



International
Labour
Office
Geneva

The implications of the SDGs on ILO's results framework – remarks from an evaluative perspective

International Labour Organization

Evaluation Office

June 2016

Evaluation and SDG series



The implications of the SDGs on ILO's results framework – remarks from an evaluative perspective

ILO Evaluation Office

June 2016

The following remarks are based on the initial scoping and review process “Evaluation and the SDGs with a Decent Work Lens” that EVAL has undertaken.¹ Remarks focus primarily on the implications for ILO's results framework from an evaluation perspective and as the front-end step in preparing for implementation of the SDGs. A table that looks in more detail at the issues, challenges and support required for the SDG implementation complements this note.

1. UN adoption of 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development – A broad and ambitious set of goals and targets

Like every UN agency, the ILO is having to determine where and how the implementation of the SDGs will impact its work. In essence, for ILO operations, this means:

- *A need to identify which of the 17 SDGs and associated 169 targets are relevant to the business of the ILO;*
- *A determination of how ILO operations, both global and country-level, will be impacted in transforming to a SDG/DW Agenda;*
- *Re-visiting the needs of national constituents, in line with increased expectations of SDG implementation;*
- *Recognition that new international partners/other UN agencies may be implicated in the SDG/DW Agenda.*

From a technical perspective, it also requires an assessment of the indicators that have been identified for each of the relevant targets and determination of whether new information needs to be collected as part of the monitoring process for management oversight, accountability and reporting purposes. Beyond the global indicator framework, more clarification is needed about the use of evaluation to provide depth of information and analysis so that reporting and decision-making is truly ‘evidence-based’.

2. A need to sort out the relationship between ILO Outcomes, SDG targets, indicators and data/information needed for monitoring

It has been recognized by the Inter-Agency and Expert Group on SDG indicators (IAEG-SDGs) that the indicators do not necessarily cover all aspects of the SDG goals and targets; data for several SDG targets remain unavailable; targets are not always quantified; and there is a need to address the capacity gaps in member States in order to better inform the measurement of SDG progress.

To address the issues of indicators, data needs and measurement strategy, including accountability for measurement and analysis, it would be important for the ILO to look at the cross-walk for each Policy Outcome, starting with a detailed examination of the work of the ILO and not simply looking at ‘the linkages with specific SDG indicators.’

¹ This paper has been heavily drawn from a background paper by Mr. Robert Lahey that was commissioned by the ILO Evaluation Office.

This will require a review of—and where they do not exist, development of—the **theories of change** at all levels of ILO intervention – global; country (DWCP); and level of programmes, policies & interventions. It will also require a review of the **measures of ‘success’** that will now be reflective of revised/updated theory of change for the SDG/DW integrated Agenda.

3. Many challenges at the Country level – for the ILO, UN System and Individual Countries

It is widely recognized that there are several challenges that will be faced at the country level, given the assumptions and expectations that have been built into SDG implementation. – It is assumed that country data will be sufficiently robust but it is actually widely known that, for many countries these assumptions would not hold at this time.

In order to support *sustainable* monitoring and evaluation capacity in countries, it is critical that UN agencies recall the ‘new paradigm’ associated with National Evaluation Capacity Development (NECD) – that is, supporting countries in the building of national monitoring and evaluation capacity for the primary purpose of country-led development. In addition to the capacity challenges faced by many individual countries, ILO Country Offices also face many challenges associated with SDG implementation, largely due to lack of resources and potentially the unknown associated with integrating the SDGs into the DW framework.

4. A need to establish a suitable format and mechanisms for reporting on ILO contribution to the SDGs

While UN-level mechanisms for monitoring and reporting are still being discussed, it has already been determined that a High-level political forum (HLPF) will be informed by an annual progress report on the SDGs prepared in cooperation with the UN system, based on the global indicator framework. The SDG 8 is expected to be up for review in 2019.

For the ILO (and indeed every agency), there is a need for two types of reporting: (i) reporting to serve management-oriented needs and progress on implementation of ILO’s SDG Implementation Plan; and (ii) reporting to demonstrate the contribution, impacts and effects of ILO interventions. Attributing change to ILO interventions could become more difficult as more international partners are implicated in the DW agenda via the SDG entry point. Issues of agency contribution could easily become blurred and, at its worst, lead to ‘mandate creep’.

An ability to tell a compelling ‘performance story’ starts with an understanding of the underlying ‘theory of change’ associated with the business. Across the ILO, this would mean ensuring that SDGs are incorporated into all aspects of major ILO interventions, at both the global and national levels. For some areas of the ILO, this would likely mean developing a theory of change that to this point has been very weak (as pointed out in various evaluations).²

² See AER 2015 recommendation related to ToC:” Recommendation: The Office should strengthen its M&E and its internal system for reporting on the implementation of programmes and projects and make a strong theory of change a compulsory requirement at all levels of the ILO’s RBM system.”

Monitoring information would serve as a useful and important input to such a report, but for an assessment of ‘contribution’, more evaluative work would be needed, relying on both qualitative and quantitative information.

5. Evaluation fit for the 2030 development agenda

The Evaluation community views the use of evaluation as a crucial ingredient for SDG success³. To date, there has been considerable focus on how to measure progress using indicators, and limited use of the word ‘evaluation’.

However, we also know that the processes of statistical monitoring and reporting will be insufficient on its own as a vehicle for the required learning and accountability. Data and reports will show whether progress is being made towards the goals and related targets but not necessarily provide information on attribution, contribution and the “how” and “why”.

Evaluation and other review processes can fill these gaps and independently validate our contribution to the SDGs at both the global and national level. If we are methodical, systematic, rigorous, and cooperative in our evaluations, this will give us the chance to learn what really works.

6. Issues, Challenges and Support Needed for SDG Implementation: the Evaluative Perspective in Summary

The implications of the SDGs on ILO’s results framework is the key consideration of this analysis. From an evaluative perspective, the nature of the required action will be both short and longer term in nature, ultimately focusing on achievements and impacts. In the coming years evaluative elements will help to ensure that the most cost-effective approach to SDG/DW implementation is being followed and that at the we will be able to provide a compelling ‘Performance Story’ regarding our contribution to the SDGs.

In considering the various ways that evaluation could potentially be used in support of the SDGs, it is important to recognize the following:

- In addition to the traditional areas of activity for ILO evaluation (conduct of systematic independent evaluations, both formative and summative) non-traditional broader areas of evaluative support are likely to be required in the form of guidance to the ILO entities that are tasked with the design of ILO’s results framework, monitoring of implementation and reporting.
- The use of any form of evaluation, monitoring and review is not simply for ‘accountability’ but ought to also be considered as tools for ‘learning’. That is, they all represent ‘*feedback mechanisms*’ that yield objective information on ‘progress’ of SDG implementation - information of a formative nature that can be particularly useful for adjustments to ILO’s support to SDG Implementation.
- While the majority of the focus across the UN system to date has been on the ‘measurement apparatus’ and has revolved around tracking an agreed-upon set of indicators this is necessary but not sufficient for gaining information to inform evidence-based decision-making. To achieve this, evaluation

³See for example IIED (2016), UNEG (2016).

initiatives need to be integrated into national, regional and global SDG ‘follow-up and review’ mechanisms.

- There are two forms of ‘monitoring and reporting’ that the ILO will need to concern itself with: (i) the more immediate monitoring and feedback on changes within the ILO as per the SDG Implementation Plan and feedback to determine whether adjustments are needed; and (ii) the longer-term monitoring (and eventually evaluation) of the SDG/DW Agenda to measure performance achieved against expectations (as per the theory of change) and ILO impact.
- The need for national-level Monitoring and Evaluation capacity building is a significant challenge facing SDG implementation for many countries, but it is one that all UN agencies, including the ILO, are well positioned to support, either directly (through training and mentoring) or indirectly (through funding, advice and/or oversight support). By providing this support, the likelihood of including ‘evaluation’ in national M&E systems increases substantially.
- ILO, through EVAL and through the established network of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), has an entry point for dialogue with other UN agencies that may now be implicated in the DW Agenda due to the SDGs. This dialogue could be particularly useful for discussions associated with issues of Monitoring and Evaluation of the SDGs and beyond, including ‘lessons’ to be gained from experience of other agencies. It would also be in line with the broader ILO work in the new UN System setup and system-wide support of the SDG process.

Issues, Challenges and Support Needed for SDG Implementation – Evaluative Perspective

Action steps, Issues, Challenges and Areas of Intervention	Support needed
1. Understanding the linkage between the SDGs & DW Agenda	
<p>Review (and develop, as needed) <u>theories of change</u> at all levels of ILO intervention – global; country (DWCP); and level of programmes, policies & interventions. Focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification/agreement of alignment of SDG targets with particular ILO intervention • Clarification/agreement on operational implications of such alignment – in particular, implications for programme/policy ‘reach’, design; and delivery process; • Identification of new international partners that may now be implicated in ‘success’ of relevant SDG • Identification of new assumptions regarding the ‘enabling environment’ that may now be relevant to ‘success’ of DW/SDG Agenda 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of Guidance Document and possibly checklists, and provision of seminar on approach to reviewing and re-developing the ‘theory of change’ in an integrated SDG/DW Agenda • Provision of workshops with ILO Policy Outcome leads (and other relevant ILO officials) to develop ILO-level theory of change pathways that incorporate the relevant SDGs • Development of a small number of specific cases (for example, one Flagship Programme; 1 or 2 Country offices) as a demonstration of approach needed to map out a revised theory of change reflective of the integrated SDG/DW Agenda – i.e. cases to share with and inform other parts of the ILO
<p>Review the <u>measures of ‘success’</u> that will be reflective of revised/updated theory of change for the SDG/DW integrated Agenda – needed at all levels. Focus on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revised/updated theory of change introduces potentially new indicators, data needs and issues for monitoring and eventual evaluation. Clarification/agreement on each of these is critical early on. • Measurement strategy that is feasible, cost-effective & assigns responsibility/accountability for timely delivery of needed data & analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of a cost-effective “performance measurement” strategy (“Monitoring and Evaluation Framework”), ensuring that the measurement strategy includes not only the monitoring of indicators, but also the conduct of ad hoc surveys and eventual evaluations. This strategy should involve the use of qualitative as well as quantitative indicators to measure ‘performance’ • Development of Guidance Document and provision of seminar on indicator development, possible sources for ongoing assessment of indicators and measurement strategies associated with ILO programmes, policies and initiatives • Consultation with relevant UNEG members who might be implicated in the SDG/DW Agenda to clarify and, as needed, coordinate indicator development and any associated monitoring and evaluation activities (EVAL)
<p>Clarify the <u>format/approach to reporting on ‘performance’</u> in implementing the SDG/DW Agenda.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ILO will want to clarify how it intends to ‘tell its Performance Story’ regarding its contribution to the SDG/DW Agenda. This needs to be more than simply measuring and reporting on a couple of indicators. A compelling ‘Performance Story’ about ILO contribution likely requires both global-level data and specific examples of ‘contribution’, relying on both qualitative and quantitative information to demonstrate where and how ILO has contributed to the SDGs • The format for such a ‘Performance Report’ ought to be mapped out in advance and planned, with expectations for various source material and data to inform such a document. Clear roles and responsibilities need to be assigned, at both global and country levels 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and possibly adjust the format and plan for populating an ILO ‘Performance Report,’ given that data/information from ongoing monitoring and ILO evaluations and reviews will be the critical source material • Drafting of a ‘straw man’ report (based on current ILO Implementation Report) as a mechanism to gain clarity and agreement about report format and content • Conduct formal internal vetting process of Performance Report within the ILO, potentially involving external reviewers. Since such a Performance Report would draw on both qualitative and quantitative information, this may ensure its credibility. • Draw on the work and experience being gained in other UN agencies that might have application to the ILO’s development of their own SDG Performance Report (EVAL). This could be done through UNEG.

2. Strategy and Plan for aligning the SDGs and DW Agenda

<p>Refine <u>strategy for ILO Implementation of the SDGs</u>. A broad strategy has been put in place, serving as the basis for the ILO Implementation Plan. It recognizes that, particularly in the early years, monitoring and review are important elements of this strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To monitor progress of SDG implementation⁴ • To assess ILO's own capacities "to regularly compile, support & provide global estimations for such an array of statistical indicators...both at the central and field levels"⁵ • "To be ready to play a significant role in the UN's annual follow-up and review of progress towards the 2030 goals and targets"⁶ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct diagnostic or assessment exploring ILO 'readiness' to implement, monitor and eventually evaluate the SDGs. This work could help advise ILO management on some of the technical aspects concerning SDG implementation that could have an immediate impact in terms of some of the strategic and implementation decisions and a longer-term impact associated with the monitoring, evaluation and reporting on ILO performance and contribution to the SDGs (<i>Continuation of work by EVAL that has initially produced this table</i>) • Emphasize the 'learning' associated with the monitoring/review/evaluation aspects of SDG implementation in the ILO. These all represent 'feedback mechanisms' that yield objective information on 'progress' of SDG implementation - information of a formative nature that can be particularly useful for ILO management to make adjustments, as needed • Consider using systematic evaluation to clarify 'progress' on ILO implementation of the SDGs (according to its own Implementation Plan) • Focus on clarifying the suitable metrics and results management/performance elements needed to report on ILO contribution to achievement of SDG goals and targets. • Review, share and adapt of some of the experience of other UN agencies in terms of their approach to monitoring progress of the SDGs and 'lessons' to be gained from the experience of other agencies.
--	---

3. ILO Activities supporting SDG Implementation

<p>Address the limitations of the country-level <u>focus of Agenda 2030</u>, for both implementation of the SDGs & the monitoring & systematic follow-up & review. Implications are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumes adequate capacity exists within the ILO Country Office as well as within the country itself. • Significant challenges at the front-end, associated with: implementation of the SDGs, being able to monitor & report on progress, & capacity issues in carrying out country-led evaluation • 'Country context' will create unique situations • ILO might consider identifying 2 or 3 country cases/'pilots' (or, a country within each Region) where special efforts would be made to work directly with the Country Office from early on to address each of these challenges and, in so doing, to assess and document 'lessons' that would have application to other Country Offices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct 'Needs Analysis' associated with SDG implementation in the ILO, including monitoring and evaluation capacity at the country level – focus on the selected Case Countries • Review the 'theory of change' using the Case Country examples to determine where and how SDGs have been built into the DWCP – ensuring adequate detailing of indicators, information sources and performance measurement strategy • Create Guidance for Country Programme Reviews (CPR) to ensure that all issues relevant to SDG implementation and measuring ILO 'contribution' to the SDGs are built within the CPR process • Disseminate formal Guidance document and advice to all SDG 'pilots' to ensure that a systematic assessment is carried out that addresses all key issues, as well as reporting back in a common format, for purposes of 'learning' from cross-case comparisons.
<p>Conduct <u>national-level monitoring and evaluation (M&E) capacity assessment and development of plans to build M&E capacity</u>, as Agenda 2030 notes that 'systematic follow-up & review' will be 'voluntary & country-led'. These capacity assessments should result in capacity support plans that address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak results-oriented monitoring capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct country-level M&E 'readiness assessments' that will provide the necessary diagnostic to identify capacity gaps and strategy for building a sustainable monitoring and evaluation capacity • Disseminate Formal Guidance Document and support to Country Officers and others for facilitating the conduct of country-specific M&E Readiness Assessments; development of national M&E capacity development plans in DWCP and National

⁴ ILO (2016), paragraph 11-12.

⁵ ILO (2016), paragraph 79.

⁶ ILO (2016) paragraph 97.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little/no capacity for systematic Evaluation & analysis • Insufficient credible data 	<p>Sustainable Development Strategies (NSDS); and assessment of adequacy of country-level monitoring and evaluation capability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborate through UNEG on national-level M&E capacity assessment and development of relevant agenda to support national-level monitoring and evaluation capacity building (EVAL)
<p><u>Support and train the tripartite constituents of the ILO</u>, noting that national level M&E systems are generally led by one of a Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Planning or the Office of the President/Prime Minister. Generally speaking, Ministries of Labour are not prime movers or participants in the development of M&E systems, nor are they generally considered to be first adopters or pilots when M&E systems are being introduced.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide support and training for ILO social partners to become more involved in national evaluation systems to enhance their capacity to conduct independent evaluations of their progress towards the SDGs • Provide Guidance documents targeted at Country Offices and others for identifying elements associated with national monitoring and evaluation capacity building, along with ‘tips’ on how to strengthen national Evaluation Systems. The capacity building could take many forms.⁷ (Note: under the UNDAF, according to MULTILATERALS, ILO will be expected to help fund M&E at the country level.) • Collaborate through UNEG, as part of UN system wide efforts, on national-level M&E capacity building with other UN agencies that may be implicated in the SDG/DW Agenda (EVAL)
<p><u>Build capacity to support SDG implementation in Country Offices (CO).</u> Quite apart from the Country cases or ‘pilots’, all ILO Country Offices will be facing challenges and needing support insofar as SDG implementation is concerned.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide Guidance package and “training/orientation’ to the COs and others to ensure that a comprehensive set of messages was being delivered insofar as SDG monitoring and evaluation was concerned. Some elements suggested for the Country Cases could be incorporated here for follow-through – for example, conduct of a front-end ‘Needs Analysis’ associated with SDG implementation, monitoring and evaluation. • Work with the Country Office Director to ensure that the evaluation of the DW agenda is a part of national review process.
<p>4. Monitoring SDG Implementation for the ILO</p>	
<p><u>Monitor progress of SDG implementation in the ILO</u>, particularly in the early years. This monitoring has been recognized by ILO senior management as an important element in moving forward on the SDGs⁸. This would be particularly true at the country level. Monitoring is one form of ‘feedback tool’ that can help advise ILO management on a number of operational issues associated with the integrated SDG/DW Agenda:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • some of the technical aspects concerning SDG implementation within the ILO • progress in meeting milestones according to the ILO Implementation Plan • a potential need to make adjustments to the ILO Implementation Strategy or Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and provide guidance and advice on what indicators and issues/aspects of the SDG implementation in the ILO to monitor, the most cost-effective way to carry out the monitoring activities, format for reporting, as well as logistical issues associated with the monitoring, analysis and reporting on ILO implementation of the SDGs (ILO Implementation Plan). This guidance and advice will be needed given the need to monitor at a global, regional and country level. Guidance to be developed to ensure consistency across countries/regions and overtime. • Provide ‘hands-on’ assistance in the first round of monitoring/reporting to help ensure that the exercise serves as a ‘learning’ exercise and not merely one of accountability; i.e. meeting milestones within the planned timeframe. A ‘straw man’ (template) report could be developed to serve to guide the monitoring exercise in its early implementation in the ILO.
<p>Participate actively in the <u>UN’s annual follow-up and review of progress</u> towards the 2030 goals and targets. The ILO Implementation Plan (paragraph 97) notes that “The ILO should be ready to play a significant role” (<u>Monitoring of Progress in Achievement of SDGs</u>). While this has not yet been well-defined, it is imperative for the ILO to be an active participant for purposes of:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This relates to item 1.3 above, about clarifying a format and information sources for performance measurement/monitoring of SDG implementation and ILO contribution to progress on relevant SDGs. • Ensure appropriate monitoring of high-level discussions concerning the global-level reviews, the regional reviews and the national-level reviews, some 22 of which are expected to be

⁷ See UNEG (2012).

⁸ ILO Implementation Plan, Version 1.0 (19.2.16), para. 11-12.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Helping define what is actually being monitored and evaluated re SDG ‘progress’ so that the DW Agenda is a part of the national review process of the SDGs • Participating in the monitoring, review and analysis per se so that DW Agenda and ILO contribution to the SDGs does not become marginalized in the annual UN review and reporting 	<p>initiated in July 2016⁹, as little is still known of the ‘follow-up and review’ process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide guidance to country cases/pilots on approach to performance measurement associated with the SDG/DW Agenda, using the tools of both monitoring and evaluation. This could come in various forms (Guidance document, training, ‘train-the-trainer’ sessions). • Collaborate UN system-wide with other Evaluation Entities in UNEG (in general) and with those agencies implicated in SDG/DW (in particular), to gain agreement and standardization on the measurement of ‘progress’. (EVAL) • Proactively work with the UN system mechanisms and in particular UNEG community, if necessary, to lobby for the inclusion of systematic evaluation as part of the SDG ‘follow-up and review’ process.
5. Reporting on SDG Implementation (Note that there are two forms of reporting)	
<p><u>Report progress on the ILO Implementation Plan</u>, seeking to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual reports to ILO management on how well ILO operations (globally, regionally and country-level) are meeting the milestones of the SDG/DW Plan devised by ILO management • Operational intelligence and ‘lessons learned’ that serves as important feedback to determine whether or not there is a need to make adjustments to the SDG/DW Strategy and/or Implementation Plan. • This form of reporting relates to item 2.1 and item 4.1 above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Format early versions of the reports used to gauge progress of the ILO SDG Implementation Plan • Provide guidance to country cases/pilots on reporting at a country level – for example, via a checklist and advice, as needed • Conduct assessment of early versions (say Year 1 and 2) of the ILO’s annual Progress Report on SDG Implementation • Consult with other UNEG members to seek to identify models used in other agencies that might have application for the ILO.’s own monitoring and reporting (EVAL)
<p><u>Report achievements of the SDG/DW Agenda</u> that would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link as input to the UN system’s annual reporting on SDG progress • Reporting on achievements as per the ‘theory of change’, that would draw on monitoring and evaluation information to illustrate and demonstrate ILO contribution at a global and country levels. For internal as well as external audiences, for governance purposes (accountability and learning) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This relates to items 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 4.2 above, on ways to ensure ILO would have an ability to tell its SDG ‘performance story’. For example, the elaboration of the ‘theory of change’ and clarifying ILO ‘pathways’ at all levels; working to ensure sufficient and relevant monitoring and evaluation at national/country levels to help inform any ILO global report. • Pilot formats and process at the global, regional and country levels for reporting as well as the assessment of content and eventual determination of an appropriate “SDG Performance Report” for the ILO. This could likely involve a few iterations over the first few years of SDG implementation. • Work with other relevant agencies that might be implicated in SDG/DW activities in the context of UN system wide efforts and in particular through UNEG. Work towards a standardized approach to reporting on ‘performance’. Consider the work and experience being gained in other UN agencies that might have application to the ILO’s development of their own SDG Performance Report.
6. Formative Evaluation of SDG/DW Implementation and Evaluability Assessments (preparing for evaluation)	
<p>Conduct a <u>formative (implementation) evaluation</u>. There are several reasons why is important, particularly with new initiatives, such as the implementation of the SDG/DW Agenda. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management needs to know early on in the life of an initiative critical issues impacting performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct formative/implementation evaluation of selected country cases or ‘pilots’. This should be carried out in Year 2 or 3 of SDG implementation, say 2018. Linked to evaluation of DWCP.

⁹ ILO (2016b).

<p>that may require adjustments to operational delivery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where monitoring data can inform on progression particular indicators, an evaluation or some form of systematic survey or study is needed to help understand such issues as: How well the initiative is being implemented; whether delivery is cost-effective; why certain results are/are not being achieved; etc. • Validation of the Theory of Change and results framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a Guidance document and checklists, illuminating issues and relevant methods, reporting format, etc. could serve as a template for broader application of implementation evaluations • Potentially carry out implementation evaluations as ‘self-evaluations’, assuming that there was sufficient oversight provided by EVAL and/or Evaluation focal points/Regional Evaluation Officers • Periodically review formative evaluation by EVAL to help ensure ‘quality control’ if self-evaluation became the norm • Work with other relevant agencies that, in the context of UN system wide efforts and in particular through UNEG, might be implicated in SDG/DW activities to link with related relevant initiatives • Consider conducting synthesis review and meta-analysis of these formative evaluation
<p>Conduct an <u>evaluability assessment</u> early on in the life of an initiative, providing management with several pieces of critical information important both for short-term and longer-term needs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The adequacy of indicators, measurement strategies and mechanisms put in place to track SDG/DW progress. This has immediate implications for the ability of ILO officials to manage their initiatives and report back on SDG progress/performance to serve relevant country, regional and/or global reporting requirements. • In assessing issues reflective of the ‘theory of change’, an evaluability assessment is an important measure to help ensure that a future evaluation would be capable of measuring the effectiveness and contribution of the ILO initiative to SDG progress. <p>In spite of considerable efforts (and gains) by the ILO to improve its approach to RBM, there continue to be problems with monitoring and evaluation approaches for ILO projects and programmes. Much of this originates with an incomplete articulation of the ‘theory of change’ at the development stage.¹⁰ The introduction of the SDGs only compounds the need to clarify ‘pathways’.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This relates to items 1.1 and 1.2 above, with guidance on developing ‘theory of change’ via documents, possible workshops, seminars and potentially direct work with managers in a small number of specific cases. • Develop Guidance documents on evaluability assessment based on the considerable material already available with ILO Evaluation Office that could be adapted as necessary to specific SDG-related initiatives • Conduct evaluability assessments at the time of conduct of a formative evaluation to avoid excessive burden • Carry out evaluability assessments to determine the ability to enable assessment of ILO contribution to the SDGs at a country and global level (in addition to project, programme and policy levels) since there will be a need to report on progress and performance at a national and global level. Would require work with ILO Policy Outcome leads to advise on this • Work with one or two country cases (as identified above) could incorporate review in the context of an evaluability assessment to assess the ability for future assessment of the contribution of Decent Work Country Programmes to the SDGs
7. Effectiveness (Summative) Evaluation of SDG/DW Implementation	
<p>Conduct an ‘<u>effectiveness evaluation</u>’ that uses the theory of change as the basis for evaluating how successful an intervention is in meeting expected results, relying on both qualitative and quantitative information. With aspirational goals of the SDGs, their achievement may require the full 15-year period (or more); i.e. impacts may not be observed and measured for many years. That said, important information is needed, long before 2030, on the effectiveness of interventions (as well as their relevance, efficiency and sustainability).</p> <p>This will serve as important (more in-depth) feedback to inform ILO management on any adjustments that</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct in say year 5 (2021) a comprehensive evaluation of the ILO’s implementation of the SDG/DW Agenda, addressing issues of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. The scope of such an evaluation would need to be developed and also include other SDG-related issues such as ‘partnerships’, etc. The intent would be to provide ILO management with more insight into operational implications of the SDG/DW Agenda, achievements to date and point out any adjustments that may be needed in the ILO Implementation Strategy/Plan or specific operations at the country, regional and global levels • Such an evaluation could serve as a development/learning exercise that would hopefully have application for future more demanding ‘impact evaluations’ – for example: Development of a common framework for evaluation and analysis so as to allow

¹⁰ Lahey, R. (2015).

<p>may need to be made in terms of ILO interventions at a country, regional or global level.</p>	<p>for comparison of progress assessment across countries. This would improve the potential for drawing common ‘lessons’ across countries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such an evaluation would also be an occasion to gain a better appreciation for the country-led review process that has been mandated to report on SDG progress at the country level. It would offer an entry point for ILO with the UN system to potentially work with selected countries (and relevant UNEG partners) to help sort out and clarify the roles and responsibilities as well as the coordination mechanisms for any future evaluation • Consider conducting Synthesis reviews and/or meta-analysis of these formative evaluations
<p>8. Outcome Evaluations and Impact Evaluation (of selected ILO Interventions) focus on contribution, impact and effects</p>	
<p><u>Address technical issues for measuring impact and attributing observed change</u> to any one agency, intervention or set of interventions. These issues are a common challenge for the Evaluation function. It is critical however, both for accountability and learning purposes, to understand whether long-term impacts have been achieved (or are likely to be achieved) and the extent that the interventions of the agency had a contributing effect to that change.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and align the approach to outcome and DWCP evaluations in ILO with the SDGs, ensuring appropriate coverage consider global, thematic and national review process and focus, and advocating use of relevant methods, such as the use of Contribution Analysis, using both qualitative and quantitative information to assess outcomes, contribution and progress toward impacts • Conduct targeted impact assessments building on EVAL’s recently completed concept mapping on impact evaluation in the ILO and development of proposed Impact Evaluation Framework for ILO • Ensure that all evaluations, from project to strategic level, provide relevant data for showing the achievements of relevant SDGs and the ILO contribution to this • Work with UNEG partners, in the context of UN system wide efforts, to develop a common framework for evaluation and analysis so as to allow for comparison of progress assessment across countries. This will improve the potential for drawing common ‘lessons’ across countries (without falling into the trap of ‘one size fits all’)
<p>Recognize that <u>political and process issues</u> around the SDGs add some uncertainty regarding evaluation strategy and architecture. For example, will ‘follow-up and review processes’ (national, regional and global) include rigorous, evidence-based ‘evaluation’?</p> <p>From a national perspective, Agenda 2030 commits UN Members to ‘systematic follow-up and review’ which will be ‘voluntary and country-led’. The implications of these terms are not yet well defined, and so cause some uncertainty in the use of evaluation to support SDG implementation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will national-level evaluations take a long-term view, focus on identifying achievements, examine policy and programme implementation and effectiveness, and build well-reasoned and supported cases for claims of progress? <p>From a global perspective, what vehicle will become the single visible evaluation where organizations would want to see their contribution and their relevance to country progress towards the SDGs be duly reflected?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with specific country offices and UN system partners (including through UNEG) in addition to the national-level capacity building (noted above), to help build country-level capacity to demand and use the results of evaluation in programme and policy-level decision-making; i.e. informing-persuading national-level decision-makers of the ‘value of evaluation’. • Ensure that ‘evaluation’ is included as part of the ILO support to developing and implementing national sustainable development strategies • Work with COs and relevant UN system partners (including UNEG) to ensure that evaluation of the DW Agenda is a part of the SDG national review processes • Work with COs and relevant UNEG partners to help sort out and clarify the roles and responsibilities as well as the coordination mechanisms for any evaluation