

Background

1. Only 27 per cent of the world's population has adequate social security coverage and more than half lack any coverage at all. The ILO actively promotes policies and provides assistance to countries to help extend adequate levels of social protection to all members of society. Social security involves access to health care and income security, particularly in cases of old age, unemployment, sickness, invalidity, work injury, maternity or loss of a main income earner.
2. The adoption of Social Protection Floors Recommendation, 2012 (No. 202) constitutes an important milestone for the International Labour Organization (ILO). Since its creation in 1919, the ILO has actively promoted policies and provided assistance to member States to supply adequate levels of social protection to all members of society guided by international social security standards adopted by its tripartite constituents and in particular its flagship Convention concerning Minimum standards of social security, 1952 (No. 102). Access to an adequate level of social protection is already recognized in the Declaration of Philadelphia (1944) on the aims and purposes of the ILO, in subsequent ILO declarations and in a number of International labour standards, in particular the Social Protection Floors Recommendation, 2012 (No. 202), as a basic right of all individuals. Furthermore, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights recognize the right to social security for everyone¹.

Social security strategy

3. The ILO has developed a two-dimensional strategy that provides clear guidance on the future development of social security in countries at all levels of development. Its **horizontal** dimension aims at establishing and maintaining social protection floors as a fundamental element of national social security systems. The **vertical** dimension aims at pursuing strategies for the extension of social security that progressively ensure higher levels of social security to as many people as possible, guided by ILO social security standards. Together, these two dimensions aim at building comprehensive social security systems in line with national priorities, resources and circumstances².
4. The horizontal dimension of the ILO's strategy consists of the "rapid implementation of national Social Protection Floors, containing basic social security guarantees that ensure that over the life cycle all in need can afford and have access to essential health care and have income security at least at a nationally defined minimum level"³.
5. The vertical dimension is premised on the understanding that building comprehensive social security systems cannot stop at the ground floor of protection, ILO member States agreed in 2011 to pursue strategies that "seek to provide higher levels of income security and access to health care – taking into account and progressing towards in the first instance the coverage and benefit provisions of Convention No. 102 – to as many people as possible and as soon as

¹Extracted from <http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/social-security/lang--en/index.htm> (accessed September 29, 2016)

² http://www.ilo.org/secsoc/information-resources/publications-and-tools/books-and-reports/WCMS_SECSOC_34188/lang--en/index.htm

³ Ibid. Pg. 5.

Terms of Reference

possible; based, as a prerequisite, on policies aiming at encouraging participation of those in the informal economy and its gradual formalization”.⁴

6. The two dimensions of the ILO’s social security strategy aim at building and maintaining comprehensive and adequate social security systems which are coherent with national policy objectives. Coordination with other public policies is essential, ensuring that social security extension strategies are consistent with and conducive to the implementation of wider national social, economic and environmental development plans.⁵
7. This strategy is an important contribution of the ILO to the global debate on social protection floors and the future of social security at a time when a crisis-shaken world is seeking a new balance between economic and social policies to achieve sustainable development.⁶

The results framework

8. The Strategic Framework 2010-2015 identified social protection as one of its four strategic objectives: *Enhance the coverage and effectiveness of social protection for all*. There are five outcomes under this strategic objective (social security, working conditions, occupational safety and health, labour migration and HIV/AIDS). This evaluation looks specifically at outcome 4 “*More people have access to better managed and more gender-equitable social security benefits*” although elements of the other outcomes (6, 7 and 8) are clearly linked to this outcome. Outcome 4 had three indicators:
 - Indicator 4.1: Number of member States that, with ILO support, improve the knowledge and information base on the coverage and performance of their social security system.
 - Indicator 4.2: Number of member States that, with ILO support, develop policies improving social security coverage, notably of excluded groups.
 - Indicator 4.3: Number of member States that, with ILO support, improve the legal framework, general and financial management and/or tripartite governance of social security in line with international labour standards.
9. Social protection was revised to become outcome 3 in the transitional Strategic Plan 2016-2017 *Creating and extending social protection floors: Member States implement the Social Protection Floors Recommendation, 2012 (No. 202), and extend social protection systems as a means to accelerate poverty reduction, inclusive growth and social justice*. The transitional Strategic Plan identified the expected changes under this outcome:

In selected member States, social protection coverage will be extended in the context of national social dialogue processes with positive impacts on the income and well-being of women and men. A coordinated inter-agency response will have an impact on social protection debates and guide constituents’ priorities with regard to applying the ILO’s social protection floor approach.⁷

⁴ Ibid. Pg. 6.

⁵ Ibid. Pg. 7.

⁶ Ibid. Pg. 8.

⁷ Para 47 of GB.322/PFA/1.

“Building Social Protection Floors for All” Flagship Programme 2016

10. In 2016, the ILO launched a global flagship programme for social protection. This programme aims to make social protection floors (SPFs) a national reality in 21 target countries that still have underdeveloped or fragmented social protection systems. At the country level, the programme carries out assessments of social protection situations and provides recommendations to build nationally-defined social protection floors, supports the design of new schemes or reforms of existing schemes, supports their implementation and improves the operations of social protection systems. A global campaign supports the whole process to inform, train, and convince decision-makers of the importance of implementing social protection systems and developing partnerships to maximize the positive impacts.⁸
11. Monitoring and reporting on the flagship programme is supported by an online tool which has been developed by the social protection department to report on progress and track impacts through ILO work (M&E system). In addition, the department possesses statistical knowledge databases which will be included as a source of information (validation) for this evaluation.
12. ILO is co-chair of the Social Protection Inter-Agency Cooperation Board along with the World Bank. The ILO aims to influence national and global social protection debates, including joint inter-agency work and by reinforcing South-South cooperation. A strong focus for the future of ILOs work in the biennium to come is on promotion and implementation of social protection floors under the “One UN” initiative⁹.

Purpose of the evaluation:

13. In 2014, the EVAL rolling work plan identified the topic of “creating and extending social protection floors” as the high level strategy evaluation for 2017. The Governing Body endorsed the topic. There has not been an evaluation on this subject in more than five years. The evaluation was selected following consultations with management, the Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC) and the constituents. The purpose of the evaluation is mainly summative with formative aspects. It is to provide insight into the relevance, coherence, effectiveness and efficiency of the ILO’s strategy, programme approach, and interventions (actions) (summative). It is also intended to be forward looking and provide findings and lessons learned and emerging good practices for improved decision-making within the context of the next strategic framework and the Sustainable Development Goals (formative) as well as for the newly launched flagship programme. The evaluation report will be discussed in the November 2017 GB session together with the Office’s response to the evaluation report.

Scope:

14. The evaluation will consider all efforts of the Office in supporting achievement of Outcome 4 and under the transitional Strategic Plan outcome 3 and Outcome 3 of the 2016-17 P&B.
15. Given the breadth of action being taken, the scope of the evaluation will be narrowed to the time period 2012-2017. While the focus is on ILO’s work in achieving outcome 4 and outcome 3 (2016-17) the evaluation will also assess the ILOs contribution in global social protection floor strategies, policies and debates and its coordination within the Social Protection

⁸ ILO Global Flagship Programme: <http://www.social-protection.org/gimi/gess/ShowProject.action?lang=EN&id=3000> Accessed September 29th, 2016.

⁹ Para 77 pg. 17. Programme and Budget For the Biennium 2016-2017.



Terms of Reference

Interagency Cooperation Board (SPIAC-B)¹⁰, the Social Protection Floor Initiatives: One UN Social Protection Floor teams, with its multilateral and United Nations partners. ILOs work in knowledge management and sharing of experiences through the online platform: Social Protection Platform will also be examined.

16. The evaluation team will in its inception report further define the specific scope, a possible proposal will be to limit the focus of this evaluation on the achievements of the ILO vis à vis the Strategic Policy Framework, P&B and concentrate evaluation efforts on ILOs work in coordination and leadership role within the inter-agency working groups mentioned above and as identified as a distinct P&B area of work and inter-agency boards. This would enhance the formative nature of the evaluation report in helping ILO position itself for better effectiveness and impact in the post 2015 era. Similarly, the evaluation could identify other areas of particular areas to focus the bulk of its work.

Clients

17. The principal client for the evaluation is the Governing Body, which is responsible for governance-level decisions on the findings and recommendations of the evaluation. Other key stakeholders include the Director-General and members of the Senior Management Team at Headquarters, the Evaluation Advisory Committee, the Social Protection Department, Work Quality, ILOs field structure offices, ACTRAV and ACTEMP. It should also serve as a source of information for ILO donors, partners and policy makers.

Key Questions

18. The evaluation questions are based on the OECD DAC evaluation criteria of relevance and coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Outcome objectives created for the P&B strategy will serve as the basis for the evaluation questions. These questions will seek to address priority issues and concerns for the national constituents and other stakeholders. When designing the questions, the evaluation team will consider availability and reliability of data, how the answers will be used and if the data are regarded as credible. Further evaluation questions will be proposed and refined by the evaluation team during the inception report phase.
19. The evaluation will address the following questions:
 - To what extent is the design of the ILO Strategy for Outcome 4/3 relevant to global strategies on social protection floors and does it address the situation facing member States' governments and social partners?
 - To what extent has the ILO fulfilled its objective in social protection using, but not limited to, the SPF and P&B targets as a benchmark.

¹⁰ World Bank ILO UNDESA UNDP UNICEF UNHABITAT UN Women WFP WHO OECD IADB ISSA IMF FAO ADB UNESCO and Bilateral: AUSAID - Australia Belgium DFID - UK EUROPEAID France France-AFD Germany - Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development Germany - GIZ Finland Ireland Italy Mexico Netherlands South Africa German Government, KfW Development Bank



Terms of Reference

- To what extent has the ILO’s strategy been coherent and complementary (in its design and implementation) with regard to the approach on social protection internally and vis à vis its partners?
- To what extent have resources been used efficiently and the programme appropriately and adequately resourced?
- How has ILO external coordination (with constituents, UN partners, World Bank and bilateral donors) and internal coordination (between sectors, technical departments, regions and sub regions) promoted the realization of Outcome 4/3?
- To what extent have ILO actions had impact in the form of increased capacity, necessary tools and policy improvements needed to work towards the creation and expansion of social protection floors?
- To what extent have ILO interventions been designed and implemented in ways that have maximized ownership and sustainability at country level?

<u>Strategy context</u>	<u>Strategy implementation</u>	<u>Outcome</u>
<p>How does the strategy fit the needs of ILO constituents? How does the strategy deal with other international agencies and development partners working on social protection? Are key sectors, agencies, or individuals missing from the collaborative effort? How does the strategy address synergies and complementarities from other ILO SPF outcomes?</p>	<p>Are there adequate resources to implement the strategy as intended? Who is involved in carrying out the strategy? How are contributing outcomes being integrated in the strategy implementation? Is the strategy meeting GB and ILC expectations and affecting the target population? Are there data collection/monitoring to capture this information?</p>	<p>Can the SPF/P&B indicators track progress towards meeting objectives for the strategy? Is the intended target audience benefiting from the strategy? What are unintended outcomes of the strategy? What are the successes in carrying out the strategy?</p>

Methodology

20. The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with [Eval Protocol No 1: High-level Evaluation Protocol for Strategy and Policy Evaluations](#). This evaluation will be based upon the ILO’s evaluation policy and procedures which adhere to international standards and best practices, articulated in the OECD/DAC Principles and the Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the United Nations System approved by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) in April 2016.
21. EVAL proposes an effectiveness evaluation approach (also known as outcome evaluation or summative evaluation), which determines whether an initiative has achieved the intended

Terms of Reference

outcome. To this end, the evaluation will seek to determine the degree to which the ILO strategy for Outcome 4 (2012-15) and outcome 3 (2016-17) 2 and the results framework has actually translated into creating and expanding social protection floors. Further refinement of the methodology will be identified during the preparation of the Terms of Reference and the inception report.

22. The evaluation will be participatory. Consultations with member States, international and national representatives of trade union and employers' organizations, ILO staff at headquarters and in the field, United Nations partners, and other stakeholders will be done through interviews, meetings, focus groups, and electronic communication.
23. The gender dimension will be considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation. In terms of this evaluation, this implies involving both men and women in the consultation, evaluation analysis and evaluation team. Moreover the evaluators should review data and information that is disaggregated by sex and assess the relevance and effectiveness of gender-related strategies and outcomes to create and extend social protection for women and men. All this information should be accurately included in the inception report and final evaluation report.
24. The details of the methodology will be elaborated by the selected team of evaluators on the basis of the Terms of Reference (TORs) and documented in their proposal and their inception report, which are subject to EVAL's approval. It is expected that the evaluation team will apply mixed methods which draw on both quantitative and qualitative evidence and involve multiple means of analysis.
25. These include but are not limited to:
 - Desk review of relevant documents such as SPF/SP and P&B strategies for the period covered by the evaluation; outcome-based work planning (OBW) and technical cooperation portfolios and related reviews; implementation planning, management and reporting reports (information from the IRIS Strategic Management Module); relevant global reports and meta evaluations; relevant DWCPs and logic model (results framework); relevant DWCP HLEs and DWCP; country programme reviews which will have examined recent performance against stated outcomes, determined what has been achieved, and whether strategies being used are efficient and effective; National and sectoral strategic plans and reports related to social protection, other relevant national, multilateral and UN policy and strategy documents
 - Reviewing evidence of follow up to relevant evaluation recommendations and use of lessons learned by ILO management;
 - Interviewing key stakeholders which should reflect a diversity of backgrounds inside the Office, according to sector, technical unit, regions and country situations
 - Conducting online surveys and other methodologies to obtain feedback and/or information from constituents and other key stakeholders; and
 - Field visits (5 countries)
 - Case studies of visited countries (5) plus desk review-only case study countries (3)



Synthesis study of project evaluations 2012-2017

26. A synthesis review of project evaluation reports on social protection has been commissioned by EVAL to synthesize findings on the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and sustainability/impact of ILOs work through technical cooperation projects. The synthesis review will examine what types of recommendations and lessons learned were reported by evaluators in the evaluation reports and whether there are any trends or recurring themes among them. Good practices should be identified.
27. The synthesis review covers the period of 2012 to 2016 and the sample was based on a key word search of EVAL's i-track on project evaluations with key words of social protection and social security.
28. The findings of the synthesis study will feed directly into the high level evaluation and will be a source of input for the overall rating on the DAC criteria (see below). The synthesis review is currently being conducted and the final study is expected to be available in January 2017

Case studies

29. The purpose of case studies is to conduct in-depth analysis of the ILO's strategic and programme means of action aimed at supporting the creation and extension of social protection floors. The case studies seek to determine what happened as a result of ILO's interventions, and determine if these interventions had any observable immediate impacts, and to the extent possible determine the links between the observed impacts and the ILO interventions.
30. Possible themes of the case studies could be focussed on the following ILOs strategy on creating and extending social protection floors: (to be further developed with evaluation team and key stakeholders)
 - **Technical advice:** to identify the effectiveness of ILO action in providing policy guidance on creating and extending social protection.
 - **Capacity development:** ILO support to development of institutional mechanisms or capacity building of constituents
 - **Knowledge sharing:** The case study on this mean of action will seek to assess how effectively ILO has promoted and applied knowledge sharing among constituents, ILO staff and its external partners (UN and multilateral institutions) through its KSP but not limited to this medium.
31. The case studies will consist of a combination of methods:
 - Interviews, field studies and participant focus groups,
 - Desk reviews to synthesize and aggregate information such as technical studies, and DWCP reviews from the selected countries and programmes at different times. This will allow greater triangulation while minimizing cost and time being expended on new, possibly repetitive studies.

Terms of Reference

32. A completed case study report will have detailed descriptions of what happened and the context in which it occurred. The report will feature a factual recounting as well as an analysis of events.
33. The selection of the field visits and the case studies will take into account budgetary expenditure in the country, proportion of budget to overall RB, RBSA and TC on social protection work in each country, balanced geographic spread, and other selection criteria to be decided in discussion with the Social Protection Department and the evaluation team. Additional criteria may be added by the evaluation team.

Summary ratings

34. A summary rating shall be expressed by the independent evaluation team at the end of the six evaluation criteria and the respective questions listed above¹¹. The evaluation shall use a six point scale ranging from “highly satisfactory,” “satisfactory,” “somewhat satisfactory,” “somewhat unsatisfactory,” “unsatisfactory,” and “highly unsatisfactory.”
- **Highly satisfactory:** when the findings related to the evaluation criterion show that ILO performance related to criterion has produced outcomes which go beyond expectation, expressed specific comparative advantages and added value, produced best practices;
 - **Satisfactory:** when the findings related to the evaluation criterion show that the objectives have been mostly attained and the expected level of performance can be considered coherent with the expectations of the national tripartite constituents, beneficiaries and of the ILO itself;
 - **Somewhat satisfactory:** when the findings related to the evaluation criterion show that the objectives have been partially attained and there that expected level of performance could be for the most part considered coherent with the expectations of the national tripartite constituents, beneficiaries and of the ILO itself ;
 - **Somewhat unsatisfactory:** when the findings related to the evaluation criterion show that the objectives have been partially attained and the level of performance show minor shortcoming and are not fully considered acceptable in the view of the ILO national tripartite constituents, partners and beneficiaries;
 - **Unsatisfactory:** when the findings related to the evaluation criterion show that the objectives have not been attained and the level of performance show major shortcoming and are not fully considered acceptable in the view of the ILO national tripartite constituents, partners and beneficiaries; and
 - **Highly unsatisfactory:** when the findings related to the evaluation criterion show that expected results have not been attained, and there have been important shortcomings, and the resources have not been utilized effectively and/or efficiently.
35. The ratings will be decided together with the external evaluators and the ILO senior

¹¹ Independent evaluations in the ILO are conducted by independent external evaluators. The final project ratings are produced by the external evaluators as an outcome of the evaluation process. These ratings are based on actual programme data, interaction with beneficiaries and stakeholders as well as on project performance documents (which include self-assessed ratings).



evaluation officer.

Evaluation Team

36. The Evaluation Office (EVAL) is mandated to manage the evaluation function and ensure proper implementation of the evaluation policy. EVAL's structure and modalities of operation are designed to protect its functional independence. The Director of EVAL reports directly to the Director-General¹² and to the Governing Body through an independent process. EVAL assesses ILO policies, strategies, principles, and procedures as well as decent work country programs. The goals of evaluation in the ILO are to learn from experience, provide an objective basis for assessing the results of its work, and provide accountability in the achievement of its objectives. It also promotes knowledge sharing on results and lessons learned among the ILO and its partners.
37. In accordance with ILO guidelines for independence, credibility and transparency, responsibility for the evaluation will be based in the Evaluation Office in its capacity as an independent entity. The evaluation team will be composed of an ILO Senior Evaluation Officer who will lead a team composed of an international consultant(s) or companies with expertise in social protection floors and evaluation. National research assistants may be recruited to support each case study. The Senior Evaluation Officer will play a critical coordination role and will be responsible for the evaluation implementation at the national and regional levels.
38. The international and national specialists will provide specific inputs based on the thematic case studies that provide the basis for the evaluation analysis. The case studies will analyse project contributions to the implementation of the Office's activities on social protection and to the respective DWCP. The international evaluator will be responsible for drafting the report.
39. This evaluation will be inclusive in nature and seek to involve all key stakeholders.

Main Outputs/Deliverables/Timeframe

40. The proposed time frame for this evaluation is from January 2017 to November 2017 in accordance with the following schedule:

Concept note shared with social protection department and appointment of a focal point from the department for the evaluation	October 2016
TORs for the synthesis study drafted and call for expressions of interest launched	October 2016
Evaluation TORS drafted and circulated to stakeholders	End November 2016

¹² ILO Policy guidelines for results-based evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing evaluations. Section 1.4 pg. 7 2nd edition, ILO.



Terms of Reference

Call for evaluation team launched and Evaluation team formed.	By mid-December
Scoping mission to Geneva for one week by team and inception report drafted	End February 2017
Evaluation mission and case studies conducted.	April/May/June 2017
First draft circulated for comments	End June 2017
Final draft shared with stakeholders	Early July
GB summary document completed	August 31st 2017
Final Report	September 2017

Management and Responsibilities

41. The Evaluation Office (EVAL) is mandated to manage the evaluation function and ensure proper implementation of the evaluation policy. The evaluation team will be composed of a Senior Evaluation Officer who will lead a team composed of international consultants with expertise in social protection and evaluation, and evaluation team members/national consultants to support the case studies. The director of EVAL will provide inputs and guidance throughout the evaluation process.
42. The Senior Evaluation Officer will play a critical coordination role and will be responsible for the evaluation implementation at the national and regional levels and will:
 - Conduct one case study of a country not selected for a field visit,
 - Participate in at least two of the evaluation missions conducted by the international consultants,
 - Supervise the work of other evaluation team members, review and finalize the final evaluation report.
43. The external evaluator(s) will provide technical leadership and is responsible for:
 - Drafting the inception report, producing the draft reports and drafting and presenting a final report;
 - Providing any technical and methodological advice necessary for this evaluation within the team;
 - Ensuring the quality of data (validity, reliability, consistency and accuracy) throughout the analytical and reporting phases.
 - Managing the external evaluation team, ensuring the evaluation is conducted as per TORs, including following ILO EVAL guidelines, methodology and formatting requirements; and

Terms of Reference

- Producing reliable, triangulated findings that are linked to the evaluation questions and presenting useful and insightful conclusions and recommendations according to international standards.
44. An officer from the Social Protection Department will be appointed to facilitate coordination with the department and field specialists and provide relevant documentation as requested by the team. This person will be the key technical liaison to the evaluation team, assisting in the identification of key stakeholders at Headquarters and the field and identification of key resources/documents.

Quality assurance

45. The international evaluator will be required to ensure the quality of data (validity, reliability, consistency and accuracy) throughout the analytical and reporting phases. It is expected that the report shall be written in an evidence-based manner such that all observations, conclusions, recommendations, etc., are supported by evidence and analysis.
46. The ILO senior evaluation officer will provide overall quality assurance on all key outputs.

Qualifications of the Evaluators

47. This evaluation will be managed by EVAL and conducted by a team of independent evaluators with the following competency mix:
- Prior knowledge of the ILO's roles and activities, and solid understanding of social protection in international development cooperation and funding (essential);
 - Demonstrated executive-level management experience in reviewing and advising complex organizational structures, preferably in the field of employment, social protection;
 - At least 10 years' experience in evaluation policies, strategies, country programmes and organizational effectiveness;
 - Proven experience in conducting and writing evaluation reports of large multilateral organizations for high level decision-making;
 - Fluency in English, spoken and written (essential); knowledge of Spanish would be highly desirable.
48. All team members and their qualifications and roles within the team should be made available in the proposal, indicating proven ability to work with others in the development and timely delivery of high-quality deliverables. The organisation of the work should be specified and explained clearly in a detailed timeline.

Selection Criteria

49. In assessing candidates EVAL will allocate greater importance to technical factors including the design and methods proposed than to cost factors. Proposals will be assessed in terms of best value to the ILO, with price and other factors considered.

Terms of Reference

Minimum Information to be Included in Offer

50. Expressions of interest must be accompanied by:
- Proposal defining the planned methodology for achieving the objectives of the evaluation, as well as a preliminary work plan and timeline for completing the work and deliver the outputs;
 - Detailed references for similar work undertaken by each team member;
 - Description of team composition with names, roles, and CVs of each member if (applicable);
 - Dated and signed Declaration of Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest; and
 - Financial proposal presenting as a fixed price lump sum bid, quoted in USD, covering all expenses and free of any taxes or duties. The proposal should also reflect a breakdown of activities covered by particular cost elements indicating how the costs were derived. The proposal should include fees for team members to undertake five field visits but the mission travel (costs of travel: airfare and DSA will be provided separately by the ILO and should not be included in the offer).
 - Fees for two trips (scoping and presentation/finalization of the report) to Geneva by the consultant or team leader of the team for one week each trip should be included.
51. The initial proposal should present a detailed evaluation approach and a range of methodologies. Key questions to take into account when developing an evaluation approach for the proposal are provided above.

Compensation and payment schedule

52. The Evaluation Office will contract an international independent evaluator(s) or a company under an output-based contract modality. All travel expenses will be paid as a lump sum based on ILO travel regulations.

Evaluators' code of Conduct and Ethical considerations

53. [The ILO Code of Conduct](#) for independent evaluators applies to all evaluation team members. The principles behind the Code of Conduct are fully consistent with the Standards of Conduct for the International Civil Service to which all UN staff is bound. UN staff is also subject to any UNEG member specific staff rules and procedures for the procurement of services. The selected team members shall sign and return a copy of the code of conduct with their contract.

Evaluation use strategy

54. Efforts will be made to keep the social protection department and specialists in the regions informed about the major steps of the evaluation process. Key outputs will be circulated for comments.
55. The following products are expected to enhance the use of the evaluation findings and conclusions by developing different products for different audiences:
- GB executive summary document for the GB 2017 discussion



Terms of Reference

- The full report available in limited hard copy and electronically available on the EVAL website and
- Key findings or table of contents presented with hyperlinks for readers to read sections of the report.
- USB keys with e-copy of the report for dissemination to partners.
- A powerpoint presentation or visual summary of the report will be prepared for EVALs website and for presentations on the evaluation.
- EVAL quickfacts on the HLE to be prepared.
- A short video on the key findings and recommendations

Timetable

Concept note shared with social protection department and appointment of a focal point from the department for the evaluation	October 2016
TORs for the synthesis study drafted and call for expressions of interest launched	October 2016
Evaluation TORS drafted and circulated to stakeholders	End November 2016
Call for evaluation team launched and Evaluation team formed.	By mid-December
Scoping mission to Geneva for one week by team and inception report drafted	End February 2017
Evaluation mission and case studies conducted.	April/May/June 2017
First draft circulated for comments	End June 2017
Final draft shared with stakeholders	Early July
GB summary document completed	August 31st 2017
Final Report	September 2017