

METHODOLOGY

This meta-analysis rates and synthesizes findings related to performance from final independent evaluations completed in 2024, using the revised methodology applied by EVAL since 2023, in response to a [Think Piece focusing on key proxies of performance to assess the effectiveness and results of ILO's work](#). The key question: "How effective are ILO interventions in delivering Decent Work results?" and recommendations based on the findings will be formulated. This current study continues to employ a calendar year-based approach, as it has been done since 2023.

The final independent evaluations assessed in the meta-analysis are for the most part decentralized evaluations of development cooperation projects with budgets exceeding \$1 million. Over the years, there has also been a growing number of clustered evaluations covering several interventions implemented by the ILO and the joint programmes of the ILO with other UN agencies.

REVIEW AND SCORING PROCESS

The framework used in the effectiveness review focuses on an ex-postperformance rating based on findings of evaluation reports. Performance information related to a list of 29 criteria (see Figure 1) will be obtained from the evaluation reports. The criteria cover elements related to strategic relevance and coherence and alignment; effectiveness, sustainability and impact; and operational and resource efficiency (in alignment with OECD-DAC recommended evaluation parameters), as well as areas of strategic interest to ILO.

FIGURE 1. PERFORMANCE CATEGORIES, WITH ASSOCIATED APPRAISAL CRITERIA¹

Strategic relevance and coherence	▶ Link between project purpose and/or objectives with P&B outcome ▶ Causal link between project objectives and DWCP outcome(s) ▶ Constituent support ▶ Validity of design/approach ▶ Consistency and contribution of the intervention to SDGs
Overall effectiveness	Achievement of outputs and outcomes: ▶ Quality and completeness of outputs ▶ Achievement of immediate objectives ▶ Promotion of cross-cutting areas: ▶ Pro-poor focus ▶ Gender-responsive ▶ Normative work / standards promotion ▶ Tripartite processes and social dialogue ▶ Disability inclusion ▶ Integration of just transition to environmental sustainability ▶ Other key types of ILO support/means to achieve results ▶ Knowledge development ▶ Capacity building ▶ Strategic relationships
Sustainability and impact	▶ Policy influence ▶ Strategic importance of results achieved ▶ Sustainability of policies, knowledge & capacities ▶ Acknowledgement and Use of ILO expertise and involvement ▶ Visibility and accessibility to knowledge and information

Overall efficiency	Operational efficiency:
	Results-Based Management approach and goal orientation Implementation management ILO support to project Internal ILO coordination Monitoring and reporting
	Resource efficiency: Resource leveraging Cost efficiency Adequacy of resources

A four-point rating system (see Table 1) was applied to the findings. Criteria with insufficient evidence received a rating of ‘0’ and was excluded in the quantitative analysis of performance but may be included in the narrative. To achieve a top rating (4), evidence will need to justify all aspects of the criterion description.

TABLE 1. FOUR-POINT SCORING SYSTEM

UNSUCCESSFUL	PARTLY SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL	HIGHLY SUCCESSFUL
Rating of 1 Highly deficient performance	Rating of 2 Basic level of performance but stated need for improvement	Rating of 3 Adequate level of performance and results	Rating of 4 Very good level of performance and results

Qualitative information was obtained from each evaluation report to present evidence and justification for the rating for each performance criterion and to allow for more in-depth analysis. Both quantitative and qualitative results will be entered in an individual appraisal template, which will be linked to a master table in the form of an Excel spreadsheet. This will allow the information to be centralised and facilitate subsequent analysis of trends and differences in performance data.

ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

Evidence from all ILO independent final evaluation reports completed in 2024 and submitted until March 2025 were synthesized in the annual meta-study report. Qualitative data was used to provide narratives to support and explain the quantitative findings, and to deepen the thematic synthesis of trends, lessons learned and good practices from the meta-analysis. As such, all findings will be backed by evidence and analysis.

A weighted approach was applied to the analysis of performance, using the same approach as in the meta-analysis editions of 2023 and 2024, to ensure continuity and comparability over time.³ The weight ratios provide more prominence to the Overall Effectiveness category.

Key insights regarding ILO’s impact in action were identified based on analysis of interventions with strongest performance across the three criteria of policy influence, strategic importance of results, and sustainability. Strongest performance was defined as interventions with at least one rating of “4” for one criterion, and “3” or “4” in the other criteria.¹⁴ In some cases, the analysis also made reference to successful projects with ratings of “3” across the three criteria.

14 A total of ten projects were identified: ACCEL-1 Africa (2024-7), THAMM (2024-9), ILO’s work in Paraguay (2024-11), RBSA-funded projects in Moldova (2024-12), Safe and Fair (2024-15), TRIANGLE in ASEAN (2024-21), RBSA-funded projects in Côte d’Ivoire and South Africa (2024-23), PSEI (2024-36), ILO/EU project in Bangladesh (2024-41), ADWA projects (2024-47).

QUALITY ASSURANCE

For methodological robustness and quality assurance purposes, the two independent reviewers have tested the Performance Appraisal template using the same report to determine shared understanding of the concepts defined in the rubrics, and to ensure inter-observer consistency and reliability. Each evaluation report will then be appraised by the two independent reviewers (except for exceptional cases when agreed upon with the EVAL task manager), and ratings will be compared and discussed, as relevant, to come up with a final rating for each report. Extreme cases may be discussed with the EVAL task manager, as deemed appropriate. The meta-study report will be written in an evidence-based manner, and findings will be supported by evidence from the appraisals of the independent evaluation reports.

LIMITATIONS

The main limitation concerned the extent and depth of information provided in the evaluation reports, which influenced the scoring process. In some cases, insufficient detail regarding certain criteria may hinder the attribution of a top score, despite potentially different realities on the ground.

Scoring thematic, cluster or regional evaluations poses challenges when results vary across countries or areas. While it is possible to qualitatively highlight variations, quantitatively representing these differences was more difficult, potentially leading to misrepresentations of effectiveness and possibly diminishing the utility of results. This underscores the importance of combining quantitative results with a nuanced narrative, which was the approach used in this meta-study.