p>	<p>Primary: IW staff including IW MEL, BC staff, MEL Coordinators, partners</p> <p>Secondary: IW MEL Framework</p>	<p>Desk review of available documents.</p> <p>Interviews with team members and partners to explore aspects of support further and to cross</p>

		<p>P1 10.2 Any recommendations on improving MEL products and research products and how these may support WGE beyond Pathway 1.</p>	<p>Progress Reports of IW and BCs, MEL Reviews, MEL products and research.</p>	<p>check and triangulate data and information.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

APPENDIX B: DATA SOURCES

List of interviews and dates:

Stakeholder	Interviewee	Date
DFAT	Embassy Hanoi	12 May 2021
DFAT	Embassy Manila	12 May 2021
DFAT	DFAT Canberra	17 May 2021
DFAT	Embassy Jakarta	19 May 2021
DFAT	Embassy Yangon	19 May 2021
Pathway 1 Staff & Partners	Director Pathway 1	7 May 2021
Pathway 1 Staff & Partners	Pathway 1 WGE Assessment and Development Manager	6 May 2021
Pathway 1 Staff & Partners	Pathway 1 Policy Reform Specialist	18 May 2021
Pathway 1 Staff & Partners	Pathway 1 MEL Manager	5 May 2021
BC MEL Coordinators	IBCWE MEL Coordinator	7 May 2021
BC MEL Coordinators	PBCWE MEL Coordinator	7 May 2021
BC MEL Coordinators	VBCWE MEL Coordinator	7 May 2021
Investing in Women Country Managers	Indonesia Country Manager	5 May 2021
Investing in Women Country Managers	Vietnam Country Manager	6 May 2021
Investing in Women Country Managers	Philippines Country Manager	6 May 2021
Business Coalitions	IBCWE Team	10 May 2021
Business Coalitions	VBCWE Team	12 May 2021
Business Coalitions	PBCWE Team	21 and 24 May 2021
Business Coalition Boards	VBCWE Chairperson / Deloitte Vietnam	17 May 2021
Business Coalition Boards	PBCWE CO-Chairperson	18 May 2021
Business Coalition Boards	IBCWE Chair	18 May 2021
Business Coalition Boards	BCGE Chair	19 May 2021
Partners	UN Women, Jakarta	25 May 2021

Partners	EAP Lead, Gender and Economic Inclusion, IFC	20 May 2021
Partners	PMAP	25 May 2021
Partners	Indonesia Global Compact Network (IGCN),	4 June 2021
Partners	Head of Vietnam Business Council for Sustainable Development (VBCSD) Secretariat	19 May 2021

List of Reports and Documents:

World Economic Forum (2021), *Global Gender Gap Report 2021*, [Global Gender Gap Report 2021 | World Economic Forum \(weforum.org\)](#), accessed on 16 May 2021.

DFAT documents:

DFAT (2017) *Foreign Policy White Paper* <https://www.dfat.gov.au/sites/default/files/2017-foreign-policy-white-paper.pdf>, accessed 22 May 2021

DFAT (2016) *Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment Strategy* <https://www.dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Pages/gender-equality-and-womens-empowerment-strategy> accessed on 20 May 2021

DFAT (2015) *Development for All 2015-2020: Strategy for strengthening disability-inclusive development in Australia's aid* <https://www.dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/development-for-all-2015-2020> accessed 23 May 2021

DFAT <https://www.dfat.gov.au/publications/aid/partnerships-recovery-australias-CV-19-development-response> accessed 20 May 2021

DFAT *CV-19 Development Response Plans* <https://www.dfat.gov.au/publications/development/CV-19-development-response-plans> accessed 20 May 2021

Investing in Women program documents:

- Progress Report July - December 2019
- Progress Report January – June 2020
- Progress Report July – December 2020
- Annual Plan FY19-20
- Annual Plan FY20-21
- Draft Annual Plan FY21-22 (excepts)
- IW MEL Framework (2018) and Revised Framework (April 2021)
- Pathway 1 Program Documents:
- Business Coalition Annual Workplans and Budgets (FY19-20, FY20-21)
- Business Coalition Bi-Annual Progress Report (Jul-Dec 2019, Jan-Jun 2020, Jul-Dec 2020)
- MEL Documents:
 - Rapid Review Report, August 2020

- Business Coalition Synthesis 2020
- Business Coalition Synthesis 2021 (draft submitted to DFAT)
- IW Indonesia CV-19 Employee Survey, June 2020
- Firm Case Studies Synthesis Final Report, August 2019
- BC Learning Memo 2021 and 2020 (with CV-19 updates)
- Evaluation of EDGE, June 2020
- Review of GEARS, February 2021
- Results Framework P1 Master, 30 June 2020
- Business Coalitions Assessment Report 1 and 2
 - BCWE Assessment Report (Nov 2019 / Aug 2020)
 - IBCWE Assessment Report (Nov 2019 / Sep 2020)
 - PBCWE Assessment Report (Dec 2019 / Aug 2020)
 - VBCWE Assessment Report (Nov 2019/ Aug 2020)
- Operations
 - BCGE Grant Agreement
- Workplace Gender Equality Tools
 - BC Systems Monitoring Tool
 - BC Systems Assessment Tool
- Partnerships
 - IFC and IW MOU Apr 2019
 - IW and EDGE MOU Jun 2020
 - IW WGEA MOU 2019
- Tools
 - Employee Turn Over Cost Calculator
 - BC F&A Systems Monitoring Tool
 - BC OPs Assessment Tool
 - IW Flexible Work Toolkit
 - WGE and WEE IW February 2020
 - WGEA GE Diagnostics Tool
 - WGEA GE Strategy Guide
 - WGEA Staff Survey Bank, Dec 2020
- Workplace Gender Equality
 - IW Master – Action Plan Tracker
 - EDGE Round 2 – results presentation Jun 2020
- Policy reform
 - Policy Dialogue Matrix, Jan 2021
 - Sustainability Reporting Working Group Notes, Feb 2021
 - Final Draft Rationale Table PBCWE Table
- ILO Country Briefs
 - ILO Country Brief Leading to Success Indonesia, 2020
 - ILO Country Brief Leading to Success Philippines, 2020
 - ILO Country Brief Leading to Success Vietnam, 2020
- CV-19 Employee Survey 2020
 - IW Indonesia

- IW Philippines
 - IW Vietnam
- General Communication and Knowledge Sharing
 - BCs Newsletters
 - IW WGE Fact Sheet Aid Identifier

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW GUIDES

DFAT (CANBERRA AND POST)

- Embassy Hanoi. Interviewed 12 May 2021.
- Embassy Manila. Interviewed 12 May 2021.
- DFAT Canberra. Interviewed 17 May 2021.
- Embassy Jakarta. Interviewed 19 May 2021.
- Embassy Yangon. Interviewed 19 May 2021.

KEQ AREAS	Interview Questions for DFAT Staff
KEQ 1 How relevant and strategic is IW to DFAT policy priorities?	Which of the areas of IW work (workplace gender equality/business coalitions; gender lens impact investing; gender norms campaigns with civil society) do you consider contribute most effectively to meeting DFAT/Post priorities? Why?
KEQ 2. To what extent is IW likely to meet its End of Program Outcome?	Are you aware of any examples of key achievements or successes of the IW program? What more could be done / done differently?
KEQ 3. How effectively has the program adapted to CV-19?	How effectively has IW adapted its programming to CV-19? What, if anything, do you think IW could do to strengthen its response to CV-19?
KEQ 4. How effectively has IW collaborated and coordinated within DFAT, with other programs and with external organisations?	Do you have a view on how effectively has IW collaborated and coordinated within DFAT/post, with other programs in country X, and with external organisations and partners? Is there potential to do more/differently?
KEQ 5. How effective and efficient are program management arrangements?	As a multi-country program managed by GEB but with co-investment from country programs and local embassy staff assigned to assist with managing the IW program – how effective do you think this arrangement is? Would you recommend any changes to these arrangements?

<p>KEQ 7. How should any future WEE program expand or change?</p>	<p>How might any future women's economic empowerment program in Southeast Asia expand or change?</p> <p>In terms of IW's areas of focus what would you propose to cover more/less/differently?</p>
<p>KEQ 10. How have MEL products and research supported program implementation and beyond IW?</p>	<p>How useful are the products/research/ public diplomacy events to DFAT/the embassy?</p> <p>Are you aware whether these have they had any impact to broader stakeholders?</p> <p>What would you like to see more/less of or done differently?</p>

PATHWAY 1 STAFF, PARTNERS AND STAKEHOLDERS

Director Pathway 1. Interviewed on 7 May 2021.

<p>KEQ 2. To what extent is IW likely to meet its End of Program Outcomes?</p>	<p>P1 2.3 If you had to look at a revised timeframe for financial sustainability, post mid-2023, would you be able to comment on how long you think is more realistic to achieve financial sustainability?</p> <p>(doesn't have to be exact)</p>
<p>KEQ 4. How effectively has IW collaborated and coordinated within DFAT, with other programs and with external organisations?</p>	<p>P1 4.2 How has DFAT helped to facilitate coordination and engagement with other bilateral programs for P1 work?</p> <p>P1 4.3 From your perspective, how has DFAT buy-in contributed to the effectiveness of P1?</p>
<p>KEQ 5. How effective and efficient are program management arrangements?</p>	<p>P1 5.1 How does work planning happen in P1 (from the BCs up to IW)?</p> <p>P1 5.2 Do you feel your current staff resourcing is appropriate for delivery of your work plan?</p> <p>P1 5.3 Do you have any direct engagement with DFAT on P1? Do you have any suggestions on how DFAT engagement may further support your work in the coming 2 years?</p> <p>P1 5.4 What changes – if any – would you suggest in the work arrangements for P1 going forward?</p>

<p>KEQ 6. How appropriate is the Phase 2 Budget and resourcing to meet End of Program Outcomes?</p>	<p>P1 6.1 From your perspective how appropriate is the P1 budget for supporting its implementation?</p> <p>P1 6.2 From your perspective do you think the grant sizes to BCs are appropriate?</p> <p>P1 6.3 Do you have any recommendations on the budget and resourcing for P1 in future?</p>
<p>KEQ 7. How should any future WEE program expand or change?</p>	<p>P1 7.1 Do you have views on what a future women's economic empowerment program in Southeast Asia could look like?</p> <p>P1 7.2 Do you think there is scope for a closer partnership with WGEA? IF so, what could this look like? If not, are you able to share your reasons why?</p> <p>P1 7.3 Do you think geographical expansion would be appropriate and feasible for any new WEE program, for example related to establishing BCs in other countries?</p>

Pathway 1 WGE Assessment and Development Manager. Interviewed 6 May 2021.

<p>KEQ AREAS</p>	<p>Interview Questions for P1 focused on BC and CEF</p>
<p>KEQ 2. To what extent is IW likely to meet its End of Program Outcome?</p>	<p>P1 2.2 During Phase 2 there has been a focus on strengthening BC understanding of WGE. Can you please share what you think have been the key P1 initiatives or partnerships that have contributed towards this improved understanding?</p> <p>P1 2.3 / 4.1 What have been some key achievements in the partnership with IFC?</p> <p>P1 2.3 / 4.1 What have been some of the key achievements in the partnership with WGEA? Do you think more can be done in collaboration with WGEA?</p> <p>P1 2.2 / 2.5 What do you anticipate may be the more challenging or different ways of working in moving towards the CEF for BCs? And for firms?</p> <p>P1 2.3 Can you please share your plans for how the sustainability scenarios (and analysis) will be used going forward for BC work planning.</p>

	<p>P1 2.5/2.6 How do the BCs currently engage with one another to share learning and insights, or do joint advocacy or networking? What more, if anything, do you think could be done to strengthen their coordination?</p> <p>P1 5.2/5.1 In your role, how do you engage with the SIU in each country?</p>
<p>KEQ 6. How appropriate is the Phase 2 Budget and resourcing to meet End of Program Outcomes?</p>	<p>P1 6.2 From your perspective do you think the grant sizes to BCs are appropriate?</p>

Pathway 1 Policy Reform Specialist. Interviewed 18 May 2021.

KEQ AREAS	Interview Questions
<p>KEQ1. How relevant and strategic is IW to DFAT policy priorities?</p>	<p>P1 1.1 Can you point to any examples where the policy reform work has connected with broader policy priorities of DFAT at Post (eg linked to DFAT's partnership strategies in each country)?</p> <p>P1 1.1 Can you tell me about the role of the Embassies/Post to contribute to the policy reform work and engagement with key actors?</p>
<p>KEQ 2. To what extent is IW likely to meet its End of Program Outcomes?</p>	<p>P1 2.6 How have you seen the policy reform work evolve during Phase 2 to this focus on Sustainability Reporting?</p> <p>P1 2.6 Aside from the sustainability reporting, do you see other policy opportunities arising in the individual countries – maybe related to revisions of laws (eg in the case of Vietnam the gender law) - that may also provide new opportunities to achieve P1 objectives (aligned with the revised TOC)?</p> <p>P1 2.6 How active are the Boards in driving the policy reform agenda? What role do they play?</p> <p>P1 2.6 What have been the challenges, if any, for this policy reform work?</p> <p>P1 2.6 What do you see as the next steps for BCs to taking forward the policy reform work, specifically the sustainability reporting, in building demand for their WGE services?</p>

Pathway 1 MEL Manager. Interviewed 5 May 2021.

KEQ	Questions for P1 MEL
Background	The MEL from Phase 1 and 2 involved shifting providers and revisions to the approach. Can you please tell us what was involved in facilitating this shift to start-up Phase 2 for P1 and for the BCs?
<p>KEQ 8. How appropriate is the MEL for supporting monitoring and learning?</p>	<p>P1 8.2 What is your approach to working with BCs to strengthen their MEL capacity? Phase 2 involved the recruitment of BC MEL Coordinators. What have been the benefits of this approach for P1 MEL and for BC capacity strengthening?</p> <p>Relates to P1 5.3 The logic has gone through a few iterations, can you comment on the process of engaging with DFAT on revisions to the logic?</p>
<p>KEQ 9. How effective has MEL been in demonstrating results and supporting internal learning?</p>	<p>P1 9.1 IW notes in several places it works in a responsive and agile way to adjust based on learning and progress. Can you tell us how the program MEL processes support working in this way to use learning and evidence to refine implementation along the way?</p> <p>P1 9.2 Given some of the setbacks you mentioned around data gathering due to CV-19, what will be a priority for the coming 2 years for MEL in this regard?</p> <p>P1 9.3. What would you do - if anything - to further strengthen the current MEL for P1 and support to BCs?</p>
<p>KEQ 10. How have MEL products and research supported program implementation and beyond IW?</p>	<p>P1 10.1 (i) Can you share an example of what you would consider good practice in the use of research products under P1 to support achievements towards outcomes?</p> <p>(ii) Do you know of any examples where P1 research or studies have been taken up and used beyond P1 and IW?</p> <p>P1 10.2 (i) What changes, if any, would you make to further strengthen MEL products and research products and their use in P1?</p>

BC MEL Coordinators. Interviewed 7 May 2021.

- IBCWE MEL Coordinator
- PBCWE MEL Coordinator
- VBCWE MEL Coordinator

MEL Discussions	
<p>KEQ 8. How appropriate is the MEL for supporting monitoring and learning?</p>	<p>P1 8.2 How has IW support helped to strengthen your MEL capacity?</p> <p>P1 8.4 Do you have any recommendations on improving MEL support to BCs for monitoring and learning for the remainder of the program?</p>
<p>KEQ 9. How effective has MEL been in demonstrating results and supporting internal learning?</p>	<p>P1 9.1 From your perspective how has the MEL system (its data, products, processes etc) supported you to learn and to deliver activities.</p> <p>P1 9.3. Do you have any recommendations on improvements to the MEL system for sharing learning, for example between BCs and across your networks?</p>
<p>KEQ 10: How have MEL products and research supported program implementation beyond IW?</p>	<p>P1 10.1 Have you seen P1 work being used by other organisations or more broadly?</p> <p>P1 10.2 Do you have any recommendations for strengthening the research agenda for the remainder of the program?</p>

Investing in Women Country Managers

- Indonesia Country Manager. Interviewed 5 May 2021.
- Vietnam Country Manager. Interviewed 6 May 2021.
- Philippines Country Manager. Interviewed 6 May 2021.

Introductory Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can you briefly outline your role in the IW team? • Can you describe your engagement with Embassy staff? • Can you describe your engagement with P1 and P3 partners?
KEQ 1. How relevant and strategic is IW to DFAT policy priorities?	<p>P1 1.1 Which of the areas of IW work do you consider contribute most effectively in meeting DFAT/Post priorities?</p> <p>P1 1.1 Do you have examples of how IW has advanced DFAT / post priorities?</p>
KEQ 2. To what extent is IW likely to meet its End of Program Outcome?	<p>P1 2.3 What do you think are the key achievements of IW in Phase 2?</p> <p>P1 2. Can you tell us how the Pathways coordinate and engage and on what areas of work? Do you think these is potential for more engagement between the pathways?</p> <p>P1 2. Do you have any suggestions on how to increase effectiveness of IW'S work in the last 2 years of the Program?</p>
KEQ 3. How effectively has the program adapted to CV-19?	<p>P1 3. From your perspective, what effects has CV-19 had on IW?</p>
KEQ 4. How effectively has IW collaborated and coordinated within DFAT, with other programs and with external organisations?	<p>P1 4.2 How has IW coordinated and engaged with other DFAT and bilateral programs?</p> <p>P1 4.3 What has been DFAT's role to facilitate learning and sharing between programs?</p>
KEQ 5. How effective and efficient are program management arrangements?	<p>From your perspective, what are the strengths of current program management arrangements for IW?</p> <p>Do you have any recommendations on how the management arrangements could improve in future?</p>

<p>KEQ 10. How have MEL products and research supported program implementation and beyond IW?</p>	<p>Have you seen P1 or P3 work being used by other organisations or programs more broadly?</p>
--	--

Pathway 1 Advisor. Interviewed 4 May 2021.

<p>KEQ 1. How relevant and strategic is IW to DFAT policy priorities?</p>	<p>P1 1.0 What are your thoughts on the strategic positioning of Pathway 1's work related to WGE/WEE in the region?</p>
<p>KEQ 2. To what extent is IW likely to meet its End of Program Outcome?</p>	<p>P1 2.1 What do you think have been some of the key achievements of IW's Pathway 1?</p> <p>P1 2.4 Can you comment on the linkages you see between Pathway 3 and Pathway 1? Do you think there is potential to do more?</p> <p>WGE tools and accreditation focus on workplace policies and systems. How effectively can they address gender norms and cultural norms? What is your perspective on how this has been addressed in P1?</p>
<p>KEQ 4. How effectively has IW collaborated and coordinated within DFAT, with other programs and with external organisations?</p>	<p>P1 4.4 From your engagement with Pathway 1, do you have any views on P1 collaboration with other DFAT programs or with other programs and external organisations?</p>
<p>KEQ 7. How should any future WEE program expand or change?</p>	<p>P1 7.1 Do you have any views on areas of focus for a future DFAT WEE program?</p>
<p>KEQ 8 . How appropriate is the MEL for supporting monitoring and learning?</p>	<p>P1 8.1 Do you have any comments on the adequacy of the TOC for Pathway 1?</p>

<p>KEQ 10. How have MEL products and research supported program implementation and beyond IW?</p>	<p>P1 10.1 Do you know of any examples where Pathway 1 / IW research or studies have been taken up and used beyond IW?</p> <p>P1 10.1 How well do you think research and analysis has been used for program improvements? Can you share any examples?</p>
--	---

BUSINESS COALITIONS

- IBCWE Team. Interviewed on 10 May 2021.
- VBCWE Team. Interviewed on 12 May 2021.
- PBCWE Team. Interviewed 21 and 24 May 2021.

KEQ AREAS	Interview Questions for BC
<p>KEQ 2. To what extent is IW likely to meet its End of Program Outcome?</p>	<p>P1 2.1- What key achievements during Phase 2 would you highlight that you are most proud of and why?</p> <p>P1 2.2 How has building and diversifying your services during Phase 2 beyond certification helped to grow your membership?</p> <p>P1 2.3 Have you seen a shift over time in demand for your services, for example from approaching companies, to companies approaching you?</p> <p>P1 2.4 How have you used Pathway 3 resources in your work?</p> <p>P1 2.5 Can you tell me how your policy reform work has evolved during Phase 2 and how you see this supporting / mutually reinforcing objectives under the other Logic Chains in your work?</p> <p>Relates to: P1 8.2 What have you learned from your experience around how firms can improve WGE in your operating context?</p>

<p>KEQ 3. How effectively has the program adapted to CV-19?</p>	<p>P3 3.4 What, if anything, do you think is needed to further strengthen your response to CV-19?</p>
<p>KEQ 4. How effectively has IW collaborated and coordinated within DFAT, with other programs and with external organisations?</p>	<p>P1 4.1/4.2 Which partnerships have brought the most benefits for your organisational development and growth of your membership, and why?</p> <p>P1 4.2 Which partnerships do you see as the most strategic for you in the next 2 years?</p>
<p>KEQ 5. How effective and efficient are program management arrangements?</p>	<p>P1 5.1 What are the strengths in the way you work with IW team?</p> <p>P1 5.2/6.2 In your opinion, is your current staff resourcing and grant size appropriate for delivery of your work plan?</p> <p>P1 5.4 Do you have any recommendations for strengthening how you work in future?</p>

BUSINESS COALITION BOARDS

- VBCWE Chairperson Interviewed 17 May 2021.
- PBCWE CO-Chairperson. Interviewed 18 May 2021.
- IBCWE Chair. Interviewed 18 May 2021.
- BCGE Chair. Interviewed 19 May 2021.

<p>KEQ 2. To what extent is IW likely to meet its End of Program Outcome?</p>	<p>What do you see as the key achievements of the Business Coalition over the past 18 months?</p> <p>What evidence have you seen of changes within your own company related to WGE resulting from the Business Coalition’s support?</p> <p>From your perspective, what evidence have you seen of the Business Coalition increasingly becoming a Centre of Excellence? In your opinion, what are the priorities for the Business Coalition to further strengthen as an organisation over the coming 2 years?</p>
--	---

	<p>In your opinion, how effective is the Business Coalition's policy engagement? Would you make any suggestions for improvement in the coming 2 years?</p> <p>From your perspective, what do you see as the strengths of IW's support to the Business Coalition, and to the Board?</p> <p>From the Board's perspective, what are the strategic priorities for the Business Coalition for the coming 2 years?</p> <p>What suggestions, if any, would you make to help strengthen the IW program in the coming 2 years?</p>
<p>KEQ 3. How effectively has the program adapted to CV-19?</p>	<p>In your opinion how well has the Business Coalition adjusted and responded to the impacts of CV-19 in order to keep supporting its members?</p>

PARTNERS

UN WOMEN, Jakarta. Interviewed 25 May 2021.

KEQ AREAS	Interview Questions for UN WOMEN
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What would you say have been key achievement/s from your partnership with IW? • From your perspective, how has your partnership with Investing in Women added value to your work, particularly the WE Empower Asia programme? • From your perspective, how effectively do you see that IW has responded to CV-19 impacts in its services and engagement with the private sector? • What do you see as the strengths of IW's approach and focus to WGE? From your perspective do you see any areas that could be further strengthened in the final 2 years? • What role do you think programs like WE Empower and IW can play in shifting gender norms that are required for effective implementation of WGE practices and policies? • What are some of the broader contextual issues, challenges and enablers you see for programs like WE Empower and IW in these countries (Philippines, Indonesia, Vietnam) for addressing WGE – perhaps at the policy level or within the private sector more generally?

EAP Lead, Gender and Economic Inclusion, IFC. Interviewed on 20 May 2021.

- What would you say have been key achievement/s from your partnership with IW?
- From your perspective, how has your partnership with Investing in Women added value to your work?
- What do you see as the strengths of IW's approach and focus to WGE? From your perspective do you see any areas that could be further strengthened in the final 2 years?
- What role do you think IFC (in its support to clients) and IW can play in shifting gender norms that are required for effective implementation of WGE practices and policies?
- What are some of the broader contextual issues, challenges and enablers you see for your work and the work of IW in these countries where you both work for addressing WGE – perhaps at the policy level or within the private sector more generally?

PMAP. Interviewed 25 May 2021.

1. Please tell me about your engagement with PBWCE and how you have engaged on promoting workplace gender equality (WGE)?
2. From your perspective, do you see an increase in the interest and commitment from The Government of Philippines and/or from local businesses to improving WGE? If so, what do you think is driving this interest and commitment?
3. What do you see as some of the challenges or constraints to promoting WGE for local businesses in Philippines?
4. Do you think you could comment on the strengths of PBCWE's approach and its work supporting WGE?
5. How do you think future engagement with PBCWE may help to advance VBCSD objectives?

Indonesia Global Compact Network. Interviewed 4 June 2021.

Please tell me how you collaborate with IBCWE?

1. From your perspective, what are the benefits you gain from your partnership with IBCWE?
2. From your perspective do you see an increase in the interest and commitment from local businesses in Indonesia to improving workplace gender equality (WGE)?
3. If so, what do you think is driving this interest and commitment from businesses to WGE?
4. What do you see as some of the challenges to WGE for local businesses in Indonesia?
5. What do you see as the strengths of IBCWE's work?
6. What sort of future collaboration are you planning with IBCWE in the future?

Head of Vietnam Business Council for Sustainable Development (VBCSD) Secretariat, Interviewed on 19 May 2021.

1. From your perspective do you see an increase in the interest and commitment from The Government of Vietnam and from local businesses to improving workplace gender equality (WGE)? If so, what do you think is driving this interest and commitment?
2. I understand that the Labor Code Chapter 10 includes reference to gender equality and the employment of women. Do you see this as an opportunity that could be leveraged to advance WGE more broadly for local businesses?
3. What do you see as some of the challenges to WGE for local businesses in Vietnam?
4. Do you think you could comment on the strengths of VBCWE's approach and its work supporting WGE?
5. How do you think future engagement with VBCWE may help to advance VBCSD objectives?