



Governing Body

310th Session, Geneva, March 2011

GB.310/PFA/4/1(Rev.)

Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee

PFA

FOURTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

Results-based strategies 2011–15: Evaluation strategy – Strengthening the use of evaluations

Overview

Issues covered

This report summarizes the ILO evaluation strategy for 2011–15.

Financial implications

Full implementation of the strategy will have financial implications which are not quantified. The strategy will be adapted to take account of resource decisions, as necessary.

Decision required

Paragraph 37.

References to other Governing Body documents and ILO instruments

GB.310/PFA/4/2; GB.309/PFA/5/4; GB.309/PFA/5/5; GB.294/PFA/8/4; GB.294/PV, para. 208; GB.309/11(Rev.).

ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization.

I. Introduction

1. The Governing Body adopted the evaluation policy and strategy in 2005 at its 294th Session.¹ This established a foundation based on international evaluation norms and standards, and aimed to reinforce accountability, transparency and quality improvement. It also aimed to contribute to policy-making and decision-making within a results-based management system to optimize the allocation of resources and their overall management.
2. In November 2010, the Governing Body discussed the overall progress reported by the Office,² and also the findings, conclusions and recommendations of an independent external evaluation of the evaluation function.³ A general conclusion of the independent external evaluation (IEE) was that the ILO's evaluation policy is generally sound and needs little modification. The real challenge identified was implementation, requiring a stronger link between evaluation and decision-making and based on a secure resource base.⁴ A separate paper on the implementation of the IEE recommendations is before this session of the Committee.⁵
3. Overall, the 2005 evaluation policy and strategy have been implemented, including the creation of a central Evaluation Unit (EVAL) in March 2005 which has overall responsibility for implementing the ILO's evaluation policy; the presentation of annual evaluation reports (AER) to the Governing Body; the establishment of an Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) to ensure involvement by ILO managers in the planning, implementation and follow-up to evaluation recommendations and lessons learned; and the allocation of resources for training activities for capacity building.
4. The revised strategy for 2011–15 builds upon the strengths of the previous approach and its objectives and outcomes and introduces changes where needed.⁶ It encompasses the key principles and values as defined by the United Nations Evaluation Group for evaluation functions, and concentrates on reinforcing independence, credibility and the usefulness of evaluation work. The evaluation strategy also embraces the key guiding principles of the ILO Strategic Policy Framework 2010–15 (SPF). These call upon evaluation to strengthen knowledge development and accountability in the areas of decent work, international labour rights and standards and the ILO Declaration on Social Justice

¹ GB.294/PV, para. 208 and GB.294/PFA/8/4: *A new policy and strategic framework for evaluation at the ILO*.

² GB.309/11(Rev.), paras 104–120 and GB.309/PFA/5/4.

³ GB.309/11(Rev.), paras 166–187 and GB.309/PFA/5/5.

⁴ GB.309/PFA/5/5, paras 5–14 and recommendation 3(ii).

⁵ GB.310/PFA/4/2.

⁶ Objectives and outcomes of the 2005 ILO evaluation policy (GB.294/PFA/8/4, para. 10):

- improve Office-wide transparency and accountability for impact of ILO actions to support its constituents;
- strengthen the decision-making process by the policy organs and senior management based on sound assessment of effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, impact and sustainability of ILO activities;
- contribute feedback for learning and ongoing improvement of the ILO's work.

for a Fair Globalization (2008), as well as to enhance the relevance and usefulness of evaluation to constituents.

5. Evaluation in the ILO should contribute to decision-making through evidence-based assessment of strategies, policies, programmes and projects. The overall approach will continue to adhere to already established measures to ensure the independence and transparency of the evaluation function. New measures will aim to improve the use of evaluation at governance and management levels, and by ILO constituents.

II. Outcomes

6. The evaluation strategy is operationalized within the context of the SPF and the biennial programme and budgets. The 2011–15 evaluation strategy is clustered under three main outcomes. These broadly align with those set out in the previous strategy but place greater emphasis on areas needing more focused attention as recommended by the IEE.

Outcome 1: Improved use of evaluation by ILO constituents and management for governance

Strategy

Improve the effectiveness of the Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC)

7. The EAC was established in 2006 to promote institutional follow-up of independent evaluation findings and recommendations and to provide advice to the Director-General on the adequacy of progress made by the Office in this regard. The EAC will retain its advisory role but will become more active in reviewing and advising the Director-General on the overall evaluation programme of work.
8. The scope of EAC functions includes all independent evaluations but with particular emphasis on strategy and policy evaluations, country programme evaluations and major thematic evaluations. All managers are accountable for ensuring proper use of relevant evaluation findings, lessons learned and recommendations. Without substituting the reporting and accountability obligations of managers, the role of the EAC will be strengthened to provide additional assurance to the Director-General that follow-up to evaluation recommendations is adequate and regularly conducted.
9. This will be achieved through more frequent meetings of the Committee for internal dialogue on the implementation of the ILO evaluation policy and strategy, including the choice of independent evaluation topics and recommendations to the Director-General or EVAL, as appropriate. The Committee will expand its role to ensure that adequate opportunities are found for constituents to regularly consult on the plans, outcomes and follow-up to evaluations, such as during regional meetings, through background studies to the International Labour Conference recurrent discussions or as contributions to technical reports. With regard to specific evaluations, Executive Directors and Regional Directors will be more directly involved in the follow-up based on a more rigorous tracking system.

Select high-level evaluation topics for strategic use

10. At the governance level, evaluation aims to generate insights into organizational-level performance within the context of the results-based management system that in turn feed into high-level decision-making about policies, strategies and accountability. Senior

management and the Governing Body will be involved in identifying priorities for evaluation, determining the timing and intended uses of each high-level 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.

11. A rolling three-year evaluation programme of work will be presented to the Governing Body each November. This plan will be updated annually. Evaluation topics will be selected according to the established criteria, as specified in existing evaluation guidelines, following consultations with constituents to discern their priorities and incorporate related criteria.
12. A list of proposed topics for 2011, 2012 and 2013 is provided in the Appendix. This list is the outcome of internal consultations involving the EAC, senior management, the Bureau for Workers' Activities (ACTRAV), the Bureau for Employers' Activities (ACT/EMP) and selected programme managers directly linked to the topics under consideration. The list will also be updated based on Governing Body discussions each year.

Annual evaluation reporting is based on analysis of lessons learned and recommendations from evaluations

13. The IEE recommended that evaluation results be better integrated into the ILO programming process linked to the achievement of high-level results. This has been facilitated through the close relationship of EVAL with all the other units under ED/MAS, which allows for mainstreaming lessons of experience by management and alerting EVAL about areas deserving its attention. While the Office will continue to submit summaries of individual strategy evaluations and report on follow-up, it will also document the Office's effectiveness in achieving short- and medium-term objectives by providing each biennium, as part of the annual evaluation report, a synthesis of conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned from project and other forms of evaluations. The performance aspects flagged can in turn support decisions related to the programme and budget preparation and implementation planning and reporting. This input will complement a reinforced effort to apply various forms of evaluation as an integral part of the programming process. In addition, the reasons for the incomplete use of evaluation results will be reviewed from the perspective of relevance, focus and quality. Finally, the Office will continue to improve the evaluability of the performance measures as well as establish a more systematic means of acquiring performance data routinely through close cooperation between the Bureau of Programming and Management (PROGRAM) and EVAL.

Measurement

Indicator	Baseline	End target
1.1. The frequency and quality of EAC decisions and advice on relevance of evaluation programme of work to GB policy decisions and strategic objectives of the Office; adequacy of follow-up to evaluation results	Three meetings in 2010; topics discussed for coming year only; no discussion of strategic use of evaluation recommendations	EAC convenes meetings and forums where analysis and dialogue on evaluation topics and follow-up lead to documented plans and follow-up for strategic use
1.2. Annual evaluation report synthesizes recommendations and lessons learned based on evaluations	Reporting on implementation of evaluation strategy without analysis of broader ILO effectiveness	Annual evaluation reporting based on analysis of evaluation reports

Indicator	Baseline	End target
1.3. High-level evaluations assess the contributions of technical and decent work country strategies to the Strategic Policy Framework and P&B outcomes	External quality rating of evaluations; 2005–09 (from IEE)	High-level evaluations better inform governance-level strategic and programming decisions
Biennial milestones		
2010–11	2012–13	2014–15
1.1. 2011: EAC schedule, procedures and deliverables specified in new action plan; formal record of recommendations for evaluation programme of work (2012–13); record of EAC advice on use of specific recommendations	Four meetings per year; record of recommendations for evaluation programme of work (2013–14); record of EAC advice on use of specific recommendations	Four meetings per year; formal record of recommendations for evaluation programme of work (2015–16); record of EAC advice on use of specific recommendations
1.2. Performance information in annual evaluation report based on analysis of evaluation reports; results discussed by Programme, Financial and Administrative Committee (PFAC)	2013: Improved annual evaluation report based on PFAC feedback; results feed into 2014–15 P&B	2015: ILO annual evaluation report used in developing new SPF and P&B
1.3. Results of internal peer review of high-level evaluations 2010–11 register satisfactory quality	Results of internal peer review of high-level evaluations 2012–13 register good quality	Results of external evaluation show high satisfaction with RBM link and usability of high-level evaluations 2010–15

Outcome 2: Harmonized Office-wide evaluation practice to support transparency and accountability

Strategy

Harmonize and standardize types of evaluations and associated roles and responsibilities to improve value and efficiency

14. The Office aims to clarify the means of consolidating evaluation work, particularly at project level, in the context of programmes or countries, or clustered thematically, in order to gain efficiencies and to reinforce organizational learning and accountability.
15. Since 2005, the ILO evaluation function has incorporated a mix of centralized and decentralized evaluation responsibilities. Independent strategy and Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) evaluations are governance-level evaluations managed or coordinated directly by EVAL, and are considered *centralized*; all other types of evaluations are *decentralized* since their direct management, including resourcing, is primarily the responsibility of sectors and regions.
16. Decentralized evaluations focus on programmatic areas more directly under the control of managers, such as technical cooperation and implementation of country programmes, review of technical interventions from all sources of funds, including the Regular Budget Supplementary Account (RBSA) and Regular Budget Technical Cooperation (RBTC).
17. The evaluation policy provides an operational framework that serves different needs and is aimed at different levels as further described below and in table 1. The Executive Directors and Regional Directors of those managing decentralized evaluations will approve the topics and take responsibility for completing the evaluation work according to the

evaluation standards. For evaluations of workers' and employers' technical cooperation, ACTRAV and ACT/EMP will be responsible. For quality control purposes, the independent evaluation terms of reference, budgets, the selection of consultants and the determination of methodologies will be overseen by sectoral or regional evaluation officers, and the final report approved by EVAL. The role of EVAL will focus on technically advising and supporting sectors and regions as requested, and will also profile evaluation results and share experiences in order to boost organizational learning. Responsibility for conducting and financing decentralized evaluations will be with those managing the projects or programmes.

18. Strategy evaluations to assess the Office's effectiveness and impact with regard to specific outcomes will continue. Within the frameworks provided by the SPF and programme and budgets, these *high-level evaluations* will focus on continued relevance, as well as how to improve efficiency, effectiveness, potential for impact and sustainability of the associated SPF strategies. In consultation with the regions, EVAL will conduct at least one independent DWCP evaluation each year. Thematic, project and all forms of internal review and self-evaluations will be decentralized.
19. Guidelines and good practices for *impact evaluations* and *joint evaluations* will be elaborated under the new evaluation strategy. The first, impact evaluation, responds to the growing demand among constituents and international partners for more credible assessment of the impact of ILO programmes and projects. This form of evaluation can be complex, time consuming and expensive, frequently involving systematic collection of data to establish baselines required for the rigorous analytical work for evidence-based assessments to establish or validate results. The second, joint evaluation, addresses the expanding portfolio of evaluation work being planned, managed and financed jointly by the ILO and national and international partners, the most prevalent of which have been linked to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and joint programmes of the UN at country level. EVAL, drawing upon existing good practices from IPEC and other technical programmes, will in collaboration with the Partnerships and Development Cooperation Department (PARDEV), develop guidance and quality standards and will offer advisory services for these evaluation types as resources permit.

Table 1. Types, designated responsibilities and timing of high-level and decentralized evaluations

	Type of evaluation	Main purpose	Responsibility	Timing
Governance-level Independent	Strategy, policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Review major policies or institutional issues – Assess impact, effectiveness and benefits of ILO core strategies as described in P&B – Improve strategies and policies, and the functioning of the Office 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – EVAL to plan and manage – Senior management proposing and Governing Body confirming topics – EAC reviewing follow-up 	Two each year; additional as mandated and resourced
Governance-level Independent/internal	Decent Work Country Programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Assess the extent to which significant impact is being made towards decent work and related Country Programme Outcomes set in the P&B – Feed into country tripartite dialogue on impact, effectiveness and relevance of ILO action at the country level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – EVAL to plan and manage – Regional Offices responsible for financing internal country programme reviews 	EVAL will conduct at least one each year and support regions to internally evaluate a number of DWCPs

	Type of evaluation	Main purpose	Responsibility	Timing
Decentralized Independent/internal	Thematic evaluation	– Develop cross-cutting lessons, including success stories to innovate and feed into sectoral/regional learning on specific technical interventions and strategies	– Technical sectors, other technical groups and regions to plan and manage – EVAL to oversee and support as required	Based on workplans of thematic/impact evaluations
	Impact evaluation	– Assess effects and impact of specific policy and programme interventions on beneficiaries	– Technical programmes and regions to resource	
Decentralized External/joint	Joint evaluation	– Assess jointly with partner organizations, programmes where the ILO is one of several managing and implementing joint programmes	– Management of ILO input to evaluation supervised by regional or sector-level evaluation officers – EVAL provides oversight on quality and compliance – Cost to be covered by joint programme	Not subject to a formal planning and reporting schedule
Decentralized Independent, internal or self	Project ¹	– Assess projects for relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and contribution to broader impact – Appropriateness of design to the ILO's strategic and national decent work programme frameworks	– Executive Directors and Regional Directors responsible for ensuring application of ILO evaluation policy – Management of evaluation supervised by regional or sector-level evaluation officers – EVAL provides oversight – Cost of evaluation to be included in project budget	Mid-term or final or as stipulated in the project evaluation plan

¹ Independent for project budgets above US\$1 million; internal or self-evaluations for others. Internal and self-evaluations of projects with budgets above \$500,000 will continue to be monitored for quality.

Upgrade and expand the use of decentralized evaluations

20. A comprehensive approach will be established by the Office to plan evaluations of different types involving sectors and regions. All regions and sectors will develop two-year rolling workplans of decentralized evaluations that can be discussed across the Office so that opportunities for collaboration and consolidation can be identified. This will also involve planning how to use internal and self-evaluation findings. The timing, scoping and orientation of evaluations will be verified to see that these respond to management and constituents' interests, are relevant, and address accountabilities for performance.

21. The quality of internal and self-evaluations will be reviewed by EVAL and its findings reported to the EAC and the Governing Body. Validation of self-evaluation reports will be carried out through a random sampling process, risk-related selection, or as part of a strategy or country programme evaluation. This work will be facilitated by IT-based compilation and analysis of the reports.

Measurement

Indicator	Baseline	Target 2010–15
2.1. By 2015, 100 per cent of Decent Work Country Programmes and projects would have mechanisms in place for	n.a.	Results of periodic ex post surveys; reporting of constituent response and follow-up show 80 per cent of evaluations used by constituents

Indicator	Baseline	Target 2010–15
regularly engaging constituents in the use of evaluation processes		100 per cent of final project reports document constituents' involvement and sustainability plans
2.2. Upgrade and expand the use of evaluations for management (decentralized)	Count of self, internal, thematic and impact evaluations conducted by sectors and regions (2009)	All regions and sectors have biennial evaluation plans that link to management accountability and organizational learning
Biennial milestones		
2010–11	2012–13	2014–15
2.1. 2011: Initial survey to constituents based on 2010 evaluations completed sets baseline measure	2013: At least a 25 per cent improvement in reported use of evaluations by constituents over 2011 levels	2015: at least a 50 per cent improvement in reported use of evaluations by constituents over 2011 levels
2.2. 2011: 20 per cent increase in use of self-evaluation to address organizational issues; 20 per cent use of project final progress report	All internal and self-evaluations accessible and searchable in the ILO's database	80 per cent use of project final progress report (self-evaluation) for projects above US\$500,000; results of validation exercise measure validity and reliability of evaluation and reporting

Outcome 3: Evaluation capability expanded through enhanced knowledge, skills and tools

Strategy

Develop evaluation capacity

22. To harmonize evaluation work within a single policy framework and strategy, the ILO has developed an internal network of evaluation professionals and focal points. A major strategy component will be to further institutionalize this network to effectively manage the range of decentralized evaluation activities, harmonize the roles and responsibilities of decentralized evaluation staff and focal persons, and standardize approaches to decentralized evaluations, including monitoring of follow-up.
23. The evaluation network currently provides the main means of ensuring that evaluation is integrated into the design of ILO technical strategies, technical cooperation and services. Improving the professional knowledge base of the evaluation network through training, knowledge sharing and hands-on evaluation experience will be a priority. Specific initiatives will address identified problem areas such as the quality and appropriateness of recommendations and lessons learned.

Develop evaluation capacity of constituents

24. A second priority is to more systematically support evaluation capacity and practice among ILO constituents for assessing the performance of their programmes to support full and productive employment and decent work for all. Such national evaluation capacity and practice are vital for improving performance in terms of the quality, targeting and sustainability of national policies and programmes. The Office will also reinforce the results-focused orientation of constituents through successful experiences with joint evaluation activities.

25. The evaluation strategy will aim to improve synergies within the Office to coordinate support to constituents in developing national capacities for evaluation and related activities. This will be partly achieved through training in regions and better guidance and communication. The International Training Centre in Turin will be a key partner for this.

Improve use of knowledge systems

26. A proactive approach to knowledge sharing is intended to strengthen organizational learning and improvements in ILO technical work. The Office has developed an online evaluation database called iTrack, which stores, shares and facilitates the use of evaluation reports, findings, lessons learned and recommendations.
27. The IEE recommended improving the evaluation knowledge system by making this functionality more user-friendly. Improvements to iTrack will focus on making the system more demand-responsive and will be integrated with Office-wide ongoing efforts to develop a new knowledge management system, particularly its “policy track” focusing on the effectiveness of different policies as applied in specific country contexts.

Measurement

Indicator	Baseline	2010–15 target
3.1. Evaluation capacity and practice among ILO staff and constituents improved	Number of staff and constituents receiving technical training and hands-on support (2009)	By end of 2015, 225 additional constituents and 225 ILO officials develop specialized evaluation skills related to evaluation ¹
3.2. For evaluation network, standardized roles and responsibilities applied throughout the ILO	No standardized job descriptions for evaluation officers; compliance with evaluation guidelines unknown	Evaluation responsibilities specified in job descriptions; individual performance appraisals; roles and responsibilities standardized
Biennial milestones		
2010–11	2012–13	2014–15
3.1. 75 constituents and 75 ILO officials develop specialized knowledge through ILO training	75 constituents and 75 ILO officials develop specialized knowledge through ILO training	75 constituents and 75 ILO officials develop specialized knowledge through ILO training
3.2. 2011: ILO generic job descriptions developed for evaluation officers	2013: Internal governance document on evaluation network: approach, roles and responsibilities adopted and applied	

¹ Estimates assume regional evaluation networks support constituent capacity development.

III. Evaluation capacity

28. The evaluation function draws from multiple sources of funding, which are largely determined by the capacity or activity to be funded. At present, core evaluation positions within EVAL and the high-level strategic evaluations are primarily financed through the regular budget (RB). Monitoring and evaluation officers in the regions are financed from a mix of RB, PSI and RBSA funds. Dedicated monitoring and evaluation positions within specific projects and programmes are financed by those projects or programmes.

29. The majority of evaluations in the ILO are financed from programme or technical cooperation budgets.⁷ In accordance with the ILO evaluation policy, a minimum of 2 per cent of the total funds should be reserved to finance independent evaluations. These resources should adequately cover the full costs of managing, overseeing and conducting the evaluation, as is now the case for RBSA. Costs associated with managing and overseeing the technical cooperation evaluations will be directly charged to the dedicated budget line in the technical cooperation budget being evaluated. In addition, donors will be encouraged to permit flexibility to cluster evaluations of similar technical and/or geographic scopes, through combining resources to improve the value for money of evaluation work.

IV. Assumptions and risks

30. Improving the use of evaluation by the Governing Body, management, staff and constituents is the overarching theme of the new evaluation strategy. Implicit in all components and associated performance targets is an expectation that the ILO will continue to make progress in nurturing a culture for evaluation, where managers and constituents take ownership of the evaluation process as a means to improve their own areas of work. Related to this is the assumption that: (i) there is commitment to mainstream evaluation in decision-making at all governance levels of the Office; and (ii) evaluation capacity will be adequate to improve the relevance, methodology and learning opportunities to make evaluations useful.
31. The revised ILO evaluation strategy is ambitious. Current financial capacity gaps exist. Extra-budgetary resources will be sought to address training of constituents and develop customized training for specific evaluation types and applications.

V. Monitoring and evaluating the evaluation strategy

32. An annual report will be presented to the Governing Body synthesizing evaluation findings conducted in the previous year or years. The report will profile overall performance of the ILO in terms of the results framework of the SPF, and will identify where improvements can be made and organizational-level lessons learned. The report will also provide information on the quality of decentralized evaluation reports and regularly report on the outcome of follow-up to governance and management-level evaluations. This work will be facilitated by IT-based compilation and analysis of the reports.
33. An independent external review of the 2011–15 evaluation strategy will be undertaken before the end of 2015 to determine the success factors and any barriers to achieving the intended outcomes, and to recommend key areas for improvement.

VI. Conclusions and point for decision

34. This paper has drawn extensively on the recommendations emanating from the 2010 IEE and the discussion of its findings and recommendations at the November 2010 session of the Committee. It also has benefited from the workshop held in December 2010 with senior ILO officials to discuss the way forward.

⁷ The regions, through extra-budgetary and/or regular budget funds, should absorb the costs for the evaluation of DWCPs.

35. In sum, the proposed strategy calls for viewing evaluation in a more “horizontal” way to ensure that the ILO receives the greatest benefit from the knowledge created by evaluations. This requires a more visible and proactive role for the EAC to support the planning, reporting and follow-up to evaluations. The revised results-based evaluation strategy proposed in this document will facilitate oversight by the Governing Body, and will enable the Office to reinforce the use of evaluation for improved planning, monitoring and performance measurement at policy, strategy, programme and project levels.
36. The Committee is invited to indicate its initial views on the proposed programme of work for high-level evaluations proposed for 2012 and 2013.
37. *The Committee may wish to recommend to the Governing Body that the Director-General implement the evaluation strategy 2011–15, taking into account the comments and observations made by the Committee.*

Geneva, 9 February 2011

Point for decision: Paragraph 37

Appendix

Proposed high-level evaluations for 2011, 2012 and 2013

Year	Evaluation type	Topic of independent evaluation	Timing	Rationale
2011	Strategy	The world of work responds effectively to the HIV/AIDS epidemic (Outcome 8)	2011	Endorsed by the Governing Body
	DWCP	ILO's decent work programme for the State of Bahia, Brazil	2011	Case of a decent work programme covering an area of a country
	Strategy	Discrimination in employment and occupation is eliminated (Outcome 17)	2011	Endorsed by the Governing Body
Proposal 2012	DWCP	ILO Decent Work Country Programme of support	2012	The Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific has shortlisted Sri Lanka, Mongolia, Nepal or Bangladesh in that order; these are all maturely developed DWCPs
	Strategy	Comparative country assessment of integrated national, sectoral or local employment policies and programmes in their frameworks (Outcome 1)	2012	Report can contribute to follow-up to 2010 ILC recurrent discussion on employment; outcome not yet evaluated; indicator 1.2 (social finance) to be subject of thematic evaluation in 2011
	Strategy	Decent work in global supply chains (Better Work and sectoral lens)	2012	Proposed as a topical evaluation as background for ILC recurrent discussion in 2013
Proposal 2013	Strategy/DWCP	Field Structure Review (FSR) and constituent capacity development	2013	Governing Body mandated evaluation to review progress/effectiveness of FSR
	Institutional capacities	ILO's technical cooperation and resource mobilization strategy	2013	Proposed for 2013
	Strategy/institutional capacity	Knowledge strategy in the ILO (P&B theme for 2012–13)	2013	Proposed for 2013