HIGH-LEVEL EVALUATION PROTOCOL FOR OUTCOME STRATEGY EVALUATION
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPO</td>
<td>Country Programme Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWCP</td>
<td>Decent Work Country Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWT</td>
<td>Decent Work Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC</td>
<td>Evaluation Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td>ILO Evaluation Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLs</td>
<td>Global Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>Global Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLE</td>
<td>High Level Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPEC</td>
<td>International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRIS</td>
<td>Integrated Resource Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBW</td>
<td>Outcome-based work planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;B</td>
<td>Programme &amp; Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBM</td>
<td>Results Based Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBSA</td>
<td>Regular Budget Supplementary Account</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPF</td>
<td>Strategic Policy Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>Technical Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDAF</td>
<td>United Nations Development Assistance Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEG</td>
<td>United Nations Evaluation Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

What are HLEs?

High Level Evaluations are governance level evaluations that aim to generate insights into organizational level performance within the context of the results-based management system. Findings from HLEs contribute to high level decision making on policies and strategies, and accountability. Senior management and the Governing Body are involved in identifying priorities for HLE, determining the timing and intended uses of each evaluation. To this end a process of informal consultations including governments, through regional coordinators, and the secretariats of the Employers’ and Workers’ groups on the topics for high-level strategic evaluations and their terms of reference will be organized annually.

This Protocol describes the processes that should be followed when conducting High Level Evaluations (HLEs) of P&B Outcome Strategies. With the introduction of Areas of Critical Importance in the 2014-15 P&B, EVAL has started to review how they fit into the ILO’s results-based strategic framework. The Protocol will provide internal and external stakeholders with an understanding of how the HLE is to be carried out and how they will work within the HLE evaluation team.

It is designed to guide evaluators and stakeholders (Country and Regional Office staff, and international external evaluators) in working together to support HLEs. Tripartite constituents and other stakeholders who may be involved in Outcome Strategy evaluations can also use this Protocol as a guide to how they can be involved.

This high-level evaluation protocol is used for all when evaluating any of the 19 Outcomes established in the Programme and Budget.

The Protocol contains six sections:

- **Context** - the ILO’s approach to High Level Evaluation for Outcome Strategy.
- **Planning** - the purpose and areas for evaluation are identified, the TOR designed, and the evaluation team recruited.
- **Implementation** – the period in which the evaluation is carried out.
- **Analysis** - areas of consideration for the analysis.
- **Writing the evaluation report** – the reporting headings and procedure.
- **Follow-up** - follow-up responsibilities.

1. **CONTEXT**

1.1 **ILO PRINCIPLES FOR EVALUATION**

The Office is committed to ensuring the credibility, impartiality and independence of evaluation at the ILO as mandated by the Governing Body documents: [GB 294/PFA/8/4](#) November 2005,
GB.310/PFA/4/1 (rev), March 2011 and summarized in the *ILO’s policy guidelines for results-based evaluations*, March 2012. To this end, the Office is supported by the following core principles:

- **Adherence to international good practice.** ILO evaluation policy will be consistent with internationally accepted evaluation norms, standards and good practices, and will harmonize with the United Nations family in the context of results-based management (RBM) approaches. The Office will apply international good practices in the appropriate manner or seek to develop new guidelines, drawing lessons from existing evaluation experiences, norms and standards.

- **Upholding the ILO mandate and mission.** The ILO evaluation approach and methods will reflect the tripartite organisation and its focus on social justice, and its normative and technical mandate.

- **Ensuring professionalism.** Evaluations will be undertaken by qualified technical experts and evaluators. Both external and internal evaluators will adhere to the highest ethical and technical standards, apply methodological rigour and respond to evaluation norms and standards existing within United Nations system organisations, the OECD/DAC evaluation principles, the evaluation policies of the international financial institutions and of the European Union. Regardless of their form or methodology, evaluation reports will provide critical assessment and an independent perspective, be issue-focused, informative, and propose actionable follow-up.

- **Transparency and learning.** Evaluations will be conducted using a transparent process and results made available to all parties concerned. Evaluation findings and recommendations will be disseminated to constituents, donors and other agencies concerned. Evaluations carried out by the Office will enable the incorporation of findings into the ILO’s decision-making process and support organizational learning.

- **Independence of process.** The ILO will ensure separation of evaluation responsibility from line management functions for policies, programmes and projects, and select evaluators according to agreed criteria to avoid any potential conflict of interest.

### 1.2 OUTCOME STRATEGY

Outcome Strategy is the term used by the ILO to describe its work in supporting and contributing to the formulation, adoption and implementation of its policies and outcome objectives in Member States.

The *Strategic Policy Framework: 2010-15* (the SPF) is the ILO’s medium-term planning document. It is the expression of the strategic orientation of the Organization, what it aims to achieve and how. It provides the framework for delivering on the Decent Work Agenda over the planning period in response to the needs of ILO constituents. The strategic framework is built on the four strategic objectives of the ILO – employment, social protection, social dialogue, standards and fundamental principles and rights at work – and 19 outcomes, which detail the results to be achieved in cooperation with constituents in the regions.

A special focus is placed on eight areas of critical importance that combine work under several outcomes.
This strategic framework emphasizes the inseparable, interrelated and mutually supportive nature of the four equally important strategic objectives of employment, social protection, social dialogue and rights at work, through which the Decent Work Agenda is expressed (figure 1) underpins the Office’s Programme and Budget.

Each Strategic Outcome emphasizes services to constituents in response to the priorities identified by the governing organs (International Labour Conference and Governing Body), Regional Meetings and in Decent Work Country Programmes.

**Figure 1: Strategic Objectives**
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A high-level strategy evaluation shall also assess the relevance of the being evaluated with the areas of critical importance (figure 2). The assessment shall determine how effective the in addressing the has affected large numbers of employers and workers and of high concern in a significant number of countries; where the need for change is evident and where the ILO can make a difference; and which have been the subject of Conference, Governing Body or Regional Meeting decisions or concerns otherwise expressed by constituents.
Figure 2: Areas of critical importance 2014-15

The backbone of programme delivery is the results-based management framework of the ILO. This framework is depicted in figure 3. The Programme and Budget Outcome Strategies are firmly anchored in results-based management framework and as such should assess the bottom-up contributions of specific means of action for the achievement of desired results and impacts.

1.3 INVOLVING THE TRIPARTITE CONSTITUENTS

Wherever possible, HLE Evaluation Teams will work closely with the tripartite constituents. The tripartite constituents comprise representatives from Member States Government bodies, Employees’ Organisations and Employers’ Organisations. This tripartite, working with the ILO, makes for a unique forum in which the governments and the social partners of the economy of its Member States can freely and openly debate and elaborate labour standards and policies.

Although HLEs are driven by ILO and undertaken by EVAL there will be opportunities to work with the tripartite constituents when undertaking scoping and in-country work.
All work with tripartite constituents should be preceded by clear information on how the process will be scheduled; how they will be involved; what will be their responsibilities; and, any agreements on the disclosure of information and confidentiality, as required.

### Key considerations for involving national tripartite constituents

- Relevant national tripartite constituents (government, workers’ and employers’ organisations) are notified of the evaluation early in the process. This will increase ownership of the evaluation responsibilities and build mutual accountability for the results.
- Early notification will enable tripartite constituents to identify and appoint focal persons to assist the evaluation team.
- Sufficient notification will also allow time for tripartite constituents to ensure a clear understanding of the scope and purpose of the Outcome/Strategy evaluation and ensure balanced gender and technical representation of key stakeholders from constituent groups.
- The exact timing of the evaluation will be a matter of discussion amongst the relevant parties taking into account country seasons, holidays, national development planning, financial year ends and cultural and social events as well as matters arising from the projects and programme cycles.

### 1.4 IDENTIFYING STAKEHOLDERS AND BENEFICIARIES TO BE INVOLVED IN THE EVALUATION

The engagement of stakeholders and, to the extent possible, beneficiaries in evaluation can create transparency, knowledge, credibility, and ownership of the findings. Evaluation results have greater relevance to stakeholders and beneficiaries and recommendations are more likely to be followed up.

- Stakeholders are defined as internal ILO departments and units relevant to the SPF Outcomes/Strategy being evaluated; external development partners such as representatives of other UN Agencies; tripartite constituents and other bilateral development partners, and implementation agencies; and, relevant NGOs, universities, embassies, etc.
- Beneficiaries are those individuals and groups who gain ultimate benefit of the outputs, outcomes and sustainable impact.
- Stakeholders and beneficiaries will be identified via relevant documentation and discussion.
- A Senior Evaluation Officer should undertake a stakeholder analysis in consultation with the relevant already identified Stakeholders and in relation to the Outcome Strategy being evaluated. The stakeholder analysis should list identified stakeholders and categorize them in order of importance for the evaluation and describe why and how they will be involved.
- Implications for the evaluation questions, budget needs, expertise of consultants, background information, and methodological approach may be drawn from the results of the stakeholder analysis.

**Reference documents:**

- ILO Programme and Budget Documents
- ILO policy guidelines for results based evaluation
- Guidance Note 7: Stakeholder participation in ILO evaluations
2. PLANNING

An Outcome Strategy HLE typically takes 6 to 9 months. It will involve a scoping exercise, document review, portfolio reviews of identified countries, case studies, interviewing ILO staff, UN Agency staff and other identified stakeholders, and country missions.

The planning and careful preparation of an Outcome Strategy HLE is crucial for good implementation and reporting. Good planning focuses on deciding, prior to implementation: what is to be done; when it will be done; who will be involved; and, how it will be carried out.

Identified stakeholders must be informed at an early stage in the planning in order for them to participate in the timing of the evaluation. Although there may never be the perfect time for an evaluation, as it is always in addition to the normal working time, the timing can make a major difference in the quality of data collected.

2.1 SELECTION OF A HIGH LEVEL OUTCOME STRATEGY EVALUATION

Evaluation topics are proposed to the Governing Body (GB), by EVAL or by other ILO stakeholders at any time. However the decision by GB on which topic is to be evaluated is made at their annual November meeting.

Senior managers and members of GB, the Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC), HQ Senior management and technical department Chiefs, ILO Regional Offices (ROs), DWTs and country Officers where case studies will be conducted shall be involved in identifying priorities for evaluations. Evaluations can also be recommended based on their topical or background contribution to recurrent discussions or policy debates at the International Labour Conferences (ILC).

Following the decision of the GB, the Director of the Evaluation Unit (EVAL) will assign the Outcome Strategy evaluation to one EVAL Senior Evaluation Officer who will develop:

- a concept paper;
- the evaluation terms of reference;
- determine the composition of the evaluation team which will include an international independent evaluator and research assistants; and,
- issue a call for expressions of interest from independent international and national evaluation consultants for selection as evaluation team members.

2.2 DETERMINE THE PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE OUTCOME STRATEGY EVALUATION

An Outcome Strategy evaluation will cover the entire process of an ILO’s intervention strategy in support of a Strategic Outcome. This will include, but not be limited to: relevant policy frameworks; main initiatives to turn policy into action; means of action by ILO HQ and regional offices, DWTs and country offices; country programme outcomes (CPOs) expected for countries to implement; and, long term impacts and the sustainability of achievements.
The Outcome Strategy evaluation will include global, regional and national projects, partnerships and direct country office initiatives that fall within the stated strategic priorities and time period. **Special attention shall be given to the achievement of Global Products (GPs) and CPOs proposed as the means to achieving the Outcome Strategy to be evaluated.**

The EVAL Senior Evaluation Officer will further determine the purpose and scope of the evaluation in consultation with internal and external stakeholders involved in the implementation of the Outcome/Strategy, such as regional and country offices and tripartite constituents.

It is likely that the HLE will include a sample of countries for direct mission investigation and these will be chosen by EVAL in consultation with ILO internal stakeholders.

The **key questions** for determining the purpose and scope are:

- Why at this specific time?
- What should the evaluation cover?
- Why undertake an evaluation?
- How are the evaluation findings to be used?

**Purpose** to be considered may include:

- specific areas of concern with the Outcome Strategy that need understanding;
- the context of the Outcome Strategy in a given number of countries being evaluated;
- as part of a normative cyclical evaluation such as the end of a funding or time period.

**Scope** to be considered may include:

- the period of time covered by the SPF and review;
- the geographical area covered by the Outcome Strategy implementation;
- the assessment and observation of internal and external stakeholders as well as beneficiaries;
- the Global Reports (GR), Country and Regional Review Reports, specific M&E plans and results and specific actions used as the means toward the achievement of the Outcome Strategy priorities.

A description of how the findings are to be used, and by whom, will help in further preparation.

### 2.3 EVALUATION MANAGEMENT ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The EVAL Senior Evaluation Officer assigned to the Outcome Strategy evaluation will be responsible for: planning the evaluation, writing the Terms of References (TORs), identifying the composition and skills needed in the evaluation team, managing the selection of the independent evaluation team members and also act as a leader of the evaluation team.

The EVAL Senior Evaluation Officer reports to and coordinates all evaluation matters with the EVAL Director who in turn notifies ILO Senior Management, GB and other relevant internal and external stakeholders of the planned evaluation.

Ensuring the integrity of the evaluation process will be the responsibility of EVAL and the designated Senior Evaluation Officer. The ILO Office has issued directions and procedures for ensuring transparency and independence of the evaluation function in line with international good practice.
Among practices to be followed are:

1. separation of evaluation responsibility from line management functions for programmes and projects;
2. limiting management influence over the terms of reference, scope of the evaluation, and selection of evaluators;
3. transparency and clarity regarding the evaluation process; and,
4. involvement of constituents and others, as appropriate, in the planning and reporting processes. (IDGS Numbers 8, 74, and 75).

EVAL will be responsible for providing information to independent team members, including:

- Institutional Guidance Documents providing comprehensive and detailed statements, including principles, procedure and guidelines, of the policy that the Director-General decided to follow with regard to the application of the relevant rules in respect to the ILO’s evaluation function (IDGS Numbers 8, 74, and 75).
- Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System – UNEG.
- Quality Standards for Development Evaluation – OECD.
- Relevant Global Reports (GR).
- Specific SPF documents, the Programme and Budget Biennium (P&B) documents for the evaluation period, and other relevant strategy and programme documentation.
- Outcome Based Work plans including CPOs and Global Products relevant to the Outcome/Strategy being evaluated.
- Strategic Management Module (SM) outcome planning, management and implementation reports from IRIS.
- Outcome Strategy project portfolio for the period of evaluation.
- Relevant ILO studies on technical and operational aspects of the strategy.
- A list of all contributing outcomes to the achievement of the strategy under evaluation. This could include clear and succinct briefing notes for the external consultants on ILO P&B planning and implementation showing synergies of the Outcome Strategy with other Strategic Outcomes.

EVAL shall collect and provide documents relevant to the Outcome Strategy to be evaluated:

To carry out their functions effectively, evaluators may need to interview staff, and have access to all relevant Office documents. Staff at all levels is expected to co-operate fully with evaluators and take all necessary steps to ensure timely access to requested information.

To facilitate the work of EVAL as defined above, Directors and programme managers are required to reserve adequate resources to ensure proper implementation of evaluation programmes to comply with ILO evaluation policy which requires regular self-evaluation of programmes and projects.

ILO country and regional offices will be responsible for providing relevant information, including:

- Planning and implementation documents pertaining to the Outcome Strategy being evaluated.
• Relevant project documents – OBW, CPO and GLs, M&E and Implementation Plans, Country Programme Reviews or internal evaluations programme and project progress reports
• Monitoring and Evaluation reports on country and regional projects (i.e. project proposals, logic models, budgets and partnership arrangements) for the period planned for the HLE
• Relevant country development plans, strategies and priorities
• National Tripartite Constituents and other stakeholder contacts
• Annual Review reports and specific country/region lessons learned
• Programme and Budget for the Biennium (for the evaluation period)

2.4 ASSESS THE EVALUABILITY

The Senior Evaluation Officer will undertake an assessment of the evaluability of the proposed Outcome Strategy, this should include:

• The clarity and comprehensiveness of SPF and the P&B Outcome and the coherence of related P&B Outcomes
• The extent to which the Outcome Strategy is planned and any accompanying logic model or milestones should be reviewed
• The extent to which the Outcome Strategy being evaluated has been contributed to by ILO interventions such as DWCPs and regional programmes
• The extent to which supporting M&E and annual reviews have been undertaken of ILO interventions
• The extent to which Member States and their tripartite constituents have been engaged in initiatives that contribute to the Outcome Strategy being evaluated
• The consistency of these priorities with the Member State’s priorities and the UNDAF country priorities should be checked for alignment

Consider the potential for evaluating alignment at two levels:

• Where the Outcome Strategy can be aligned to, and contribute to the achievement of, Member States’ higher level objectives
• Where Outcome Strategy priorities can be aligned with UNDAF priorities

Sufficient Outcome Strategy documentation should be in place to support an assessment of evaluability. The Senior Evaluation Officer should establish to what extent Outcome Strategy milestones are defined and have been used and reported.

Reference documents:
- ILO policy guidelines for results based evaluation
- Guidance Note 11: Using the Evaluability Assessment Tool
- Guidance Note 12: Dimensions of the Evaluability Instrument

2.5 IDENTIFY LESSONS LEARNED FROM PREVIOUS EVALUATIONS

The Senior Evaluation Officer will review lessons learned from previous Outcome Strategy evaluations and from Outcome Strategy Meta Evaluations by EVAL in relation to the proposed scope and rationale for the current evaluation. Consideration on how these affect the proposed evaluation should be formulated.
Lessons learned from relevant DWCP programme evaluations should be identified. These may influence the evaluation design and the evaluation questions, and may contribute to the preparation of the evaluators’ Terms of Reference (TOR).

2.6 TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR AN OUTCOME STRATEGY EVALUATION

The Terms of Reference (TOR) is a key document in the evaluation and forms a substantive part of the contractual arrangements with external evaluators. The TOR presents the purpose, scope, and objectives of the evaluation; the methodology to be used; the resources and time allocated; reporting requirements; and any other expectations regarding the evaluation process.

During the drafting of the TOR the EVAL Senior Evaluation Officer prepares and writes a draft TOR and consults with the ILO internal stakeholders (sector specialists and programme managers) at Head Quarters (HQ) and at relevant Country and Regional Offices and with national tripartite constituents. The EVAL Director, Senior Management and tripartite constituents and the relevant stakeholders involved in the evaluation agree to the document. This document can alternatively be called “evaluation mandate”.

2.6.1 The outline headings of the TOR:

- Introduction and rationale for evaluation
- Past co-operation and Lessons Learned
- Brief background on project and context
- Purpose, scope and clients of evaluation
- Key evaluation questions
- Methodology to be followed
- Main outputs: inception, draft and final reports
- Management arrangements, work plan, formatting requirements and time frame

Sections 1-4 shall derive from the preliminary planning stages described above. Sections 5-8 shall be developed when drafting the TORs. There is a rating formula which can be used to assure the quality of the TOR. Checklist 5: Preparing the evaluation report should be annexed to the TOR as essential information for evaluation team.

2.6.2 Evaluation questions

The ILO evaluation questions are developed as part of the TOR and should reflect ILO evaluation policy and international norms and standards and shall be guided by the following DAC criteria: relevance; efficiency; effectiveness; impact and sustainability.

While the above criteria should always be applied evaluators are at liberty to add additional criteria, if appropriate. Consideration should be given to including the criteria of ‘coherence’ as it provides a framework to address higher level evaluation questions on the combined effects of separate initiatives. The framework for the questions is:

- Are we doing the right thing?
- Are we doing it right?
- Are there better ways of achieving the results?

The focus of HLE questions should be on the ‘how’ and ‘why’ of the accumulated strategic influence of a number of ILO and partner initiatives; the influence on tripartite constituents and relevant government bodies; operational circumstances; and, the ‘so what’ questions on the difference made.
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or likeliness of doing so. It is a requirement in ILO that evaluation questions are posed in such a way that information in relation to gender criteria can be disaggregated.

Questions relating to cross cutting issues should be integral, as much as possible. Social justice, gender equality and non-discrimination might be considered for all evaluations in addition to those areas related to the specific subject of the Outcome Strategy priorities.

Where assumptions and/or risks have been previously identified against the Outcome Strategy objectives these should be reflected in the evaluation questions.

**2.6.3 Methodology to be followed**

The methodology is developed in line with the evaluation approach chosen. The methodology includes specification and justification of the evaluation design and the techniques for data collection and analysis. The selected methodology should seek to answer the evaluation questions using credible evidence.

In the HLE the emphasis is on the higher achievement of Policy and Strategy. The methodology should include, but make a distinction between, the ILO initiatives that deliver services and products (outputs), the direct realization of new policy and practice by stakeholders as a consequence of what has been delivered (outcome), and the influence and wider application of the outcome in relation to stakeholders and beneficiaries improved work situation (impact).

The methodology should seek to evaluate the degree of mainstreaming policy and best practices in government departments, employers’ and employees’ organisations and their respective members as part of the impact. In some HLEs it may be appropriate to include beneficiaries as part of assessing the benefits of the outcome, and impact, to determine the likely sustainability of the policy and/or best practice.

Indicators for measuring achievement of the Outcome Strategy objectives are validated according to generally accepted criteria such as SMART and/or intermediate steps - progress milestones. If indicators have not been set the evaluation team may have to provide retroactive indicators to guide the analysis. Suggested indicators may include:

- indicators which will show progress in formulating, adopting and applying policy; these indictors should be placed at the projects’ and programmes’ Outputs and Outcome objectives level;
- indicators which will show how policy and strategy, once applied, is being mainstreamed in national organisations; these should be placed at the Impact and Sustainability level of objectives;
- indicators which will show the benefit of the strategy and policy on beneficiaries’ working lives should be formulated when ex post is included;
- indicators which will supply information which can be disaggregated, i.e. gender and disadvantaged groups.

The TORs should specify the scope of the country missions, clearly identifying those to be included. The TORs should describe evaluation techniques (i.e. desk reviews of Outcome Strategy documents, interviews with national tripartite constituents and key stakeholders, case studies, mission visits and statistical analysis, if required) the evaluation team will use to answer the evaluation questions. The TORs shall also indicate the types of briefings and workshops to be organized to discuss and transmit preliminary and final findings to internal and external stakeholders.
2.6.4 Main outputs: inception report, draft and final reports

The TOR shall clearly describe the main outputs in terms of reporting, with a realistic timetable that meets the established deadlines for documents to be presented to the GB.

2.6.5 Management arrangements, work plan, formatting requirements and time frame

The TOR must clearly describe the management arrangements. EVAL is responsible for:

- The evaluation governance structure to safeguard credibility, inclusiveness, and transparency.
- The evaluation coordination/management which organizes the evaluation process and is responsible for day-to-day administration. Depending on the size and complexity of the evaluation, these functions may be combined or separate.

The draft TOR is circulated for comment, within a specified time period, to:

- Senior management, Regional and Country Directors, tripartite constituents and other relevant stakeholders.
- The key technical liaison in the ILO responsible department(s).
- Global, regional and/or national constituents, as appropriate.
- Technical support at headquarters.
- DWT technical specialist and project managers operating in the field.

The management arrangements should be structured in such a way as to provide the opportunity to create a common understanding of the purpose and scope of the evaluation, the management of the evaluation process and identify shared responsibilities. This should clarify expectations and ensure ownership of evaluation results and follow-up on recommendations.

### Process for approving the TOR

- The EVAL Senior Evaluation Officer circulates a draft of the TOR among ILO internal stakeholders for feedback and incorporates comments into the final draft TOR, as appropriate, and passes the TOR to the Director of EVAL for final approval.
- The EVAL Director shares the final draft of the TOR with ILO Senior Management, Regional and Country Directors, the key technical liaison person, and representatives of the tripartite constituent groups.
- The approved TOR is sent to the same group of stakeholders who participated in commenting on the draft.

### Reference Documents:

- [ILO policy guidelines for results based evaluation](#)
- [Checklist 1: Writing the TOR](#)
- [Checklist 2: Rating the TOR](#)
- [Checklist 5: Preparing the evaluation report](#)
- [Guidance Note 3: Evaluation Lessons Learned](#)
- [Guidance Note 7: Stakeholder participation in ILO evaluations](#)
2.7 BUDGET FOR OUTCOME STRATEGY HIGH LEVEL EVALUATION

Outcome Strategy evaluations are financed from EVAL’s regular budget which covers: (i) contractual costs and travel of independent evaluators, research assistants, and (ii) travel expenses for the EVAL Senior Evaluation Officer.

The EVAL Director will decide on the actual budget required by each HLE, taking into account the scope and complexity of the evaluation. The Senior Evaluation Officer will be responsible for proper management of the evaluation budgets.

2.8 EVALUATION TEAM

A transparent and open procurement procedure is used for selecting the evaluation team. In accordance with internationally accepted practice, the HLE team may involve a mix of external consultants and an internal EVAL Senior Evaluation Officer who are independent from any link to the specific initiatives, projects and programmes being evaluated. In this way, the Office will be able to make judicious use of its institutional memory of previous evaluations and provide valuable insights to the evaluation based on knowledge of the ILO context and its normative and tripartite dimensions.

The members of the evaluation team should possess a mix of evaluative skills and thematic knowledge. Gender balance is sought and the team may include professionals from partner countries or regions concerned.

Key elements in the selection of evaluation team members

- Outcome/Strategy HLE teams comprise of the Senior Evaluation Officer (EVAL), an independent international evaluator and evaluation assistance, as required, who work with relevant national tripartite constitutions and the regional offices.
- Team members shall not have previous or current involvement – or offers of prospective employment – in the ILO programme or projects contributing to the Outcome/Strategy being evaluated or personal links to the people involved in managing any of the contributing initiatives (not a family member, friend or close former colleague).
- All HLE teams should seek a gender-balanced composition.
- The evaluation team should respect human rights and gender equality in all its dealings at all levels.
- The team should have the technical, regional, linguistic and professional expertise to perform the necessary evaluation tasks.
- The search for consultants should be an open process, with several candidates being considered from a shortlist, against the criteria included in the TOR.
- The Senior Evaluation Officer is responsible for issuing an open and widely disseminated call for expressions of interest and develops a short list based on a pre-established consultant’ ranking criteria.
- The decision on the selection of independent evaluators is made by EVAL.

Reference Documents:
- ILO policy guidelines for results based evaluation
- Guidance Note 4: Integrating gender equality in monitoring and evaluation
- Guidance Note 5: Using the ILO/IPEC Consultant database
- Guidance Note 6: Identifying, selecting and managing evaluation consultants
- Checklist 3: Writing the inception report
- Checklist 5: Preparing the evaluation report
2.9 INDUCTION OF STAKEHOLDERS

EVAL will have sufficient time to induct ILO departments and Units involved in the HLE and tripartite constituents in the relevant countries in the evaluation approach and processes and to arrange the schedule of work.

Consideration should be given to identifying, and offering, any suitable short training courses on results based evaluation to internal and external stakeholders prior to starting the evaluation.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

The Outcome Strategy HLE is undertaken in ILO HQ, a number of designated countries and, in some cases, through teleconferencing by an evaluation team within a defined number of days. The team will be supported by EVAL and the key technical liaison person in ILO, and where appropriate by regional and country offices. The Senior Evaluation Officer in EVAL will be expected to prepare all the relevant documentation and make the necessary logistical arrangements prior to the evaluation team’s commencement.

The evaluation will take into account all means of action used in the achievement of the Outcome Strategy results (i.e. technical advice services, TC projects, RBSA activities aimed at supporting country programme outcomes (CPOs), Global Reports and DWCPs evaluations). The evaluation team will meet with HQ staff and, when appropriate, with Member States’ tripartite constituents to establish the evaluation working arrangements.

The HLE establishes the coherence of the results of individual interventions and other CO/RO initiatives’ results and their impact on stakeholders to implement best practice and policy for decent work. Individual interventions rarely achieve impact and sustainability, therefore coherence of a number of interventions focused on the same high level objectives is of crucial concern to HLE evaluations.

Reference documents
- ILO Decent Work Country Programme: A Guidebook (version 3)
- ILO policy guidelines for results based evaluation
- Guidance Note 1: Monitoring and Evaluation of Decent Work Country Programme

3.1 INCEPTION REPORT

The inception report is listed as an output in the TOR and its acceptance by ILO will constitute an agreement to proceed with the evaluation. The inception report is prepared by the evaluation team at the very beginning of the evaluation assignment and sent to EVAL at HQ. The EVAL Director is responsible for reviewing and responding to the inception report and finally agreeing with its content. This triggers the final preparation and permits the evaluation team to undertake the evaluation.

The evaluation team should use the preparation of the inception report to test:

- the evaluation focus and methods;
- the evaluation questions;
- that the appropriate cross cutting themes are clear;
- the assessment criteria;
- that there is a balance between quantitative and qualitative data collection methods;
that there is sufficient rigour in the approaches to analysis; and
check that the methods will draw on both subjective and objective data analysis methods to
provide a balanced and insightful report.

This is the opportunity for the evaluation team to suggest revisions, if required, and prepare a
detailed work plan based on the TOR. If any revisions to the questions were made these are
documented.

Reference documents:
- ILO policy guidelines for results based evaluation
- Checklist 3: Writing the Inception Report

3.2 DATA COLLECTION FOR EVALUATION

The data collected must answer all the questions detailed in the TOR. The data to be collected
during an evaluation and the selection of data collection methods depends on several factors,
including:

- the evidence needed to best answer the evaluation questions;
- data availability and location;
- what is most appropriate to generate useful findings and address the evaluation criteria;
- the feasibility of data collection based on time and resource availability, and the local
  context; and
- location and accessibility to stakeholders.

To strengthen the credibility and usefulness of evaluation results, a mix of data sources collected
through multiple methods is advised. A combination of methods will establish data accuracy and
facilitate its interpretation. This use of mixed methods and data from mixed sources is called
triangulation and defined by the OECD/DAC as “the use of three or more theories, sources or types
of information, or types of analysis to verify and substantiate an assessment”.

3.3 ACCESS TO INFORMATION, CONFIDENTIALITY AND DISCLOSURE
OF EVALUATION RESULTS

ILO evaluations are carried out in accordance with international standards and norms. Officials are
expected to fully respect the confidential nature of draft evaluation reports and to strictly follow the
guidelines set down for handling such documents. Managers are expected to facilitate the evaluation
process and to ensure that it is not impeded in any way.

Within the agreed terms of reference for the evaluation, evaluators shall be independent and have
sole responsibility for evaluations. To carry out their functions effectively, evaluators may need to
interview staff, and have access to all relevant Office documents. Staff at all levels are expected to
co-operate fully with evaluators and to take all necessary steps to ensure timely access to requested
information.

Final evaluation reports are disseminated in accordance with ILO policy on public information
disclosure. In addition, all evaluation information is stored in a central repository of evaluation
documentation to ensure transparency and accessibility.

Key steps for the Implementation and reporting of the Outcome/Strategy Evaluation

- The Evaluation Unit has primary responsibility for leading and managing the evaluation team.
- A Senior Evaluation Officer will manage the evaluation team, clarify objectives and identify persons to be interviewed, define the responsibilities of participants in the process, and identify topics for the in-depth results assessment.
- Review the TOR: the scope, methodology, questions and stakeholders to confirm or make revisions to elements of the TOR as necessary.
- The evaluation team prepares an operational evaluation plan, known as the inception report, which should be based on the TOR, and include suggested revisions to the evaluation plan, if required.
- The evaluation questions established in the TOR, and any revisions as detailed in the inception report, determine the methodology for the evaluation.
- Through the respective ILO department responsible for the Outcome/Strategy being evaluated a focal person will be identified to support the evaluation process.
- The evaluation is undertaken according to the plan: documents are reviewed, data is collected and analysed and the report drafted.
- The executive summary should be prepared as a standalone summary document and therefore evaluators are expected to pay attention to making it both comprehensive and short, not more than 5 pages in length.
- The Outcome/Strategy evaluation report should be brief (around 40 pages, with supporting data and analysis contained in annexes). The document itself should have six major chapters:
  - the first chapter should be a brief executive summary
  - second chapter is the context to the evaluation;
  - chapter three describes the Outcome/Strategy being evaluated;
  - chapter four includes the purpose and methods of the evaluation;
  - chapter five presents the findings; and
  - chapter six presents the conclusions and recommendations (a maximum of ten) that have direct links to the findings and are actionable within a realistic timeframe, the lessons learned and evolving good practice, and comments on the draft evaluation report from the Office stakeholders.
- Statistical results of projects should be displayed in a matrix or graphs with minimum written descriptions.
- Separating the case studies, programme descriptions from the body of the evaluation report should be an option. The emphasis of HLE should be orientated towards analytical understanding and less towards descriptions of programmes and other initiatives.
- Conclusions and recommendations will be based on the analysis and data presented in the report. In addition, there is always a subjective element to evaluative judgments. To keep subjectivity to a minimum, headquarters’ and country offices’ key stakeholders, and country officials will be asked to respond to these findings and recommendations.
- Management’s reflection on lessons learned shall be included in the final report and GB Summary, and should be drafted so as to serve as the basis for further dialogue of the subsequent Outcome/Strategy.
- It may be appropriate to include recommendations based on the lessons learned. If this is the case the recommendations should be clearly categorized as such.
- Responsibility for follow-up action and timelines should be indicated where appropriate.
- Conclusions and recommendations are strengthened if the reader can clearly relate them to the evaluation report narrative, and can link them to evidence supported in the report.
3.4 DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

Documentation is an important data source; EVAL and regional and country offices should prepare these, as much as possible, prior to the evaluation team’s commencement.

Document sources for examination will include:

- the SPF and P&B for the period covered by the evaluation;
- Outcome-based work planning (OBW) and technical cooperation portfolios and related reviews;
- Implementation planning, management and reporting reports for the Outcome being evaluated (information from the IRIS Strategic Management Module);
- relevant global reports and meta evaluations;
- DWCP design document and logic model (results framework) and DWCP HLEs;
- the country programme reviews which will have examined recent performance against stated outcomes, determined what has been achieved, and whether strategies being used are efficient and effective;
- relevant individual programme M&E reports;
- national strategic plans and reports related to the world of work and social justice; and,
- other relevant national and UN policy and strategy documents.

The document review will support an assessment of how the delivery of output services has contributed to the achievement of outcomes. The achievement of outcomes and movement towards impact and sustainability against the logic model plans are reported on.

Country case studies based on desk reviews of global and country documents will provide valuable insights into how countries are responding to ILO Outcome Strategy work. The document review will inform the evaluation team of alignment across and between the ILO/DWCP country work, UN and country policies and strategies, and will guide analysis of coherence. The documents reviewed by the evaluation team should be listed in the evaluation report.

3.5 PRIMARY DATA

The primary data source for the Outcome Strategy evaluation is the information the evaluation team observes or is collected directly from stakeholders and/or beneficiaries about their first-hand experience with the intervention. This data will inform the DAC criteria questions under the headings of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, impact and sustainability. This data is collected through surveys, meetings, focus group discussions, interviews, case studies or other methods that involve direct contact with the respondents.

A focus of primary data collection should be on the realization of policy, strategy or action by stakeholders as outcome consequences of the results of the ILO’s delivered output services.

Where logic models or milestones have been established these should be used against which progress can be measured. The data collected should enable a deeper understanding of observed changes and the factors that contributed to change.

Where assumptions and/or risks have been established against Outcome Strategy level objectives data on their realization or mitigations should be collected and, to the extent possible, their influence on the achievement of their related objectives identified.

In the Programme and Budget (P&B) plan for the evaluation period the Outcome Strategy level objectives have been allocated indicators, measurement targets and baseline statements that provide important basic data against which causal planned and actual relationships can be analysed.
This information on implementation planning, management and reporting from the IRIS Strategic management Module will be provided to the evaluator by EVAL.

Names and details of primary data sources should be listed in the evaluation report.

### 3.6 SECONDARY DATA

Secondary data is data that has been collected by the ILO, other individuals or agencies for purposes other than those of the evaluation. HLEs for Outcome Strategy evaluations can expect to use considerable secondary data in the formulation of aggregated analysis when covering a number of countries or regions.

It may consist of documentary evidence that has direct relevance for the purposes of the evaluation: nationally and internationally published reports; economic indicators; project or programme plans; evaluations and other records; country strategic plans; and research reports.

A record of all secondary data sources should be listed in the evaluation report.

**Reference documents:**
- ILO policy guidelines for results based evaluation
- Guidance Note 9: Internal Evaluation for Projects

### 3.7 DATA QUALITY

The evaluation team is required to record data sources and show an evidence trail; this is included in the supporting documentation for the evaluation report. To the extent possible evidence trails should show data origin, time of data sources, responsibility for data collection and flow of data sources to corroborate data accuracy.

In some cases, the evaluation may be limited by the absence of baseline data, e.g. the description and documentation of the specific situation in the area targeted for change prior to the ILO intervention. Where baseline surveys and studies have not been undertaken or are not of the required quality, the evaluation team should identify how they will secure a reasonable proxy for the initial conditions. This may include seeking comparable baseline data from other sources.

In other cases, there may be a lack of data relative to the evolution of outcomes for a comparison group, which could make an assessment of the effectiveness of interventions and the identification of causal links particularly difficult. In order to check data quality the following areas can be used to guide evaluators in managing data and quality.

**Accuracy**
- Does the data measure what is intended to be measured?
- Is the data free of error?

**Reliability**
- Is the data generated and recorded according to standard or known procedures?
- Is the data collected and recorded in a consistent way?

**Precision**
- Is there sufficient detail in the data, for example do indicators require numbers, are the numbers disaggregated by gender?
Completeness
- Is the information system from which results are derived appropriately inclusive?
- Is the stakeholder list comprehensive?

Timeliness
- Is the data current?
- Has original information been updated?

Integrity
- Is the data free from bias or manipulation?
- Are the systems of data collection and recording free from bias or manipulation?

Confidentiality
- Is the data maintained and stored securely?

Reference documents:
- ILO policy guidelines for results based evaluation
- Checklist 4: Validating methodologies

4. DATA ANALYSIS

The evaluation team will undertake the analysis of the data collected, and as a team be responsible for the conclusions drawn. If, however, there is a dissenting voice this should be noted in the evaluation report and recorded. The evaluation team should:

- analyse the actual achievements against the planned targets and objectives and assess variance, if any, between them;
- analyse the assumptions made in the logic model to inform on the quality of programme design;
- check whether management of the implementation took note of the assumptions and responded to them as required;
- assess whether the assumptions supported or hindered the achievement of objectives;
- include the analysis of the realization, or otherwise, of the assumptions against which objectives in the logic models will have been made and the mitigation of risk designed;
- check relevance, efficiency and effectiveness in relation to the delivery of services;
- check the achievement of outputs against the logic model;
- determine the likely achievements of outcome (when stakeholders make change as a result of services they receive from ILO);
- assess coherence between, and across ILO initiatives, in relation to strategic and policy outcome level objectives;
- assess, as far as possible, the impact, or likely impact, the Outcome Strategy is or is likely to make in the near future on the designated target group; and,
- assess the level of mainstreaming of outcomes in partner organisations, whether as policy or practice, to determine likely sustainability of achievements.
- identify unintended results, positive or negative, from which future programmes can learn.

ILO’s Outcome Strategy objectives and priorities are focused on employment, social protection, social dialogue and rights at work, and as such are global in reach and application. Outcome Strategy evaluation analysis should use quantitative analysis to assess the contribution by ILO projects and programme results and qualitative analysis to focus on the strategy application within stakeholder organisations. When evaluating the achievement and support for the formulation of national policy...
caution needs to be applied as there are many influences involved over a reasonably long period of time. Therefore, attributing ‘the degree of contribution’ is less important than that the ILO contributed positively towards policy formulation and implementation.

A distinction should be made by the evaluation team between the analysis of the interventions and the analysis of the results of the interventions.

The interventions can be viewed as outcome level (outputs to outcome) when the tripartite constituents are formulating and putting policy in place, and the results of the interventions can be viewed as impact level (outcome to impact) when the policy is being applied beyond the tripartite constituents’ organisations.

At the outcome level focus should be on the progression from advocating and formulating to adoption and application. Data analysis should include:

- ILO’s capacity for social dialogue and communication with partners and stakeholders;
- its initiatives (projects and programmes) in advocacy, capacity building and promotion;
- its ability to correctly interpret the political and economic context in which it operates; and,
- its status as the pre-eminent UN body to foster social justice and decent work so that countries expect the ILO to be the body they are advised by.

At the impact level focus should be on how the policies have improved beneficiaries working lives. This should be seen as an ex post evaluation which may be beyond the scope of the Outcome Strategy HLE, or may be the focus of it. All data, documents, statistics, interview answers and observations should be kept and made available for inspection.

4.1 TRIANGULATION OF DATA

Triangulation overcomes the evaluation bias that comes from single information sources, the use of single methods or single observations. This use of mixed methods and data from mixed sources is defined by the OECD/DAC as “the use of three or more theories, sources or types of information, or types of analysis to verify and substantiate an assessment”.

Triangulation helps validate evaluation findings and relates to whether the findings of the evaluation are true and certain. "True" in the sense of the findings accurately reflecting the real situation and "certain" in the sense of the findings being backed by evidence.

At the higher level of objectives (outcomes and impact) the more sources of data that can be used to analyse the results the stronger is the evidence of conclusions and attribution.

4.2 RATING THE EVALUATION

Although rating is not an exact science it can be used to help the evaluation teams make conclusions and provide a ‘sounding board’ against which readers of evaluations can compare their understanding and interpretation. Ratings should complement evaluation findings at the highest degree possible.

- The DAC criteria are used as cross-cutting criteria for performance rating of Outcome Strategy.
- The ILO provides a clear approach to rating using the DAC criteria.
- Rating criteria can also be applied in relation to the specific evaluation questions.
- The scale of measure used by ILO is ordinal, where the score is ranked, but without percentage of amount between the different levels of value.
5. WRITING THE EVALUATION REPORT

The evaluation report should show the ILO’s performance in the implementation of its Outcome Strategy against the stated (P&B Strategic Outcome). The evaluation report should clearly show:

- An assessment of the effectiveness of ILO’s P&B, role, investment and engagement during the period under evaluation.
- A reflection on the theory of change; did it underpin the normative, technical, knowledge and capacity building work of ILO in Output/Strategy achievements, both at country and global levels.
- An assessment and rating of the strategy’s performance according to the six established performance criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coherence, impact and sustainability).
- Recommendations relevant to the context, with potential broader relevance to other countries.

5.1 FORMAT

The Outcome Strategy evaluation report should be brief (around 40 pages, with supporting data and analysis contained in annexes). Both a draft and a final version of the evaluation report must be prepared. The draft version provides stakeholders with an opportunity to give feedback prior to the preparation of the final evaluation report. All officials are expected to fully respect the confidential nature of draft evaluation reports and to strictly follow the guidelines set for handling such documents.

The individual structure of each evaluation report will be dependent on the nature of the evaluation focus and content, however, certain elements should be addressed in every report. Reports should meet the ILO evaluation quality standards which are consistent with, and conform to, the UNEG norms and standards. ILO uses an overall standard format for evaluation reports, however, under each main heading sub-headings can be included according the evaluation subject:

**Cover page with key intervention and evaluation data**

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions and recommendations should summarize and communicate the most important evaluation findings. The evaluation team should develop conclusions and recommendations as a team.

Conclusions are to tie together the various issues covered in the body of the report and to make comments upon the meaning of all of it. They should be a logical ending to what has been previously discussed and should not introduce any new information but should reinforce the evidence in the report and make an impact on the reader.

Recommendations are “proposals aimed at enhancing the effectiveness, quality, or efficiency of a development intervention; at redesigning the objectives; and/or at the reallocation of resources.” (OECD/DAC 2002). Recommendations should be linked to the conclusions, be clear, concise, actionable, and time-bound. These concise statements are also used in the Executive Summary of the evaluation and should therefore be written as standalone statements.

Consideration should be given to a limited number of recommendations in order to create focus for the GB and to be actionable by the relevant ILO focal points. There should be no more than 10 recommendations.

The categorization of recommendations into headings helps the reader place them in terms of their interests and influence. Consideration should be given to categorizing recommendations in terms of:

- the ILO internal policy and operational practice;
- the ILO supporting initiatives (projects and programme) design, content and structure; and
- organizational effectiveness in the support of the design and implementation of ILO Outcome Strategy; and
- high, medium or low importance.

LESSONS LEARNED

ILO places emphasis on lessons learned by concluding the evaluation report with them: this cycle is a key function of evaluation and promotes learning as one of the main purposes of evaluation. Lessons learned are not the same as conclusions and must be treated differently. Conclusions, focus on the findings and results of the Outcome Strategy initiatives – how well were they applied?

Lessons learned emerge when consideration is placed upon the way the Outcome Strategy has been designed, implemented, monitored and evaluated, the techniques, methods and approaches used - did we do it right and are we doing the right thing?
Lessons learned via HLE provide a major contribution to policy and strategy prepared by the GB. These observations from experience can be translated into relevant knowledge by establishing clear causal factors and effects.

- They contribute to reducing or eliminating deficiencies or building and strengthening good practices.
- It is the insight lessons learned offer and how they can be reused by ILO in the future, rather than their number that is important.
- Trivial or obvious insights should not be included as they only ‘muddy the water’.
- It is of upmost importance if the same lesson learned is repeatedly being noted: this should be identified and well supported when writing the final evaluation report.
- ‘Emerging good practice’ is when a lesson learned shows proven and sustainable benefits and is determined by the evaluation team to be replicable in other Outcome Strategy applications. Emerging good practice should be distinguished from lessons learned in the report.
- EVAL has responsibility for the recording and follow-up of lessons learned; in addition the Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) is responsible for promoting institutional follow-up on lessons learned.

**Reference Documents:**
- *Guidance Note 3*: Evaluation lessons learned
- *Checklist 5*: Preparing the evaluation report

### 5.4 FINALIZING THE DRAFT REPORT

The first draft should seek agreement among all Stakeholders both at HQ and relevant country and regional offices regarding matters of fact. Stakeholders are invited to make written comments on factual errors or omissions. They may also comment on the lessons learned presented in the first draft report. Individual comments may be sent to the Senior Evaluation Officer who will then present them to the evaluation team to take any required actions prior to finalizing the final report.

On noting the comments the evaluation team finalize the first draft report and circulate it to key ILO stakeholders and relevant country offices and other relevant stakeholders.

In the *ILO policy guidelines for results based evaluation* there is a clear laid down procedure for approving the evaluation (as shown in page 42).

### 5.5 COMMUNICATING THE FINAL REPORT

The communication of the final report will be managed by EVAL which is responsible for its dissemination within ILO and to the main stakeholders in the countries who participated in the evaluation. There may also be a need for the report to be disseminated to specific groups in relation to the subject of the Outcome Strategy being evaluated.

**A plan for communicating the evaluation report** should be put in place to define who may need to receive the information. EVAL should consult the stakeholder analysis undertaken at the beginning of the HLE for information on who else might receive copies of the evaluation report.
6. FOLLOW UP

6.1 RESPONSIBILITIES FOR FOLLOW UP

The Evaluation Unit (EVAL) is responsible for managing the evaluation function and ensuring that the evaluation policy is competently implemented. The structure and modalities of operation of the EVAL are designed to protect its functional independence.

EVAL is responsible for monitoring the follow-up to evaluation recommendations that have been accepted by management and will report on their progress to the Governing Body. EVAL will maintain an updated follow-up matrix for each HLE until recommendations have been declared as completed.

The Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) is responsible for advising the Director-General on the adequacy of follow-up to evaluation recommendations. The EAC reviews each follow-up date and passes judgment on the adequacy of Management’s follow-up report.

ILO line Managers are responsible for ensuring that the principles supporting the evaluation function are applied for all evaluations falling within their domain.

Effective follow-up of evaluation reports requires the active engagement of the relevant parts of the Office and may also require the involvement of ILO constituents and other partners.

**EVALUATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

- The Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) is an internal committee that provides a mechanism to oversee the use, implementation, and follow up to lessons learned and recommendations resulting from ILO evaluation activities.
- The EAC also functions as a forum for internal dialogue on the implementation of the ILO evaluation policy and strategy and, in particular, ensures that evaluations are credible and conducted in an impartial and independent way.
- It may discuss the draft plan for independent evaluations and provide its recommendations to the Director-General or EVAL, as appropriate.
- The EAC verifies that all independent evaluation reports are disclosed according to the ILO Policy on public information disclosure.
- EVAL is responsible for reviewing the follow up on the recommendations with support from EAC.
- EVAL will inform the appropriate ILO department/Country Office of recommendations and lessons learned that they can implement; and monitor progress and report to EAC.