

Management and Administration Sector

Follow-up to DWGMT meeting

Establishment of Regional DWCP Support Groups

Terms of Reference

Background

Regions have started formulating more DWCP documents following the meeting of the Decent Work Global Management Team in October 2006. As of last November, 25 DWCPs have been prepared across all regions while several documents were at different stages of preparation and validation. Regions are using different approaches to DWCP preparation and have also developed their own mechanisms and processes to review and monitor DWCPs. To ensure the application of a uniform approach and framework for DWCP quality assurance, the MAS Sector has proposed the establishment of Regional DWCP Support Groups. This mechanism is intended to support the field in developing and implementing high-quality DWCPs in full collaboration with headquarters units and TURIN. The initial proposal was presented last November to the SMT plus meeting. Subsequent follow-up action was taken to solicit comments and input from the field and headquarter units. The feedback so far received from the regions and headquarters, including TURIN, is positive.

Objectives

The main functions of these Regional DWCP Support Groups are:

- a) to review draft DWCPs prepared by field offices both in terms of their format and their substantive content;
- b) to provide comments and recommendations as feedback to the appraisal, using the Quality Assurance Framework; and
- c) to mobilize the field and headquarters support to DWCPs, including resource mobilisation for implementation planning in each biennium.

Composition

Regional Directors are responsible for convening their Regional DWCP Support Groups. These Support Groups will operate under the authority of the Regional Directors. There should be only one Regional Support Group per region. The Regional Directors may designate a regional focal point to coordinate and follow-up with group members in headquarters and within the regions.

The membership of each Regional Support Group will consist of a representative of the Regional Office, and a representative from each of the four technical sectors, ACTRAV, ACTEMP, GENDER, INTEGRATION, PARDEV/CODEV, EVAL, TURIN and PROGRAM. The representatives of headquarters sector/department and TURIN are responsible for consolidating input within their organisational units in the appraisal

process. When discussing a particular draft DWCP document, the Director of the country office concerned as well as selected technical SRO specialists will be included.

Headquarters departments and sectors may establish their regional, sub-regional and country focal points to serve as their representatives for Regional Support Groups. These arrangements are already in place in some departments and sectors to assist in implementing country programmes and coordinating implementation planning during the biennium. .

A full list of representatives of headquarters sectors/departments and TURIN should be provided to PROGRAM by 15 March 2007. This list will be available in DWCP intranet webpage which is accessible to all ILO staff.

Process

A quality assurance framework has been developed (attached Annex I) to serve as a basic tool for use by members of all Regional DWCP Support Groups in discharging their tasks. It was designed to ensure overall consistency and compliance with certain minimum qualitative and quantitative criteria. Its initial use in this pilot phase will provide useful insights for further improvements in 2008 with input from regions. An electronic copy will be posted in DWCP website for group members to download into a word document. Work is in the process to update the DWCP website for posting all information on DWCPs and for interactive communication between the field and headquarters.

The appraisal process includes the following steps:

- a) Regions send draft DWCP documents to PROGRAM for posting in the DWCP website;
- b) Regions invite all members of Regional DWCP Support Groups through e-mail to review the documents (pending designation of representatives from technical departments and sectors, invitation could be addressed to Executive Directors or directors of departments);
- c) Support Group Members use the quality assurance framework to appraise the draft documents and send their review results to the regions and PROGRAM within 15 days after receiving the request;
- d) PROGRAM posts appraisal results in DWCP website;
- e) Directors of country offices finalise DWCPs and send them to the regional offices for approval.
- f) Regions send electronic copies of final DWCP documents to PROGRAM (with copy to Support Group members) for posting in the DWCP webpage;
- g) Support Group members of sectors/departments and TURIN provide assistance in preparing implementation plans and in implementing country programmes and mobilising resources.

Timeframe

This mechanism will take effect from 15 March 2007. Region Directors and Executive Directors are requested to keep their staff informed and to take necessary action to initiate and support the process.

DWCP Quality Assurance Framework

This template is designed to provide a framework for appraising draft DWCP documents by members of the Regional DWCP Support Groups. It is intended to assist directors of country offices in finalising their DWCPs with consolidated input across the Office.

Members of Support Groups are encouraged to appraise all elements in the template; however, some appraisal items are more specific and address issues falling within the interest of certain departments.

The template and draft DWCP documents are available on the DWCP Intranet website (<http://www.ilo.org/intranet/dwcp>). The template is to be filled in within 15 days after receiving the invitation of the regional offices. To ensure sharing of information among all members of support groups, electronic copies of completed template should be provided to PROGRAM for posting in the website. Work is in progress to update the DWCP website for interactive communications among members of the all Support Groups.

DWCP of country: _____

Appraisal elements		Rating (high, medium, low)	Comments
1. RELEVANCE			
1.1	Do DWCP priorities align with national development framework, including UNDAF, MDGs, PRSP? Assess articulation between the draft DWCP and national development framework, UNDAF, and PRSP.		
1.2	Does the DWCP respond to specific needs or concerns identified by social partners?		

1.3	To what extent do identified country programme outcomes support attainment of Office-wide operational outcomes in the strategic policy framework?		
1.4	Is there evidence that the Office has comparative advantage, vis-à-vis other agencies, to deliver services/products in identified priority areas?		
2. STRATEGIC FIT			
2.1	Does the DWCP build on earlier or on-going initiatives undertaken in the country by the field, headquarters, and other development partners (UNDP, other UN agencies, World Bank, regional bodies and donor countries)?		
2.2	Does the document take account of ILO comparative advantage and mandate in its implementation strategies?		
2.3	Does the document provide a good compromise between ILO mandate and priorities identified by tripartite constituents? If applicable, identify how comments provided by the ILO supervisory bodies are used as a basis for decent work country programming.		
2.4	Do the country and the tripartite partners have adequate absorptive capacity and commitments, political and financial, to take on ILO's deliverables?		
2.5	Are gender issues addressed and mainstreamed to contribute to gender equality. Are there adequate gender disaggregated problem analysis and strategic response?		
3. TRIPARTISM AND SOCIAL DIALOGUE			
3.1	Is the document formulated with full involvement of tripartite partners? Is there evidence of the use of participatory approach and social dialogue in identifying DWCP priority areas and outcomes?		
3.2	Based on the DWCP logic as presented, appraise if worker' and employers' organisations are major partners and beneficiaries in implementing the country programmes. If this is not the case, provide		

	suggestions for improvements.		
4. PROGRAM LOGIC AND FEASIBILITY			
4.1	Does the document provide adequate background and context giving rise to defined priority areas for country programming?		
4.2	Are principles of a logical framework and results-based programming applied in defining country priorities, outcomes, performance indicators and outputs?		
4.3	Is there right 'distance' between intended country outcomes and outputs to be delivered by the Office? Are these outputs likely to lead to desired outcomes?		
4.4	Can the DWCP reasonably be accomplished within the timeframe and with the indicative resource level indicated in the implementation plan?		
5. RESOURCES MOBILISATION			
5.1	As additional input, identify areas where collaboration with headquarters and TURIN could be established in the implementation phase (any ongoing programmes or funding sources to complement, technically and financially, field resources).		
5.2	Is the document attractive and convincing to donor community? Identify potential areas (if any) where extra-budgetary resources could be mobilised.		
6. PRESENTATION			
6.1	Is the document presented in the format described in the DWCP guidebook? Suggestions for improvements.		
6.2	Have adequate mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation been identified? Suggestions on how the document could benefit from lesson learned from past evaluation exercises.		

7. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT-KNOWLEDGE SHARING

7.1	Assess if the document takes into account lessons learnt, makes use of institutional knowledge, or benefits from information sharing in the drafting process. Cross-refer, hyperlink or comment on any interesting relevant practice or lessons learned that could help improve the draft.		
-----	--	--	--

Any other comments:

Appraised by: _____

Date: _____