



Governing Body

328th Session, Geneva, 27 October–10 November 2016

GB.328/POL/4

Policy Development Section
Employment and Social Protection Segment

POL

Date: 3 October 2016

Original: English

FOURTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Voluntary peer-review mechanisms of national employment policies

Purpose of the document

The resolution concerning the second recurrent discussion on employment adopted at the 103rd Session of the International Labour Conference (2014) requested the Office to develop proposals for a voluntary peer review of employment policy with the objective of promoting knowledge sharing and mutual learning on good practices among Members of the Organization. During the 326th Session of the Governing Body, the Office was requested to present proposals for its implementation for the Governing Body's consideration at its 328th Session.

The Governing Body is invited to provide guidance regarding which of the options proposed should be further developed (see the draft decision in paragraph 18).

Relevant strategic objective: Employment.

Policy implications: Implementation of peer-review mechanisms.

Legal implications: None.

Financial implications: Depending on the outcome of the discussion.

Follow-up action required: Further development of the mechanism.

Author unit: Employment Policy Department.

Related documents: GB.322/INS/4/1; GB.326/PV; ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization; ILC resolution concerning the second recurrent discussion on employment (2014); ILC Resolution on Advancing Social Justice through Decent Work (2016).

Introduction

1. The 2008 ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization underlines the importance of strengthened policy reviews for its effective implementation. It considers “the tripartite sharing of experiences and good practices at the international, regional and national levels in the framework of ... any common schemes such as peer reviews which interested Members may wish to establish or join on a voluntary basis”.¹ The evaluation of the Declaration, undertaken at the 105th Session of the International Labour Conference, 2016, reiterates this call to enhance each Member’s capacity to produce, use and share information on best practices, including through voluntary national peer reviews.²
2. The resolution concerning the second recurrent discussion on employment adopted at the 103rd Session of the International Labour Conference (2014) requested the Office to “Develop proposals for a voluntary peer review of employment policy with the objective of promoting knowledge sharing and mutual learning on good practices among Members of the Organization”. This item was included in the Plan of Action of the follow-up to the 2014 resolution.³ The 326th Session of the Governing Body in March 2016 asked the Office to prepare a paper on options for voluntary employment policy peer-review mechanisms for the consideration of the Governing Body at its 328th Session in October–November 2016.⁴
3. In the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (2030 Agenda), such a mechanism would also contribute to improved implementation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), especially Goal 8. Indeed the 2030 Agenda calls for “peer learning, including through voluntary reviews, sharing of best practices and discussion on shared targets”, in particular at regional level.⁵ At the global level, the High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (HLPF) also carries voluntary and thematic reviews involving multiple stakeholders.⁶
4. This paper, drawing lessons from recent experience with policy peer-review mechanisms, proposes options for voluntary employment policy peer reviews for the Governing Body’s consideration and guidance.

¹ ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization (2008), p. 20. See: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---dgreports/---cabinet/documents/genericdocument/wcms_371208.pdf.

² Resolution on Advancing Social Justice through Decent Work, International Labour Conference, 105th Session, 2016. See: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---relconf/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_497583.pdf.

³ GB.322/INS/4/1. See: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---relconf/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_312521.pdf.

⁴ GB.326/PV, para. 296. See: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---relconf/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_484933.pdf.

⁵ United Nations: *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 25 September 2015 (A/RES/70/1, para. 80). See: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/post2015/transformingourworld>.

⁶ HLPF Ministerial Declaration, July 2016, and summary of discussion of the HLPF meeting convened under the auspices of the Economic and Social Council, 11–20 July 2016.

Policy peer-review mechanisms: An overview and key lessons

5. In preparing for this discussion, the Office analysed eight policy peer-review mechanisms that are currently operational or were carried out in the recent past. The main characteristics of these mechanisms grouped against eight criteria that were considered most relevant for employment policy peer reviews, including the objectives and outcomes, are presented in the summary table appended to this paper. Four of these eight experiences relate to employment policy, of which three have been facilitated by the ILO and one by the European Union (EU). Only two of the reviewed mechanisms are mandatory following membership in the concerned institution (World Trade Organization (WTO) and Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development–Development Assistance Committee (OECD–DAC)) and others are voluntary. A common feature across these schemes is that public policy practices of States are periodically assessed by other States, and sometimes the secretariats of international organizations. This procedure builds on collection of information around commonly agreed standards, frameworks or goals. Different processes are involved, such as on-site visits, peer discussions and recommendations to the reviewed country. The institutional design varies significantly and so do their functions, for instance as regards the degree to which they enable peer learning, or lead to peer persuasion, public attention or pressure.⁷
6. A number of lessons can be drawn from this overview. In order for the exchange of experiences to foster the adoption of effective policies, the mechanism must put in place the conditions that allow for learning on successful and less successful experiences. This entails a long and well-organized process with a fact-finding phase during which the reviewed country produces information to support the assessment and an analysis phase during which the reviewer evaluates the reviewed country, followed by a peer-review meeting. In addition, countries appreciate being reviewed by peers who share institutional and political realities rather than undergo a purely academic exercise on the technical aspects of their policies. So a good balance between comments from peers and technical inputs from academics and experts on specific themes commonly identified by participants leads to good outcomes. The EU Mutual Learning Programme's peer reviews, for instance, are hosted by one of its Member States wishing to present an effective policy or practice to a group of peers, and the events are attended by independent academics who contribute wider knowledge and sometimes background papers.
7. A well-designed peer review also contributes to the building capacity of the national actors involved. Provision of constructive feedback through peer reviews is useful for identifying gaps and planning further capacity building. By studying familiar policy areas in another country, the national actors involved learn to look at their own practice through the others' eyes. To fully tap the potential for collective learning, thematic reports can be produced to distil lessons in key areas.⁸

⁷ J. Espey, K. Wałęcik and M. Kühner: *Follow-up and review of the SDGs: Fulfilling our commitments*, Sustainable Development Solutions Network, Working Paper, Nov. 2015, p. 16.

⁸ This is done, for example, in the CIS network on youth employment, by the OECD development cooperation peer review and the EU Mutual Learning Programme.

8. Regular, institutionalized mechanisms, such as the EU Mutual Learning Programme, OECD–DAC reviews, the WTO Trade Policy Review or the African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM), require significant human and financial resources. Members' contributions to the regular budget of these organizations cover the cost of the technical teams supporting the mechanism.⁹ In the case of the APRM, a minimum annual subscription of US\$100,000 per country is mandatory and countries also carry the cost for the actual review.¹⁰
9. In some cases (OECD–DAC and WTO), the secretariats play an important role in supporting the whole review process by producing documentation and analysis, organizing meetings and missions, stimulating discussion, upholding quality standards and maintaining continuity as the keeper of the historical memory of the process. In other cases, their member countries lead the process and cover most costs (African Union (AU), United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)).¹¹ In both scenarios, peer reviews can function properly only if there is an adequate level of commitment by the participating countries in terms of both human and financial resources.
10. A peer-review system can be an evolving process according to time or capacity of the countries involved. It can start with general policy reviews (usually at the beginning of the mechanism's implementation) and shift to a more focused analysis of specific policies or practices after a period of time. The EU Mutual Learning Programme has built that flexibility into its mechanism by introducing learning exchanges that bring together a small group of government representatives and associated stakeholders, building sometimes on peer reviews, to examine specific measures in greater depth. This helps keep the interest of participating countries and fosters sustainability over time.
11. There also needs to be some follow-up mechanism or incentive system, either in the form of additional funding (EU), in the form of publicizing country practices to comply with international regulations (WTO and UNCTAD¹²), and/or in the form of technical assistance and capacity building (ILO).¹³ This latter type of follow-up can be critical to the success of the peer reviews, as in the case of UNCTAD's mechanism or the ILO's youth employment policy reviews in CIS network countries and country reviews of employment policy in South-Eastern Europe. The short experience on the implementation of the Global Employment Agenda (GEA) during the ILO Governing Body lacked the pairing of reviewer/reviewed countries and this type of formal follow-up.

⁹ The WTO has a full department in charge of TPR consisting of 30 professionals who draft the country report and conduct three missions to the country for each review: one fact-finding, one capacity-building and one consultation mission.

¹⁰ This cost varies from US\$1 million to US\$3 million, depending on the size of the country.

¹¹ In fact, some participants in UNCTAD's mechanism complained that it was costly and only limited funding was made available by UNCTAD.

¹² In the case of the WTO, countries have a keen interest in the process as they are directly impacted by the trade policies of other countries. Also, without such a process the monitoring of compliance would not be possible as countries are under pressure to provide information even in areas that might be critical. The will for legislative and economic changes motivated countries participating in the voluntary UNCTAD reviews. Another factor was the need to build national awareness of the benefits of competition law and policy, and highlight the role of the relevant government agencies.

¹³ The WTO offers technical assistance in case countries indicate after the review that they want it. The APRM foresees a process of follow-up and implementation, including resource mobilization. The latter especially has proven to be very difficult.

12. Another positive outcome of the peer-review process is to facilitate the mobilization of national resources for employment policy implementation through publicizing good practices to a wider national audience, including ministries of finance. In the ILO's CIS youth employment policy reviews, for example, work experience components were introduced in the youth employment policy of the Russian Federation following a policy review and, in Azerbaijan, the President allocated funding for the capacity building of public employment services (PES).

Possible options for a peer-review mechanism on national employment policies

13. Taking into account that the objective of an ILO voluntary peer-review mechanism on employment policy, in accordance with the conclusions of the 103rd Session of the International Labour Conference (2014), is primarily **knowledge sharing and mutual learning** on good practices among member States, and in light of the lessons learnt from the overview of existing or past mechanisms, three options are proposed for the Governing Body's consideration. All three options are **voluntary**, propose to review policies against **the agreed framework of comprehensive employment policies**, included in the resolution on the second recurrent item discussion on employment adopted at the International Labour Conference in 2014 and its future updates, and are **facilitated and supported by the ILO**. In addition to peer learning, possible outcomes of the proposed mechanisms are to promote policy and institutional reform, identify capacity-building needs for governments and social partners, develop technical assistance, including through South–South and triangular cooperation, and facilitate the mobilization of national resources for employment policy implementation. The mechanism would also contribute to further dissemination of knowledge by the ILO on good practices in employment policies, and for further refining its tools and technical advice in response to specific needs.
14. The role of the Office (the Employment Policy Department and field offices and specialists) in preparing for facilitation of the process and in the follow-up could vary significantly in all three options. The breadth and depth of this support, while bearing better outcomes, have different cost implications. The time and resources requirements need to be assessed carefully. The current ILO youth employment peer review is financed through technical cooperation funds and supported by technical specialists in the field and headquarters.

Option 1. Periodic tripartite international exchange of experiences on employment policy

15. The first option would be to organize periodically a tripartite international exchange of experiences through a dedicated symposium held every two years. Four to five volunteer member States could be reviewed over two days. The members could be grouped according to similar objective criteria of income levels or other common affinities and shared objectives.

Process: Reviewed countries prepare a report submitted in advance of the symposium and made available to reviewing countries;¹⁴ reviewing countries prepare written comments and recommendations, possibly based also on on-site visits. Both groups present their reports during the tripartite symposium for peer discussions. A synthesis of key lessons is published after the symposium and widely disseminated. The Office could support reviewed countries in elaborating a plan of action for follow-up at country level and mobilize South–South and triangular cooperation for its implementation.

Institutional design: The Office’s role could include the fact-finding and analysis phases of the peer review, organize the symposia and summarize the findings of the peer reviews in a synthesis report. Participating countries make documents and data available, respond to questions and requests, and facilitate contacts. The individuals responsible for participating on behalf of countries could include civil servants from ministries and agencies and at different levels of government, as well as the social partners.

Purpose: Knowledge sharing and mutual learning; dissemination of the results of policy-making to wider audiences.

Variations within this option could be to organize the international exchange annually at the March or November session of the Governing Body, or during the International Labour Conference recurrent item discussion on employment, once every five years, as per the new cycle. Lessons from the previous experience of the evaluation of the GEA by the Governing Body would be used to make this process more efficient and meaningful, in particular by refining the preparatory phase along the lines described above.

Pros and cons: Best option for wider international dissemination, in particular through dedicated symposia. Longer intervals of periodicity if organized within the recurrent item discussion. Time, process and participation constraints if organized during Governing Body sessions. However, the latter option would be less costly.

Option 2. Regional employment policy peer reviews

16. The second option would be to organize peer reviews during the ILO Regional Meetings. Every year, there would be at least one region organizing a peer review.¹⁵ Two member States could be reviewed each time by two reviewers, and experience shared and presented in a day.

Mechanisms involved: Reviewed countries prepare a report submitted in advance of the Regional Meeting and made available to the two reviewing countries;¹⁶ the reviewing countries prepare written comments and recommendations, possibly based also on on-site visits. These are then presented during the Regional Meeting for tripartite peer discussions. The conclusions of the Regional Meeting include a plan of action for follow-up by the region with technical assistance and capacity building. A report of key lessons published after the meeting and widely disseminated.

¹⁴ This national report should be validated at the tripartite level to allow social partners to discuss and assess the findings of the report.

¹⁵ Normally, a Regional Meeting is held each year in one of the four regions in the following order: Asia and the Pacific (including Arab States), the Americas, Africa and Europe.

¹⁶ This national report should be validated at the tripartite level to allow social partners to discuss and assess the findings of the report.

Institutional design: Managed by regional offices and supported by the Employment Policy Department and specialists. The Office's role could be to organize a special peer-review event during Regional Meetings, provide technical inputs during the fact-finding and analysis phase and summarize findings of peer reviews in a synthesis report after each Regional Meeting. Participating countries are represented by high-level policy-makers and social partners during the peer-review discussion, while technical government officials and social partners undertake the review itself.

Purpose: Knowledge sharing, mutual learning and networking at regional level; follow-up technical assistance.

Pros and cons: Allows a design that best suits each regional context and needs. The frequency would not be very high, allowing for in-depth follow-up between each regional event, but limiting the number of countries reviewed (only two countries every four years following the Regional Meetings cycle).

Option 3. National policy peer-review mechanisms

17. The third option is to promote national peer-review mechanisms among member States with similar economic conditions or levels of income (for example, within a specific regional economic community,¹⁷ among fragile states, BRICS – Brazil, Russian Federation, India, China and South Africa – etc.). Two countries can be reviewed every year with another two countries acting as reviewers.

Mechanisms involved: During the fact-finding phase, the country under review produces a range of data and documents to support the assessment and reports back on the national situation;¹⁸ during the analysis phase, the reviewing country evaluates the performance of the country under review, producing a review report. This is based on all documents provided and additional primary research, including on-site visits; during the tripartite peer-review workshop, the country under review, reviewers and other peer countries meet to discuss, debate and verify the findings of the review, particularly the policy recommendations.

Institutional design: Participating countries initiate and lead the process. The Office's role could be to facilitate meetings and social dialogue events, provide technical inputs if required during the fact-finding and analysis phases, and summarize findings of peer reviews in synthesis reports. A group of experts could meet once a year to discuss the review (peer-review workshop), while a ministerial level tripartite meeting could be organized every two years to review the work of the expert meetings and identify priorities for future peer-review work.

¹⁷ At the time when the Andean Community was meeting regularly, an Andean employment conference was organized every two years. Each one of the four member countries made a presentation on their employment performance and received comments from the others on common problems and best practices. The ILO Decent Work Team (DWT) and Country Office for the Andean Countries usually provided technical assistance to the host country. It was a mechanism that was promoted, at the beginning, with the ILO's support but then was devolved to the Andean Community General Secretariat. That mechanism was one of the regular activities developed by the Council of Andean Labour Ministers. The employment conferences have not been organized for the last three years.

¹⁸ This national report should be validated at the tripartite level to allow the social partners to discuss and assess the findings of the report.

Purpose: Knowledge sharing, mutual learning and networking; policy and institutional reforms, strengthened social dialogue, follow-up technical assistance.

Pros and cons: This mechanism is most focused allowing for an optimal design responding to specific country needs. This mechanism is also limited to countries with similar contexts/challenges, which enhances the potential of policy replication, but loses the wider, global exchange of experiences.

Draft decision

- 18. *The Governing Body requests the Director-General to prepare a more detailed proposal for a peer-review mechanism of employment policies based on the guidance provided during the discussion, and the discussion foreseen in March 2017 on the follow-up to the evaluation of the impact of the Social Justice Declaration.***

Appendix

Summary table

	OECD–DAC peer reviews	WTO trade policy review mechanism (TPRM)	UNCTAD peer-review mechanism for competition law and policy	European Employment Strategy “Mutual Learning Programme” (MLP) ¹	African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM)	Implementation of the Global Employment Agenda (ILO)	The “Bucharest Process” for EU accession countries (South-Eastern Europe) ILO/Council of Europe (CoE)	Youth employment peer reviews in CIS countries (ILO)
Period	1962–present	Ongoing	2005–present	1999–present	Ongoing	2007–08	2003–08	Ongoing
Voluntary	No ²	No ³	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Objectives	To help each member country understand how to improve its development assistance strategy and structures; to identify and share good practice.	To increase the transparency and understanding of countries’ trade policies and practices; to improve the quality of public and intergovernmental debate; to enable a multilateral assessment of trade policies’ effects on the world trading system.	To assist developing and transition economies/ regional organizations in the formulation and implementation of competition law and policy, including identifying needs for capacity building of national competition agencies and other relevant bodies.	To assist progress towards the goals of the European Employment Strategy through mutual learning and transferability of the most effective policies between EU Member States.	To foster the adoption of policies, standards and practices that lead to political stability, high economic growth, sustainable development and accelerated subregional and continental economic integration. ⁴	To assess the level of implementation of the GEA at country level.	To foster regional cooperation in addressing employment challenges; to strengthen labour market institutions and improve employment and labour market policies; to contribute to the countries’ preparation for future accession to the EU.	To gain support for reforms of youth employment policies, programmes and institutions; to improve policy-making through the adoption of good practices and compliance with agreed criteria.

	OECD–DAC peer reviews	WTO trade policy review mechanism (TPRM)	UNCTAD peer-review mechanism for competition law and policy	European Employment Strategy “Mutual Learning Programme” (MLP) ¹	African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM)	Implementation of the Global Employment Agenda (ILO)	The “Bucharest Process” for EU accession countries (South-Eastern Europe) ILO/Council of Europe (CoE)	Youth employment peer reviews in CIS countries (ILO)
Participants	<i>All DAC members</i>	<i>All member States</i>	<i>All member States</i>	<i>All EU Member States</i>	<i>35 of the 54 member States of the African Union</i>	<i>Burkina Faso, Pakistan, Viet Nam</i>	<i>Stability Pact countries</i>	<i>CIS countries</i>
	Senior officials from the reviewed country and two reviewer countries; DAC staff.	High-level officials of ministries of trade (usually ministers); World Bank, IMF and other UN organizations upon request; NGOs can read the report but have no right to comment.	Officials from the reviewed competition agencies; competition policy experts from developing and developed countries.	Government representatives, supported by independent experts. The MLP support service is provided by ICF International on behalf of the European Commission.	National stakeholders through the APR national team; technical experts through the APR panel of eminent persons; high-level policy-makers through the APR Forum (Committee of Participating Heads of State and Government).	Minister in charge of employment, other members of the delegation to the ILO Governing Body (GB) (tripartite), other GB members.	Senior officials from the ministry in charge of employment and the public employment services, trade union representatives, employers’ representatives.	High-ranking officials and technical experts representing ministries of labour, PES and social partners.
Overview of mechanism	Five stages: (i) preparation and planning; (ii) fact-finding, analysis and report writing; (iii) peer-review meeting led by the DAC Chair at the OECD in Paris; (iv) approval and publication;	A report by the government under review and a report written by the WTO are prepared before the peer-review dialogue. The WTO report is based on consultations with the respective member. The report is then given to all member States before the Dissemination	Three steps: (i) a peer review report is prepared by independent experts; (ii) the report is discussed at the annual session of the Intergovernmental Group of Experts (IGE) in Geneva; (iii) with UNCTAD assistance, a proposal to fulfil the	The European Employment Strategy is supported by the MLP. Under this intergovernmental method, the Member States are evaluated by one another (peer reviews), with the Commission’s role being limited to surveillance. Peer reviews are hosted	After pre-consultations and preparatory work (the country has to submit a draft programme of action and the secretariat prepares a background document and an issues paper), the appointed team conducts a review	Country presentations at the GB Committee on Employment and Social Policy, followed by an exchange with the other countries sitting in the Committee.	The Ministers of Labour of the Stability Pact countries approve the objectives of this cooperation (ministerial conference). The activities were designed and supervised by a permanent high-level committee comprising Directors-General of	Inception: The scope of the review is defined. Fact-finding: The country under review produces a range of data and documents to support the assessment and reports back on the national situation. Analysis: The reviewers evaluate the performance of

OECD–DAC peer reviews	WTO trade policy review mechanism (TPRM)	UNCTAD peer-review mechanism for competition law and policy	European Employment Strategy “Mutual Learning Programme” (MLP) ¹	African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM)	Implementation of the Global Employment Agenda (ILO)	The “Bucharest Process” for EU accession countries (South-Eastern Europe) ILO/Council of Europe (CoE)	Youth employment peer reviews in CIS countries (ILO)
(v) follow-up: a mid-term review after 18–24 months has become a standard practice.	Seminar. Countries prepare their comments and present them at the conference. 20–23 review meetings are held each year (a meeting may cover several countries if their policies are sufficiently harmonized, e.g. EU, OECD, SACU).	recommendations of the report is prepared by the beneficiary country/ organization.	by a Member State wishing to present an effective policy or practice to a group of peer countries. The events are attended by independent academics who contribute wider knowledge and support, including background papers. The peer review comprises a range of presentations and interactive working groups, delivered over two days.	mission of two–three weeks. A country report is then prepared. The mission meets with all national stakeholders. The report is submitted to the APR panel who meets to discuss it and provides recommendations for the APR Forum that prepares recommendations to be given to the country.	Employment and representatives of PES. Each review is based on a national report produced by the Ministry of Labour in cooperation with the PES based on a common outline for national background reports. The ILO and the Council of Europe then complemented the information presented, as requested. The Country Reviews of Employment Policy (CREPs) were adopted at National Tripartite Conferences. ⁵ The validated report provided the basis for the peer-review discussion, which took place during the sessions of the Permanent High-Level Committee.	the country under review, producing a review report. This is based on all documents provided and additional primary research. Peer-review workshop: The country under review, reviewers and other peer countries meet to discuss, debate and validate the review’s findings.	

	OECD–DAC peer reviews	WTO trade policy review mechanism (TPRM)	UNCTAD peer-review mechanism for competition law and policy	European Employment Strategy “Mutual Learning Programme” (MLP) ¹	African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM)	Implementation of the Global Employment Agenda (ILO)	The “Bucharest Process” for EU accession countries (South-Eastern Europe) ILO/Council of Europe (CoE)	Youth employment peer reviews in CIS countries (ILO)
Framework against which the review is taking place	DAC peer-review reference guide, developed and maintained by the OECD Development Cooperation Directorate	International trade agreements Marrakesh Agreement of 1995	UN Set of Principles and Rules on Competition	European Employment Strategy 2020	APRM guidelines and objectives, standards, criteria and indicators ⁶	GEA	EU Joint Assessment Papers (JAPs) ⁷ on Employment Policies	<i>The youth employment crisis: A call for action</i> ⁸ and the conclusions of the 2014 recurrent discussion on employment ⁹
Role of the facilitating agency	A division of DAC is responsible for conducting the reviews; a lead administrator is assigned to each review with responsibility for day-to-day facilitation and drafting the report; three or four staff members are part of the review team.	The WTO builds the capacity of countries to provide relevant information; drafts the report; conducts the conference; facilitates the dialogue among peers but does not intervene in the discussion. About 30 persons support this process.	UNCTAD supports the follow-up with technical assistance and capacity building.	The European Commission’s role is limited to surveillance. Member States evaluate one another.	The entire process is under the responsibility of the APR Forum, which is the Committee of Participating Heads of State and is the highest authority and decision-making body in the APRM.	The ILO facilitated the presentations during the GB, but did not intervene in the discussions.	The ILO and the CoE facilitated the peer reviews, provided technical assistance in finalizing country reports and acted as experts during the National Tripartite Conferences and High-Level Committee Meetings.	The ILO serves as a facilitator and shares its technical expertise. The ILO summarizes findings of peer reviews in synthesis reports.
Funding	OECD; reviewed members make funds available to cover the costs such as field missions	Members’ contributions (regular budget (RB) funding)	Some funding provided by UNCTAD, but costs mainly covered by countries themselves	European Commission Member States	Countries themselves based on business plan plus the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) secretariat extra-budgetary technical cooperation (XBTC) if needed	ILO regular budget	Countries themselves plus ILO regular budget/regular budget for technical cooperation	Project (XBTC)

	OECD–DAC peer reviews	WTO trade policy review mechanism (TPRM)	UNCTAD peer-review mechanism for competition law and policy	European Employment Strategy “Mutual Learning Programme” (MLP) ¹	African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM)	Implementation of the Global Employment Agenda (ILO)	The “Bucharest Process” for EU accession countries (South-Eastern Europe) ILO/Council of Europe (CoE)	Youth employment peer reviews in CIS countries (ILO)
Outcomes	The main findings and recommendations of the DAC and the report of the secretariat are published. Lessons from peer reviews are published in thematic reports. This learning contributes to improving the effectiveness of aid and helps to hold donors accountable for results. According to the DAC secretariat, over 80% of the recommendations are partly or fully implemented. ¹⁰	Reviews enable outsiders to understand a country’s policies and circumstances, and they provide feedback to the reviewed country on its performance in the system. Follow-up discussions on identified weak points with WTO staff.	Approximately 50% of the recommendations made in the reports were taken on board by competition agencies in the reviewed countries, ¹¹ leading to improvements in legislation, a genuine competitive climate and greater public knowledge of the role of regulatory authorities.	Encourage mutual learning opportunities resulting in policy influence at the EU and national levels. Disseminate the results of the MLP and their contribution to the European Employment Strategy to wider audiences. Dissemination seminars held at the end of each year to disseminate the MLP’s results and identified good practices. Thematic synthesis report produced at the end of the MLP annual cycle. It summarizes all of the outcomes of the MLP during the year. It is formally presented at the Dissemination Seminar.	In the report, capacity-building needs are identified and the APR Forum looks into filling these gaps. The forum tries to fundraise based on the outcome of the report. The country revises the plan of action based on the recommendation. Progress in implementation gets monitored by the APR Secretariat. Regional workshops are organized to share experiences on issues identified in the report.	Exchange of experience on the implementation of the GEA.	Increased regional cooperation on employment policy-making. Built capacity of countries on requirements of the European Employment Strategy in view of EU accession.	Policy reforms to address imbalances in the youth labour market adopted. More effective labour market intermediation services and better targeted programmes for disadvantaged youth. Further development of labour market information systems. Strengthened social dialogue.

OECD–DAC peer reviews	WTO trade policy review mechanism (TPRM)	UNCTAD peer-review mechanism for competition law and policy	European Employment Strategy “Mutual Learning Programme” (MLP) ¹	African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM)	Implementation of the Global Employment Agenda (ILO)	The “Bucharest Process” for EU accession countries (South-Eastern Europe) ILO/Council of Europe (CoE)	Youth employment peer reviews in CIS countries (ILO)
------------------------------	---	--	--	---	---	--	---

¹ See: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1047&langId=en>. ² Membership of DAC obliges each member to undergo peer review every four or five years, and to serve as “examiner” in the review of other members.

³ Membership of the WTO obliges each member to undergo peer review every two years for the four biggest trading entities, every four years for the next 16 biggest trading entities, and every six years (or less upon request) for developing countries. ⁴ The mechanism is an element of the implementation process for the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD). ⁵ This provided an opportunity for the social partners to discuss and assess the findings and the recommendations proposed. ⁶ See: <http://aprm-au.org/publications?nXerGdt=12>. ⁷ In 1999, the European Commission initiated a cooperation process with the candidate countries in the area of employment. Together, in Joint Assessment Papers (JAPs), they identified the employment policy challenges resulting from applying the Lisbon objectives and from implementation of the Employment Title of the Treaty establishing the European Community. EU financial support for accession can then be focused on the priorities identified. ⁸ Resolution adopted at the 101st Session of the International Labour Conference in 2012.

⁹ See: http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---relconf/documents/meetingdocument/wcms_246169.pdf (pp. 53–61). ¹⁰ G. Ashoff: *50 years of peer reviews by the OECD’s Development Assistance Committee*, DIE Briefing Paper, 12/2013. ¹¹ M.-M. de Fays: *UNCTAD peer review mechanism for competition law: 10 years of existence*, New York and Geneva, UN, 2015.

