

--Draft--

**Terms of Reference**  
**Independent Mid-term Evaluation of**  
**Better Work Indonesia Programme Phase III**

ILO Project Code	INS/14/51/NET, INS/12/10/MUL, INS/11/04/REV
Administrative Unit in charge of the project	Better Work Indonesia and CO-Jakarta
Technical Backstopping Unit	BETTERWORK
Type of Evaluation	Independent
Timing of Evaluation	Mid-term
Project Period	1 January 2016 – 31 December 2018 (36 months)
Total Project Budget	USD 8,943,987
Funding Agency	Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (SECO) and Australia Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)

## I. Background and Justification

### *Global Better Work Programme*

1. The Better Work (BW) programme is a joint initiative of the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the International Finance Corporation (IFC), a member of the World Bank Group. The programme- initially launched as Better Factories Cambodia in 2003 and later scaled to a global programme called Better Work in 2007- works to improve working conditions and promote competitiveness in global garment supply chains. It is a comprehensive programme bringing together all levels of the garment industry to improve working conditions and respect of labour rights for workers, and boost the competitiveness of apparel businesses.
2. Given the uniqueness of the garment sector, the Better Work programme focuses at this point *specifically* on the **garment supply chain**<sup>1</sup>, working with workers and managers from RMG (ready-made garment / cut-make-trim) factories; global brands; and tripartite constituents like trade unions, garment sector employers' associations, global brands, and the government. The BW programme is currently active in Cambodia, Vietnam, Haiti, Indonesia, Jordan, Nicaragua, and Bangladesh.
3. As a result of their participation with Better Work, factories have steadily improved compliance with ILO core labour standards and national legislation covering compensation, contracts, occupational safety and health and working time. This has significantly improved working conditions and, at the same time enhanced factories' productivity and profitability. A longitudinal independent impact assessment by Tufts University published in 2016 has proven impact of many of Better Work's services. (See the impact assessment report at <https://betterwork.org/blog/portfolio/impact-assessment/>.)

---

<sup>1</sup> Recently, BW has ventured into footwear supply chains given the strong similarities and overlap with the garment sector.

4. The Better Work Global (BWG) Programme just completed its third funding phase (2012-2017) at the end of June 2017. The main emphasis of the third phase was to achieve direct impact through its own programmes in the garment sector, and wider, indirect impact through its influence, knowledge sharing, and partnerships. The ultimate goal was to reach the required scale that will trigger or contribute to behavioural change in the garment industry and beyond, where compliance becomes the norm. By June 2017, BWG expanded its services to 1,486 factories currently employing approximately 2 million workers. Better Work estimates to have impacted at least 3 million workers and millions more of their family members.
5. The Better Work Global (BWG) Programme is now entering its fourth funding phase (2017-2022). During this new phase, Better Work will leverage existing and new partnerships to expand its impact from 3 to 8 million workers and to 21 million family members. In addition, ILO and WBG will support garment producing countries to strengthen the policy and enabling environment for decent work and competitiveness to drive positive outcomes on a much larger scale. This will be achieved through two areas of intervention, i.e. influencing business practices in the global supply chain and strengthening the enabling environment for decent work by strengthening public institutions and advancing policies at the national level.

#### *Background of Better Work Indonesia Programme*

6. Better Work Indonesia (BWI) is being implemented in three phases over an eight-year period (2011-2018). The first phase took place from August 2011 to June 2012 and focused on adapting the programme, training staff, and piloting programme tools and services in 30 garment enterprises in the Greater Jakarta area. The second phase ran from July 2012 to July 2015 with the goal to further extend the programme in terms of number of participating factories and the impact of the programme's services. By end of phase II, BWI provided its services to 140 factories with a total of 280,000 workers.
7. The project is in the mid portion of a three-year project cycle, designed based on learning and knowledge from previous cycles. Additionally, all Better Work Country Programmes are designed to align with the structure and goals of the wider Better Work Global Phase IV programme.
8. In the third phase, BWI moved into local sustainability and established an independent national institution, "Foundation for Partnership at Work", that now delivers the core services of assessment, advisory and training on behalf of BW, under the new, more efficient service model which started to be rolled out in Indonesia in April 2015. BWI itself was reduced to a smaller team that continues with the ILO and works closely with national partners and stakeholders on using the BWI knowledge and lessons learned from the programme to help strengthen the capacity of national constituents, influence public and private sector policy on labour related issues, and support improved industrial relations in line with BW's mandate.
9. The Foundation Partnership at Work became operational in January 2017. It is operating under an initial implementation agreement with the ILO, covering 2017 and 2018 and reports to the ILO/BW every 3 months in technical and financial terms and as per ILO regulations.
10. BWI's strategy for the third phase of the programme is, therefore, based on achieving 2 Outcomes:

Outcome 1: By 2018, BWI will have achieved scale, quality and effectiveness in its core service delivery to improve working conditions, especially for women workers, in the Indonesian garment and footwear sector.

Outcome 2: In support of BWI's mandate, necessary changes in relevant laws, strategies, policies and practices at the sectoral and national level are initiated and influenced by BW.

*Previous evaluations of the BWI*

11. The ILO commissioned Tufts University to conduct an independent, longitudinal impact assessment of the program in five countries, including Indonesia. Data was collected yearly at the factory level over a six-year period. The impact assessment, *Progress and Potential*, was published in 2017 and has proven the impact of Better Work core services at the factory level.
12. Given the internal and external evaluation requirements per the ILO evaluation policy, in recent years, BWI has been part of multiple mid-term, final, phase design and impact evaluations. The most recent relevant evaluations are:
  - 1) Mid-term evaluation (Phase II) – December 2014;
  - 2) BWI sustainability study (2015) conducted by an independent consultant and looking at the financial case for the setting up of a Foundation and other key aspects such as legal considerations, governance arrangements, etc;
  - 3) Final Evaluation (Phase II)- December 2016 for phase ending December 2015 in which scope of the evaluation covered activities, achievements and stakeholders's views up until early 2017;
  - 4) Impact assessment data collection in respect of 29 factories in June 2017; and
  - 5) The Better Work Global evaluations, such as the mid-term evaluation in 2015 and final evaluation in 2017 also reviewed progress of country programs.

---

## **II. Purpose and Objective of the Evaluation**

13. Given the fact there are a number of recent evaluation findings and recommendations for BWI, the specific purpose for this mid-term evaluation (MTE) is for project improvement with focus on policy and influencing agenda in Indonesia (outcome 2), not the operational components at the factory level. Although BWI is entering its final year (2018) of the current phase, it is expected that the project will continue and that the results of this MTE can also be taken into account going forward.
14. Specific objectives of the independent midterm evaluation are to:
  - 1) Assess the continued relevance of the interventions of outcome 2: policy and influencing agenda in Indonesia;
  - 2) Assess the validity and logic of the project's theory of change; specifically whether it is still valid within the current development circumstances in Indonesia;
  - 3) Assess the project implementation effectiveness including the progress in achieving outcome 2 (including intended and unintended, positive and negative results), the challenges affecting the achievement of the outcome, factors that hindered or facilitated achievement so far, and effectiveness of management arrangements;
  - 4) Assess efficiency of resource use; and
  - 5) Assess the likelihood of sustainability of the interventions.

### III. Evaluation Scope

15. The midterm evaluation is due as per the ILO evaluation policy. The evaluation is scheduled for implementation from November 2017 – February 2018 and it will help guide BWI in planning implementation strategies for the remaining period of the project.
16. The evaluation will focus on the influencing agenda activities, not the operational components at the factory level the ILO has implemented under the BWI project Phase III from the start until the time of midterm evaluation. Gender equality and non-discrimination, promotion of international labour standards, tripartite processes and constituent capacity development should also be considered in this evaluation.
17. The midterm evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations will be primarily addressed to the national stakeholders, Better Wok HQ and Better Wok Indonesia.
18. Primary clients are the beneficiaries, the ILO constituents and the ILO units directly involved in the project:
  - The Constituents (The Employers' Association of Indonesia – APINDO; Trade Unions; Ministry of Manpower (MoM);
  - The ILO (Country Office – Jakarta; Better Work Indonesia; Better Work Global; DWT-Bangkok); and
  - The Donors (Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (SECO) and Australia Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)).

Secondary clients are the ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP) and other key stakeholders.

### IV. Evaluation Criteria and Questions

19. The evaluation should address the following ILO evaluation criteria: relevance of the interventions; validity and logic of the theory of change; implementation effectiveness; effectiveness of management arrangements; efficiency of resource use; and likelihood of sustainability of interventions as defined in the ILO Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation, 2012 (Annex 1).
20. The core ILO cross-cutting priorities, such as gender equality and non-discrimination, promotion of international labour standards, tripartite processes, and constituent capacity development should be considered in this evaluation. In particular, gender dimension will be considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation. To the extent possible, data collection and analysis should be disaggregated by sex as described in the ILO Evaluation Policy Guidelines and relevant Guidance Notes (Annex 1).
21. It is expected that the evaluation addresses all of the questions detailed below to the extent possible. The evaluator may adapt the evaluation criteria and questions, but any fundamental changes should be agreed upon between the ILO team and the evaluator. The evaluation instruments (to be summarized in the background report) should identify the general areas of focus listed here as well as other priority aspects to be addressed in the evaluation.
22. Suggested evaluation criteria and evaluation questions are summarized below:

*Relevance of the interventions*

- To what extent are the project strategies and approaches pertinent to stakeholders' requirements and policies of partners and donors?

#### *Validity and logic of the theory of change*

- To what extent are the project design (outcomes, outputs and activities) and its underlining theory of change logical and coherence? How well do different stakeholders understand the project theory of change?
- How appropriate and useful are the indicators described in the project monitoring and evaluation plan in assessing the project's progress at output and outcome levels? Are the indicators gender sensitive? Are the means of verification for the indicators appropriate?

#### *Implementation effectiveness*

- To what extent has the project been making sufficient progress towards its planned results (including intended and unintended, positive and negative)? Will the project be likely to achieve the programme's influencing agenda goal by the end of the project? Are there any external factors that hindered or facilitated achievement of the project?
- Are there any limitations of BWI action on capacity building and stakeholder engagement and policy Influencing? If so, what are they and how can these limitations be overcome?
- How effectively are the strategies being implemented and coordinated? What are the possible changes in project strategies or implementation that are needed in order to achieve the project objectives on influencing agenda (outcome 2)? What other alternative strategies, entry points and techniques could BWI put in place to achieve its policy objectives?
- How effective has the project been at stimulating interest and participation of project partners at the local, meso and national levels? Are project partners (government, industry, etc) able to fulfil the roles expected in the project strategies? What are the capacity challenges? How can BWI further motivate and support its tripartite partners in taking up the policy issues that are being raised?
- To what extent does BWI effectively mainstream gender in project strategies and interventions?

#### *Effectiveness of management arrangements*

- To what extent are the interaction and roles/responsibilities between BW and the ILO office in Jakarta and other relevant ILO projects clear and effective in achieving the influencing agenda goals of the program?
- To what extent are the current terms of reference and format of BWI's Programme Advisory Committees (PAC) working? Are these stakeholders helping to create the enabling environment? What can be done differently? How can the PAC be reformed?
- One of BWI's main vehicles of implementation of its influencing agenda is the BWI-Labour Inspection DG of the Ministry of Manpower Ad-Hoc committee on law interpretation and application. To what extent are the current terms of reference and format of the Ad-Hoc Committee working? What can be done differently? How can the Ad-Hoc committee be reformed for greater efficiency and impact?

#### *Efficiency of resource use*

- Is there a need to reallocate resources or adjust activities in order to achieve its immediate objectives? Are resources sufficient for the remaining project period? How effectively has the project leveraged resources (e.g., by collaborating with non-BW initiatives and other projects)?

#### *Sustainability*

- How effective has the project been in establishing national/local ownership? Are the linkages to broader sectoral and national action been made?
- Is the phase-out strategy for the project in place and under implementation? Is it sufficiently clearly articulated and progress made towards this goal?

### **V. Methodology**

23. The evaluation will comply with evaluation norms, standards and follow ethical safeguards, as specified in the ILO's evaluation procedures. The ILO adheres to the United Nations system of evaluation norms and standards as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.
24. Both qualitative and quantitative evaluation approaches should be considered for this evaluation. While quantitative surveys is not expected to be conducted, quantitative data will analyses will be drawn from the project reports and the monitoring and evaluation system. The evaluation fieldwork will be qualitative and participatory in nature. The evaluation fieldwork will however be reduced due to the amount of pre-existing information available in the recent evaluations. Ideally and if possible, this field work will take place to overlap with the local PAC (project governance) meeting in November. Attempts should be made to collect data from different sources by different methods for each evaluation question and findings be triangulated to draw valid and reliable conclusions. Data shall be disaggregated by sex where possible and appropriate.
25. A detailed methodology will be elaborated by the independent evaluators on the basis of this ToR. The detailed methodology should include key and sub-question(s), detailed methods, data collection instruments and data analysis plans to be presented as a key element in the background report.
26. The methodology for collection of evidences should be as follows:
  - 1) Document Review
    - The evaluation team will review the project document, work plans, project monitoring plans, progress reports, previous evaluations completed by ILO and donors, government documents, meeting minutes, policy frameworks, draft regulations or laws that relate to the influencing agenda aspects of the project, and other documents that were produced through the project or by relevant stakeholders. In addition, the evaluation team will conduct electronic or telephone interviews with BW and respecting the attempt to reduce duplication of consultation on issues that were recently evaluated or that have been evaluated in the past years. The evaluation team will receive a briefing by the project team and conduct an internal scoping exercise.
  - 2) Background Report and Focus Groups

A background report will be prepared by the evaluation team. The content of the Background Report will include:

- Drafting of a summary report compiling previous evaluation, impact assessment and other findings on the projects as relevant to the focus of the MTR (policy/ influencing agenda for BWI);
- Summary of the key findings based on the purpose of the review, the suggested aspects to address and the initial scoping by the evaluation team; and
- Based on suggested evaluation criteria and evaluation questions, the document review, the briefings and interviews, the evaluation team will identify key issues for discussion during the stakeholder consultation focus group discussions.

### 3) Stakeholder Focus Groups

- The evaluation team will first complete relevant consultations with internal BW stakeholders such as the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), project staff, and BWG staff. If the evaluator wishes to speak with other stakeholders such as donors, buyer representatives, or similar this can be discussed with BWI.
- The evaluation team will organize a workshop with key local tripartite stakeholders to get their views and feedback on BW engagement with them, particularly as related to policy influencing. This may include one or more workshops or meetings with government representatives, workers or employers' associations and implementing partners. The evaluation team will work together with project management to ensure that the participants who can provide information to answer the questions are invited to the focus group meeting or, if availability does not allow, that separate meetings are organized.
- Based on these meetings and the document review, the evaluation team will build an initial set of conclusions and possible recommendations for next steps.

### 4) Follow-up Meeting with Internal Key Stakeholders

- Half day follow-up meeting with internal key stakeholders with decision-making authority regarding strategy, work plans, budgets, and similar. This will focus on the findings from the meetings and general conclusions, and open the table to discussions on possible recommendations. Any proposed adjustment in strategy and establish the possible changes in project components, work plans, project monitoring plans, and other documents as appropriate. The participants of this meeting will be:
  - BWI CTA and decision makers;
  - Project staff as appropriate;
  - Representatives from BWG, as required.

A more detailed list of participants for the focus group meeting as well as for the follow-up meeting will be finalized with consultation between the evaluation team and the project.

### 5) Evaluation Report

- Based on the background report and the inputs from the key stakeholders' discussions during the focus groups and follow-up meetings, the evaluation team will draft the mid-term evaluation report. The draft report will be sent to the evaluation manager directly by the evaluation team. The evaluation manager will forward the report to stakeholders for their inputs/comments to the report. The evaluation manager will consolidate the comments and forward them to the evaluation team for consideration in finalizing the draft report.

- The evaluation team will finalize the report, taking into consideration the stakeholder comments.

## VI. Main Deliverables

27. The evaluation team will provide the following deliverables and tasks:

Deliverable 1: A background report. It will include initial desk review of previous evaluations, impact assessment findings, other reviews or findings on the projects, the evaluation questions and data collection methodologies and techniques, and the evaluation tools (interview, guides, questionnaires, etc.).

Deliverable 2: Stakeholder Workshop. The evaluator will conduct a workshop with key stakeholders to get their views and feedback on BW engagement with them (focusing on the policy work/influencing agenda).

Deliverable 3: First draft evaluation report. Evaluation report should include action-oriented, practical and specific recommendations assigning or designating audiences. The draft evaluation report should be prepared as per the ILO Checklist 5: Preparing the Evaluation Report which will be provided to the evaluators. The first draft evaluation report will be improved by incorporating evaluation manager's comments and inputs.

Deliverable 4: Final evaluation report with evaluation summary. The evaluators will incorporate comments received from ILO and other key stakeholders into the final report. The report should be finalized as per the ILO Checklist 5: Preparing the Evaluation Report which will be provided to the evaluators. The quality of the report and evaluation summary will be assessed against the ILO Checklists 5, 6, 7, and 8 which will be provided to the evaluators.

28. The reports and all other outputs of the evaluation must be produced in English. All draft and final reports including other supporting documents, analytical reports, and raw data should be provided in electronic version compatible with WORD for windows. Ownership of the data from the evaluation rests jointly between ILO and ILO consultants. The copy rights of the evaluation report rests exclusively with the ILO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

## VII. Management Arrangements and Workplan

29. M&E officers from Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific will manage this independent evaluation with oversight provided by the ILO Evaluation Office. A team of two (international and national) consultants will be commissioned to conduct this evaluation. The evaluation will be funded from BWI budget. A list of tasks of the evaluation manager is following:

- Draft and finalize the evaluation TOR upon receiving inputs from key stakeholders;
- Reviewing CV and proposals of the proposed evaluators;
- Providing project background documents to the evaluator;
- Coordinate with the project team on the field visit agenda of the evaluators;
- Briefing the evaluation consultants on ILO evaluation procedures;
- Circulating the report to all concerned for their comments;
- Reviewing and providing comments of the draft evaluation report; and



- Consolidate comments and send them back to the evaluators.

30. BWI team will handle administrative contractual arrangements with the consultants and provide any logistical and other assistance as required. The BWI team will be responsible for the following tasks:

- Provide project background materials to the consultants;
- Prepare a list of recommended interviewees;
- Schedule meetings for field visit and coordinating in-country logistical arrangements;
- Be interviewed and provided inputs as requested by the consultants during the evaluation process;
- Review and provide comments on the draft evaluation reports;
- Organize and participate in the stakeholder workshop; and
- Provide logistical and administrative support to the consultants, including travel arrangements (e.g. plane and hotel reservations, purchasing plane tickets, providing per diem) and all materials needed to provide all deliverables.

31. The evaluation team reports to the evaluation manager. The consultants will be selected through a competitive process from qualified consultants. The consultants will lead the evaluation and will be responsible for delivering the above evaluation deliverables using a combination of methods as mentioned above.

32. Indicative time frame and responsibilities

No.	Task	Responsible person	Time frame (by end)
1	Preparation of the 1 <sup>st</sup> draft TOR for the project to relevant ILO staff for review and comment	Evaluation Manager	12-16 Oct 2017
2	Share the draft ToR with all stakeholders for comments/inputs	CTA (send an introduction email)  Evaluation Manager (send emails soliciting comments)	24 - 31 October 2017
3	Finalize the ToR	Evaluation Manager	1 November 2017
4	Share the approved ToR with CTA, Geneva and the donors; Prepare EoI based on the approved ToR	Evaluation Manager	3 November 2017
5	Advertisement of consultants	Evaluation Manager/ Evaluation Office	6-10 November 2017
6	Selection of consultants	Evaluation Manager/ Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Officer	13 November 2017
7	Share CVs of selected evaluators to CTA and the donors	Evaluation Manager	14 November 2017
8	Issuance of contracts	CTA/CO-Jakarta	16 November 2017
9	Draft mission itinerary for the evaluators and the list of key stakeholders to be interviewed	CTA	16 November 2017
10	Brief evaluators on ILO evaluation policy (Evaluators to start desk study, Skype calls with Geneva, Donor, etc.)	Evaluation Manager	17 November 2017
11	Submit background report to Evaluation Manager	Evaluators	24 November 2017
12	Circulate background report to CTA, Geneva and	Evaluation Manager	27-29 November

No.	Task	Responsible person	Time frame (by end)
	the donors for comments/inputs for three days		2017
13	<b>Approve background report</b>	<b>Evaluation Manager</b>	<b>1 December 2017</b>
14	<b>Conduct Evaluation Mission and stakeholder workshop</b>	<b>Evaluators (The project staff support the workshop arrangements)</b>	<b>4-8 December 2017</b>
15	<b>Draft report submitted to Evaluation Manager</b>	<b>Evaluators</b>	<b>22 December 2017</b>
16	Share the draft report with all concerned stakeholders for comments for two weeks	Evaluation Manager	25 December 2017 – 12 January 2018
17	Consolidate comments into the draft report and send to the evaluator	Evaluation Manager	19 January 2018
18	<b>Finalize the report and submit to Evaluation Manager</b>	<b>Evaluators</b>	<b>24 January 2018</b>
19	Review the final report; share the final report to CTA, Geneva and the donors for comments/inputs (if any) for five days	Evaluation Manager	2 February 2018
20	Submit of the final report to EVAL	Evaluation Manager	9 February 2018

### VIII. Required Qualifications and Duration

33. Two independent consultants – one international evaluation specialist/team leader and one national labour law expert/team member with the relevant experience and qualifications are being sought.

#### *International Evaluation Specialist/Team Leader*

- 1) No previous involvement in the delivery of the BWI project;
- 2) Technical expertise in evaluation methodologies and previous proven skills and experience in undertaking evaluations of similar projects;
- 3) Extensive knowledge of, and experience in applying, qualitative and quantitative research methodologies;
- 4) Strong background in organizational and institutional capacity building, Human Rights-Based Approach programming, and Results-Based Management and Monitoring;
- 5) Excellent analytical skills and communication skills;
- 6) Experience with employment policy design and policy making;
- 7) Knowledge of ILO's roles and mandate and its tripartite structure as well as UN evaluation norms and its programming is desirable;
- 8) Experience in supporting labour inspectorates in labour inspection reform and improvement of compliance and law enforcement issues will be advantage;
- 9) Background regarding global supply chains and the garment sector will be an advantage; and
- 10) Experience working with Indonesian tripartite constituents will be advantage;

#### *National Labour Law Expert/team member*

- 1) No previous involvement in the delivery of the BWI project;

- 2) Strong and substantial professional experience working on labour law, employment policy or labour inspection reform in Indonesia;
- 3) Experience in Indonesian employment market realities and institutions;
- 4) Designing and implementing employment and industrial relations policy;
- 5) Experience working with Indonesian tripartite constituents;
- 6) Excellent analytical skills and communication skills;
- 7) Bahasa Indonesia language skills;
- 8) Excellent command of oral and written English; and
- 9) Knowledge of ILO's roles and mandate and its tripartite structure as well as UN evaluation norms and its programming will be an advantage.

Given the uniqueness of the garment sector, strong preference is given to a professional that is familiar with this industry. Familiarity with Better Work will be an advantage.

34. The evaluation will be completed in English with translation.
35. It is foreseen that the duration of this evaluation will fall within November 2017 – January 2018. The field mission in Indonesia is expected during first week of December 2017.
36. Below are indicative inputs and tasks to be completed. Numbers of days foreseen for consultants in one task can be reallocated to another task where justified and in consultation with the evaluation manager.

Task	Dates	Team Leader	Team Member
Briefing, desk review, internal briefings, development of draft background paper and agenda for the meeting (home)	13 – 22 November 2017	8	8
Meetings with key stakeholders, facilitate stakeholder focus group meeting, debriefing. (field mission to take place in mid-November to (if possible) overlap with the project governance-PAC- meeting) (Jakarta)	4 – 8 December 2017	5	5
Prepare draft report (home)	11 – 22 December 2017	10	10
Finalize report taking into views the consolidated comments (home)	23 – 24 January 2018	2	1
Total		25 days	24 days

## IX. Legal and Ethical Matters

37. The evaluation will comply with UN Norms and Standards. The ToR is accompanied by the code of conduct for carrying out the evaluations. UNEG ethical guidelines will be followed. It is

important that the evaluators have no links to project management or any other conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of evaluation.

## **X. Annex**

- Annex 1: All relevant ILO evaluation guidelines and standard templates
  - ILO Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation, 2012  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_176814/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_176814/lang--en/index.htm)
  - Code of conduct form (To be signed by the evaluators)  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_206205/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206205/lang--en/index.htm)
  - Checklist No. 3 Writing the inception report  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165972/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165972/lang--en/index.htm)
  - Checklist 5 preparing the evaluation report  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165967/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165967/lang--en/index.htm)
  - Checklist 6 rating the quality of evaluation report  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165968/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165968/lang--en/index.htm)
  - Template for lessons learnt and Emerging Good Practices  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_206158/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206158/lang--en/index.htm)  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_206159/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206159/lang--en/index.htm)
  - Guidance note 7 Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165986/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm)
  - Guidance note 4 Integrating gender equality in M&E of projects  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165986/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm)
  - Template for evaluation title page  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_166357/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_166357/lang--en/index.htm)
  - Template for evaluation summary  
<http://www.ilo.org/legacy/english/edmas/eval/template-summary-en.doc>