



Call for Expressions of Interest INDEPENDENT MID-TERM EVALUATION

Title	ILO-DFID Partnership Programme on Fair Recruitment and Decent Work for Women Migrant Workers in South Asia and the Middle East (WIF)
Countries Covered	Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Jordan, Lebanon, and Kuwait
Application deadline	30 January 2022
Type of Contract	External Collaboration (individual consultancy contract)
Expected Duration	15 February – April 2022
Languages required	Proficiency in written and spoken English (knowledge of local language for national consultants)

The ILO Evaluation Office is seeking expressions of interest from a team of evaluation consultants (A team leader and 3 national team members) or from individual consultant(s) to conduct an independent mid-term evaluation of the programme titled “Work in Freedom”.

Required Information for Submission an Expression of Interest (EOI)

1. A description of how the candidate’s skills, qualifications and experience are relevant to the required qualifications of this assignment;
2. A brief approach/methodology the candidate will likely to use for this evaluation;
3. A list of previous evaluations that are relevant to the context and subject matter of this assignment;
4. A statement confirming their availability to conduct this assignment and the daily professional fee expressed in US dollars;
5. A copy of the CV of all the team members (which must include information about the qualifications held by the candidates);
6. A statement confirming that the candidates are not engaged or had any previous involvement in the delivery of the “Work in Freedom Programme” in any of the mentioned countries or have a personal relationship with any of the ILO Officials who are engaged in this programme;
7. Names of two referees who can be contacted for reference;
8. Preference will be given to the group submissions consisting of team lead and 3 national consultants (For team composition please see [page number 16](#) in the ToR)
9. If a candidate is applying as an individual consultant, clearly mention the position for which you are applying - a national consultant (Name of the country(s)) or Evaluation Team Lead (international consultant).

The **deadline to submit an application** is 17:00 hrs Bangkok time Sunday, 30 January 2022. Please send an e-mail with the subject header “WIF Phase 2 Mid-term Evaluation” to the Evaluation Manager, Mr. Kaji Ratna Awaley, awaley@ilo.org and copy to Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka, pamornrat@ilo.org

Terms of Reference

For

Independent Mid Term Evaluation

“ILO-DFID Partnership Programme on Fair Recruitment and Decent Work for Women Migrant Workers in South Asia and the Middle East” (Phase II)

Key Facts

1	Title of project being evaluated	ILO-DFID Partnership Programme on Fair Recruitment and Decent Work for Women Migrant Workers in South Asia and the Middle East
2	Project XB Symbol	RAS/17/11/GBR (de-centralized)
	Countries	<i>Origin:</i> Bangladesh, India, Nepal <i>Destination:</i> India, Jordan, Lebanon, Kuwait and Oman.
	Start and End Date of Phase 1	20 April 2013 to 31 March 2018 (July 2018) ¹
	Start and End Date of Phase 2	1 April 2018 to 28 March 2023
3	Type of evaluation	Independent
4	Timing of evaluation	Mid Term
5	Donor	FCDO, UK (formerly DFID)
6	Administrative Unit in the ILO responsible for administrating the project	The ILO Decent Work Technical Support Team (DWT) for South Asia and Country Office for India (New Delhi)
7	Technical Unit(s) in the ILO responsible for backstopping the project	FUNDAMENTALS (Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Branch)
8	P&B outcome(s) under evaluation	Outcomes 8 and 9
9	SDG(s) under evaluation	8.7
10	Budget	16,204,507 USD

¹ Final Evaluation Report of Phase 1.

List of Abbreviations

DFID	- UK Department for International Development
FCDO	- UK Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office
DWCP	- Decent Work Country Programme
DWT	- Decent Work Team
EA	- Evaluability Assessment
EM	- Evaluation Manager
ETE	- End Term Evaluation
EVAL	- ILO Evaluation Unit
FPRW	- Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work
GEFONT	- General Federations of Nepalese Trade Unions
IFPRI	- International Food Policy Research Institute
ILO	- International Labour Organization
LSHTM	- London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine
M&E	- Monitoring and Evaluation
MTE	- Mid Term Evaluation
P&B	- Programme & Budget
WIF	- Work in Freedom Programme
TPR	- Technical Progress Report
VFM	- Value for Money

1. Introduction and rationale for the mid-term evaluation

1. As per the ILO evaluation policy, the WIF programme phase 2 is subject to a mid-term independent evaluation and a final independent evaluation. The Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) is scheduled to start during the first quarter of 2022.
2. The aim of the MTE is to assess the continued relevance of the intervention and the progress made towards achieving its planned objectives. Evaluation provides an opportunity to make modifications to ensure the achievement of these objectives within the lifetime of the programme. In addition, MTE provides an opportunity to ascertain the intervention is still coherent with the ILO's strategic objectives; is relevant and useful to the key stakeholders, and is being conducted in an efficient manner according to ILO standards and the agreed programme document.

2. Background Information

3. The advent of the COVID-19 pandemic significantly worsened job security, affecting women most acutely. More than one million garment workers in Bangladesh were fired or furloughed as a result of order cancellations and the failure of buyers to pay for these cancellations ([Anner, 2020](#)). That represented one fourth of the workforce in the sector. Women represent 60 per cent of the workforce (CPD, 2016). In Bangladesh, 1.2 million domestic workers lost their jobs

(National Domestic Women Workers Union, 2020) and in Nepal, according to a rapid assessment conducted by General Federation of Nepali Trade Unions (GEFONT), 85 per cent of Nepali domestic workers lost their jobs. In India, by August 2020, 121 million people, especially young adults, had lost their jobs (CMIE, 2020). Such shocks, together with other more regular drivers of migration (e.g., agrarian and employment crises) are likely to fuel migration trends in the future. In an environment shaped by multiple rules and practices determining the mobility of workers, labour intermediaries mediate labour migration to domestic, garment and other similar employment sectors. Labour intermediaries also help aspiring workers who already have work but need additional services as many migrant workers expect holistic services in the migration process over and above reaching their destination.

4. The fluidity and segmentation of labour supply chains and labour regimes are such that none of the key stakeholders such as labour recruiters, regulators and even employers can guarantee on their own a fair migration outcome and FPRW for any worker. In spite of strong public calls to protect migrating women from the pitfalls of trafficking in persons, forced labour and modern slavery, in practice the presumed responsibility of ensuring fair migration outcomes is fragmented among multiple formal and informal stakeholders. Therefore, migrants face multiple risks and challenges in their efforts to find jobs and at the workplace.
5. The drain of human capital for origin communities and States, usually consisting of young men and women at the beginning of their adult life, represents a net loss that would otherwise contribute to the local economy. At the receiving end, the gain is all the more significant as receiving economies do not invest in the upbringing of migrants. The introduction of migrant labour also creates the conditions for the expansion of the care economy. It increases labour supply and generates downward pressure on wages in sectors where migrant workers are absorbed. Women migrants often enter the more precarious areas of the economy as they lack the human and economic capital to integrate into other sectors.
6. The ratio of labour inspectors and labour attachés in relation to migrant populations is disproportionately low for receiving and adequately dealing with complaints. Lack of collectivisation is also one of the contributory reasons among women and girl domestic workers in accessing such institutionalized forms of support. Sponsorship systems, such as the kafala system² that is prevalent in most countries of West Asia, exacerbate vulnerability to forced labour as the migrant worker is effectively at the mercy of the employer or “sponsor”.

3. Programme Background

7. Work in Freedom (WIF) is a ten-year development cooperation programme that started in 2013 and is funded by UK Aid. It adopts an integrated and targeted approach in developing practices and multi-sectorial policy measures that reduce vulnerability to trafficking and forced labour of women and girls in South Asian countries of origin (Bangladesh, India and Nepal) and in selected destination countries (India, Jordan, Lebanon, and Kuwait). *The main goal of the WIF Programme is to contribute to reduce vulnerability to trafficking and forced labour of women and girls across migration pathways leading to the care sector (especially domestic work) and the garment sector. The Programme in its second phase planned to reach directly at least 350,000 women and girls at source and destination areas in targeted countries by 2023.*
8. The programme acknowledges that patterns of women’s labour mobility are not uniform. In other words, the angles of internal migration and international migration are insufficient to explain the motivations, drivers, challenges and experiences of migrant women. Instead, they migrate within the country and abroad through variable pathways and cycles depending on

² The kafala, or sponsorship, system defines the relationship between foreign workers and their local sponsor, which is usually their employer.

inter-related factors. The programme focuses on both internal migration (e.g., migration of women from the Chotanagpur plateau to large metropolitan areas in South and North India) as well as international migration (e.g., migration of women from South India, Nepal or Bangladesh to the Gulf). The WIF Programme has been implementing a series of interventions engaging migrant workers, trade unions, civil society groups, businesses and regulators in a collaborative effort to begin addressing the above-mentioned challenges such as the multiple facets of forced labour in areas with high outflows and inflows of low-income women migrants. It focuses especially on sectors where women's work is increasing such as care work and garment manufacturing. The WIF programme is implementing the following five areas of interventions:

- 1) Strengthening women's empowerment in areas with high outflows of migrant women seeking jobs elsewhere
- 2) Outreach to workers and employers in destination areas
- 3) Assessing and testing better recruitment practices
- 4) Advocacy to improve laws and policies
- 5) Research to establish a better evidence base that can inform interventions, law and policy changes

These interventions contribute to the achievement of Outcome 8 (Comprehensive and sustainable social protection for all) and 9 (Fair and effective international labour migration and mobility) of P&B. Outcome 1 and outcome 2 of the WiF phase II programme are directly linked to outcome 9 of the P&B whereas outcome 3 of the WiF phase II programme is directly linked to outcome 8 of the P&B.

9. The programme updated its Theory of Change in 2019 as recommended by the MTE of the first phase of WiF, which identified that increased levels of empowerment experienced by women migrant workers and aspiring women migrant workers, combined with an improved enabling environment, can lead to the overall reduced levels of vulnerability by women migrants to forced labour and trafficking.
10. The programme expects to contribute towards bringing about a sustained situation where women and girls in South Asia and the Arab States are less vulnerable to trafficking and forced labour in emerging sectors of migrant employment. Overall, the programme has the following three objectives (outcomes) (Annex D):
 - a) Women have greater ability to make their own choices during the entire migration process in an enabling environment for safe migration into decent work
 - b) Increased levels of collaboration, accountability, and respect between key actors along migration pathways towards an enabling environment for safe migration into decent work
 - c) Strengthened laws, policies, practices and systems for social protection, safe labour migration and decent work for women

4. Status of the Programme:

11. The COVID-19 pandemic has seriously affected migration trends. Paragraph 3 of the above section (background information) described that jobs were lost in India, Bangladesh and Nepal. In Jordan, the number of migrant domestic workers dropped from 60,797 in 2019 to 35,243 in 2020 (a decrease of 42 per cent in one year), while the number of garment workers dropped from 66,872 to 48,506 in the same period (a decrease of 27 per cent in one year) (Ministry of Labour, GoJ, Data of 2020). In Lebanon, the number of new and renewed work permits for migrant domestic workers fell from 207,757 in 2018 to 119,081 in 2020 (a decrease of 43 per cent in two years) (Ministry of Labour, GoL, 2021)³. This staggering loss of jobs has also depressed wages in both destination countries and countries of origin. The WIF Programme

³ TPR - WIF 2 - 3rd Year May 2021 (p.2)).

registered an unprecedented increase in cases of unpaid wages and other worker grievances. In short, vulnerability to forced labour has unequivocally increased, thus making the programme all the more relevant although also more challenging. Given these changing trends, WIF has had to expand its focus on local employment in countries of origin and review recruitment trends in an environment of increased job scarcity. In areas of destination, the programme faced a couple of setbacks. In India, the Lok Sabha approved a version of the labour code that removed many worker protections that existed until then (e.g. exclusion of private households as a place of employment), and in Lebanon the State Administrative Court (Shura Council) overturned a newly adopted standard unified contract for the employment of migrant domestic workers that had been developed with the support of the programme.

12. Additionally, the COVID-19 pandemic has made WIF interventions more challenging because Government policy making in sending and receiving countries has become preoccupied with other issues, and interest in protecting women migrants is seen as a low priority when those employing them, whether individuals or companies, are struggling economically. This is making it harder for WIF to achieve some of the policy reforms that were aimed for at the programme's onset; yet with risks for migrant women being exacerbated, the need for the programme and its initiatives to reduce these is greater than ever (WIF EA, p.55).

The programme finalized 22 studies that document evidence on the evolving context of WIF interventions at a regional and national level. The consultant team will be subsequently provided with the list of publications/documents that were produced during the programme period.

13. Some of the key contributions made by the programme during the second phase are indicated below and during this period three technical progress reports were produced which illustrate the evolution of the status of the programme over the past three years.
14. The advent of the COVID-19 pandemic has unequivocally increased vulnerability to forced labour, thus making the WIF programme all the more important and though more challenging. Given these changing trends, WIF has had to retool its interventions by focusing on local employment in countries of origin, reviewing recruitment trends in an environment of increased job scarcity and focused more attention on improving working and living conditions in destination areas.
15. On the positive side, following years of advocacy efforts and evidence documented by the programme, the Government of Jordan issued a new regulation on domestic work that provides better protections and the Government of Nepal admitted that age bans on women migrating abroad did not work, although much work remains to be done. During its second phase, the programme delivered impressive performance in delivering outputs (at times almost doubling outreach targets) and based on a VFM review during the EA, there is enough evidence that the programme continues to represent good value for money. WIF II followed flexible programming with efforts to tailor community outreach methods for improved effectiveness, clearer targeting of vulnerable migrant women, particularly in destination countries, and the programme also enhanced its focus on improving working and living conditions in destination areas.
16. The Final Evaluation of the first phase of WIF and Advisory Board Report 2018 referred to the difficulties in addressing migrant women's working conditions at destination. Therefore, the ILO took the strategic decision to change the location of the Chief Technical Adviser of the programme to ILO's Regional Office for Arab States (ROAS) in Beirut, where ILO interventions in most migrant destination countries are planned and coordinated (Annual Progress Report, May 2019, p.4).

5. Evaluation background

17. ILO considers evaluation as an integral part of the implementation of development cooperation activities. Provisions are made in all programmes in accordance with ILO evaluation policy and based on the nature of the programme and the specific requirements. ILO agrees upon at the time of the Programme design and during the Programme as per established procedures.

6. Purpose and objectives

18. The mid-term evaluation will have two different purposes: accountability and learning. The main purpose of this MTE is to review the programme's strategy and performance in the evolving national and regional context and to enhance learning within the programme. In addition, the MTE aims to review the extent to which annual and cumulative targets planned in the log frame are attainable considering the budget cuts in year 4 and other changing labour migration trends, e.g., COVID-19 crisis, demand for migrant workers, etc.; and to gather information needed to evaluate the programme as recommended in the evaluability assessment and designed in the logical framework.
19. Specifically, the MTE aims to:
 - a. Examine the relevance and validity of the programme design and implementation strategy with the Evaluability Assessment as one of the key references;
 - b. Determine the implementation efficiency of the programme and how it may have achieved value for money⁴;
 - c. Assess the extent to which the programme has achieved its outcomes and to identify the supporting factors and constraints that have led to this achievement or lack of achievement (by paying attention to other initiatives in South Asia funded by the same donor (DFID/UK FCDO) as well as by the ILO);
 - d. Identify unintended changes at the policy (policy influence), institutional and beneficiaries' level, both positive and negative at outcome level, in addition to the expected results;
 - e. Assess the relevance of the sustainability strategy, its progress and its potential for achievement, identifying the processes that are to be continued by stakeholders;
 - f. Assess the programme's contribution to gender equality and non-discrimination;
 - g. Provide recommendations to programme stakeholders to support the completion, expansion or further development of initiatives supported by the programme.
20. The MTE should look at an enabling environment to reduce vulnerability to forced labour and trafficking of women and girls in the target areas. In order to assess the degree to which this contribution has been made, the evaluation will have to take into account relevant factors and developments in national processes, including the roles of different stakeholders.
21. The MTE should examine whether or not the best approaches were taken and optimally executed taking account of the lessons learnt.
22. The MTE should also cover issues concerning the programme's design, implementation, [lessons learnt](#), as well as scalability and recommendations for current and future programmes. The MTE should review the extent to which these learnings have been incorporated in the design and implementation of the programme in particular and in ILO programming in general
23. The evaluation should focus on the achievement of development results within the respective contexts, taking into account design, implementation and management processes. The MTE

⁴ Value for Money Indicators (VFM), 2021

should identify levels of achievement of objectives and especially explaining how and why they have been attained in such ways so as to help stakeholders learn from the on-going experience.

24. The evaluation to review the WIF programme relationship with external evaluation/research partner (IFPRI) and to explore how the IFPRI's work is contributing / not contributing to the programme/intended beneficiaries.

7. Scope

25. The MTE of the WIF Programme is planned during the first quarter of 2022. The period under evaluation is from January 2018 until December 2021. The evaluation will mainly cover the duration of the current phase of the Programme since its beginning and all targeted countries (Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Kuwait, Jordan and Lebanon). All outcomes of the programme will be evaluated, and all programme countries will be assessed as part of the desk review and in-depth analysis as well as meetings with programme stakeholders and beneficiaries (country visits/virtual engagements).
26. The target groups of the evaluation are programme beneficiaries, especially work-age women and girls who are vulnerable to forced labour and trafficking across migration pathways leading to domestic work, and garment and textile work. Other indirect stakeholders are recruitment intermediaries, worker collectives or trade unions, employers and representatives of government institutions (i.e. policy and lawmakers, and those implementing policies, laws and programmes).
27. The MTE will focus on the WIF programme's achievements and its contribution to the overall reduction of vulnerability to trafficking and forced labour of women and girls in the targeted countries. The evaluation should focus on all the activities that have been implemented since the start of phase II of the programme, especially from 2018 to the time of the application of the methodology for this evaluation.

8. Clients of the evaluation

28. This evaluation will be useful for both internal and external ILO stakeholders. For the WIF programme, the evaluation will identify improvements needed based on lessons learned, as well as good practices that may be scaled up or replicated. Other non-WIF stakeholders may use the findings for opportunities of convergence. The evaluation will also be useful for other ILO programmes related to FPRW, UN and other organisations working on human trafficking and forced labour, other development practitioners (organisations and activists working on bonded labour, domestic work, garment work and supply chains), academics interested in labour studies and gender inequalities, and beneficiary groups (e.g., worker collectives), etc. More specifically, the external clients will be the key stakeholders listed under [Annex A](#) and include the donor FCDO, UK (formerly DFID), IFPRI, WIF advisory group members, regional partners, etc.

9. Sample Evaluation Questions

29. The evaluation should be carried out in context of criteria and approaches for international development assistance as established by the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard. The ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation⁵ and the technical and ethical standards and the Code of Conduct for Evaluation of the UN System⁶ are established within these criteria, and the evaluation should therefore adhere to these to ensure an internationally credible evaluation. In

⁵ https://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_168289/lang-en/index.htm

⁶ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866>

particular, the evaluation will follow the ILO EVAL Policy Guidelines Checklists 5 and 6: “Preparing the evaluation report” and “Rating the quality of evaluation reports”.

30. Gender concerns should be addressed in accordance with ILO Guidance note 4: “Considering gender in the monitoring and evaluation of projects”⁷. All data should be sex-disaggregated and the different needs of women and men and of marginalized groups targeted by the programme should be considered throughout the evaluation process.
31. The following are the proposed evaluation questions under each criterion that have to be addressed through the evaluation. The evaluator may adapt the evaluation criteria and questions, but any fundamental changes should be agreed between the evaluation manager and the evaluator, and reflected in the inception report:

Relevance of the programme

- a. Examine whether the programme responded to the real needs of specific target groups in consideration of the different contexts in the countries covered. *This should include intersecting dimensions such as class, caste, religion, sexuality, race and identity, which influence behaviours and change at all levels.*⁸
- b. Are the Programme initiatives aligned with national policies and priorities? What are the changes caused by the programme at the policy (policy influence), institutional and beneficiaries level, both positive and negative, expected and unexpected?
- c. Assess whether and how the COVID-19 pandemic has affected the planned objectives and whether the programme was able to make adjustments to remain relevant.
- d. Has the program made adjustments that directly address adverse impacts on women migrants in response to the COVID-19 pandemic?
- e. Has the programme identified any other constraints or opportunities that need to be accommodated in the design in order to increase the impact and relevance of the programme?

Validity of design

- a. Are the programme’s defined outputs and performance indicators with baselines and targets, realistic in contributing to the country programme outcomes (e.g., NPL105 and NPL828, BGD303, IND151, JOR103, LBN151 and LBN152, KWT106) given the intervention logic, time and resources available?
- b. To what extent are the programme’s theory of change and its mechanisms, assumptions and counter-trends still relevant?
- c. Have the programme strategies addressed the different needs, roles, constraints, access to resources of the target groups, and to what extent do the programme strategies, within their overall scope, remain flexible and responsive to the emerging concerns of target groups, and the changing context in each of the countries covered by the programme?

Coherence

- a. To what extent do other interventions and policies support or undermine the WIF interventions, and vice versa?
- b. Are there possible ways to maximize synergies and improve collaboration with new or existing actors? Has there been a duplication of efforts/resources?
- c. Identify if there would be any other partnerships to consider.

⁷ https://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang-en/index.htm

⁸ Recommended in the Evaluability Assessment Draft Report, November 2015

Effectiveness

- a. Examine whether significant changes have been made related to the programme's desired outcomes and the contributing and hindering factors for moving towards their achievement and whether the programme's responses were appropriate and sufficient as mentioned in the Results Framework of Evaluability Assessment conducted in January 2021.
- b. Review and analyse whether the programme approaches are appropriate in achieving the immediate objectives of the programme?
- c. To what extent has the programme increased the voice and representation among women workers in destination areas and enabled the provision of support services to workers? (Outcome 1.1)
- d. What are the programme's contributions to new or revised legal or policy initiatives that protect the rights of women migrant workers?
- e. Examine how the programme's approach to anti-trafficking and migration issues differ or resemble those of other projects/programmes and how these programme approaches may be affecting results (e.g. on sustainability and empowerment).
- f. Examine the systems, networks, processes that are in place towards influencing laws, policies, and allocation of resources.
- g. How is the programme keeping track of fluid policy environments so that changes that are not influenced by the programme are visibilized and regularly compared with those influenced by the programme? What is the programme's extent and means of promoting an enabling environment to reduce vulnerability to forced labour and trafficking of women and girls in the target areas, taking into account the contribution of relevant factors and developments in national processes, including the contribution of different stakeholders?

Efficiency

- a. Examine delivery of programme outputs in terms of quality and quantity as planned in the project document. Have they been delivered in a timely manner?
- b. Were the right resources chosen to deliver outputs and expected quality? Has programme management and staffing to implement and monitor the programme been adequate?
- c. Is the programme adequately resourced to enable the achievement of desired outcomes?
- d. Review and comment on the relevance, reliability and robustness of data sources of the programme's value for money indicators. How did the programme achieve (or not achieve) value for money?
- e. To what extent has the programme leveraged resources with other projects/programmes, and through partnerships with other organizations/networks, to enhance the programme's impact and efficiency?

Impact orientation⁹

- a. Assess the role and contribution of the programme to the development and strategies of targeted governments in reducing vulnerability to forced labour and trafficking; as well as to the FCDO, UK and ILO strategic priorities, such as addressing other fundamental principles and rights at work and the modern slavery agenda of the UK Government.
- b. Has the programme management and programme strategy for each output steered towards impact and sustainability?
- c. Review and provide clear accounts of WIF's achieved impacts/results (e.g. how WIF policy interventions have led to shifts towards better policy outcomes, including changes in laws and regulation, or change in institutional and organizational capacity, improved collaboration and relationships, etc.)? To what extent does the programme contribute to reduced forced labour and labour trafficking (programme goal)?

⁹ Recommended in EA, January 2021.

Sustainability

- a. Determine the potential to sustain the outcomes of the programme beyond its life and what measures are needed to ensure this.
- b. Where should the ILO focus its interventions in order to achieve sustainable impacts in women's empowerment in the future and to improve decent work and living conditions in destination areas?
- c. Assess to what extent the practical tools developed by the programme (e.g. Worker centres, policy briefs, training materials) are likely to produce a direct impact if their use is extensively promoted, or even better enforced. (Outcome 3.3)

Cross-cutting issues/Issues of Special Interest to the ILO

International Labour Standards (ILS)

- The degree to which intervention activities, outputs, and objectives are consistent with prescriptions in relevant normative instruments where they have been formally embraced through ratification or expressions of endorsement by stakeholders.
- What ILO normative framework (Conventions, Recommendations, operational guidelines, agreed policy instruments etc.) that forms the basis of this FCDO supported program?

Social dialogue

- To what extent the program has further enhanced the social dialogue among the constituents and partners in each of the programme countries and at regional level? And the extent that the social dialogue has contributed to achieving the country programme outputs (CPOs, for example; NPL105 etc)?

Gender and non-discrimination

- a. To what extent has the programme improved the empowerment process of work-age women and girls during the life of the programme, and what interventions had effects on gender and power relations? What multiplier effects can be identified? How have policy measures, related to the programme or not, affected the empowerment process?
- b. To what extent has the programme improved targeting the most vulnerable women migrant workers both in origin communities and destinations (in terms of targeting the group, presenting alternatives to migration or making migration a genuine choice, organizing and capacity building, etc.)?

Lessons learned

- a. What should have been different, and should be avoided in similar future programmes/projects?
- b. Identify potential good practices and models of intervention that could inform future migration/human trafficking/modern slavery/forced labour programmes, especially those that the national partners could incorporate into national policy and implementation.

10. Methodology

32. An evaluation team consisting of an individual international consultant (Team leader) and national consultants from selected countries will be hired by the ILO to conduct the evaluation. Gender balance will be considered in the selection of the evaluation team. The exercise will cover all components as relevant in all programme countries. The evaluation team leader (international consultant) and national consultants (3) will be working together to evaluate the programme. Therefore, the task remains one including the deliverables and the related

knowledge products which will be jointly produced by the all evaluators whereas level of effort is reflected through number of work-days separately for the evaluation team lead and separately for each national consultant. To support the data collection and analysis and to contribute to the report writing, national consultants in programme countries will be identified and will work under the overall guidance of the evaluation team leader.

33. The Evaluation Team Lead will carry out a desk review of all appropriate materials including programme documents, progress reports, study and research reports, knowledge products developed by the programme, results of internal planning processes, advisory group reports, annual review reports by the donor, and other documents from secondary sources where available. At the end of the desk review, an inception report will be submitted to the Evaluation Manager defining the methodological approach, final evaluation questions, instruments and workplan, which will be used throughout the evaluation. The Evaluation Manager will review and sign off on the inception report.
34. The mid-term evaluation team to briefly take a stock of phase one of the programme for improved understanding of the context, programme's development, evolution and current status. As part of desk review, the team should review achievements and learnings of phase 1 and critically relate up to this MTE. This review should include review of key documents from phase 1 like evaluation reports, lessons learnt, some relevant policy briefs,, research/study reports, advisory board reports, external evaluation partner reports (IFPRI) etc.,
35. If COVID-19 restrictions allow, the Evaluation Team Leader and National Consultant(s) will undertake field visits, as appropriate and subject to clearance from the management team, to areas where interventions are delivered, to be identified and agreed in consultation with the WIF programme. Otherwise, the field visits and face-to-face interviews will be replaced by remote interviews (by telephone or other online communication tools such as Skype, Zoom, MS Teams etc.). Selection of field visit locations should be based on criteria defined by the Evaluation Consultant in the inception report considering the purpose of the MTE. Selection of locations should also take into account the socio-political, cultural contexts as well as programme investment in a particular location. In programme countries, in most cases, in-person interviews are possible for National Consultants by following appropriate COVID-19 protocols and in some countries, small group gatherings are also possible. Physical travel by the Team leader to the programme countries may become a limitation if international travel is not eased and restrictions on gatherings continue to be in place.
36. At the end of the field missions (or virtual data collection if COVID-19 restrictions persist), a validation workshop will be held where preliminary findings of the evaluation will be shared. The Evaluation Consultant will be responsible for developing the methodology of the workshop. However, the WIF programme team will select the participants based on guidelines provided by the Consultant. Further information may be gathered through the workshop led by the Evaluation Consultant. Participants will also be encouraged to give feedback and inputs on the preliminary findings and recommendations presented.
37. Logistical support for the fieldwork of the above activities will be provided by the programme in terms of coordination of interview schedules with respondents/groups of respondents, provision of interpretation services when needed, introduction to stakeholders, in-country transportation and organizing of the stakeholders' validation workshop.

38. It is expected that the Evaluation team composed of the Team Leader and the National Consultants will work to the highest evaluation standards and codes of conduct for UN evaluations as embodied in the UN Evaluation Guidelines¹⁰.
39. The gender dimension should be considered as a crosscutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation. All this information should be accurately included in the inception report and final evaluation report.

11. The team responsibilities and profile

40. Team leader (International consultant):

Responsibilities	Profile
• Conduct desk review of programme documents and other pertinent materials. • Develop evaluation methodology and tools. • Prepare inception report. • Conduct virtual and in-person interviews with selected stakeholders and programme staff. • Undertake/Coordinate data collection to facilitate focus group discussions and interviews in selected communities or at the local and national level with government and civil society organizations. • Facilitate the stakeholders' workshop. • Draft evaluation report. • Finalize evaluation report.	• Has not been involved in the programme. • Relevant background in social and/or economic development with a specialization in gender equality, social inclusion, mobility and labour issues. • Experience in the design, management and evaluation of development programmes, in particular with policy-level work, institutional building and local development programmes. • Experience in evaluations in the UN system, FCDO, UK or other international context as team leader. • Relevant sub-regional experience (in regions covered by the programme). • Relevant country experience (highly preferred). • Evaluation experience in the area of FPRW, including forced labour, human trafficking; women's work and gender, low skilled sector migration, rights-based approaches, workers' organizations, normative frameworks around labour rights and operational dimensions. • Proven knowledge and experience in a systems approach to evaluation. • Experience at policy level and in the area of human rights and legal issues. • Proficient written and spoken fluency in English is essential. Speaking Hindi, Bangla, Nepali or Arabic is an advantage. • Experience in facilitating workshops.

41. National Consultants:

Responsibilities	Profile
• Conduct desk review of programme documents. • Contribute to the development of the evaluation instrument. • Organize interviews of stakeholders and field visits in the country.	• Relevant background in country social and/or economic development. • Experience in the design, management and evaluation of development projects, in particular with policy level work, institutions building and local development projects.

¹⁰ See Annex 1 and 2 on "UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System" and "Standards for Evaluation in the UN System", respectively.

• Conduct key informant interviews or focus group discussions jointly with the Team Leader. • Contribute to the evaluation report through systematizing the data collection and providing analytical inputs. • Other responsibilities as required by the team leader.	• Relevant country experience, and prior working experience in migration, gender, livelihoods, and forced labour. • Experience conducting key informant interviews or focus group discussions. • Fluency in English (and other national relevant languages) essential • Knowledge of other local languages in the field visit areas an asset. • Experience with the UN system or similar international development experience desirable.
---	--

12. Tentative Work plan

42. Plan for the Consultant

The following table indicates the proposed work plan of the Team Leader and assigned work days for different activities. An external consultancy contract will be issued no later than 1st February 2022:

Table 1: Proposed work plan and tentative workdays

Description of Milestone / Process	No. of workdays	By Date
The MTE team selection and issue of the contracts		1 February 2022
Inception phase • Regional and country-level inception and planning meetings with Evaluation Manager and EM and WIF Team • Document review and analysis • Articulating the MTE evaluation approach and methodology • Developing instruments for the MTE evaluation • Compilation of the document review, analysis and inception report • Submission of draft of inception report and evaluation methodology	7	14 February 2022
• Finalization of inception report after feedback from the EM, Programme Team, etc.	1	28 February 2022
Regional and country-level consultations • Country-level visits and interviews with key stakeholders and beneficiaries • Compilation of findings, and preliminary analysis	25	28 March 2022
Preparing draft reports and validation of findings • Drawing conclusions, preparation of the first draft report and making recommendations • Stakeholder meeting to validate and discuss MTE findings and recommendations • Integration of comments and completion of second draft of deliverables	7	8 April 2022
Report writing and final adjustments • Finalise MTE report with all annexures	4	22 April 2022

Note: Total workdays for Lead Evaluator is 44

It is proposed that this MTE will be led by one international consultant with the support of three National Consultants

- 1 consultant for Arab countries covering Jordan, Lebanon and Kuwait (10-12 work-days)
- 1 consultant for India (9-10 work-days)

- 1 consultant for both Nepal and Bangladesh (preferably Bangla speaker) (8-9 work-days)

13. Main Deliverables

43. The Evaluator should complete the following deliverables within the specific timetable provided:
 1. Draft inception report defining the methodological approach and instruments;
 2. Final Inception Report incorporating comments from the ILO;
 3. Draft Evaluation Report in accordance with the following structure:
 - i. Executive Summary with key findings, conclusions and recommendations
 - ii. Methodology of the evaluation (including methodological limitations)
 - iii. Clearly identified findings addressing all evaluation questions
 - iv. A table presenting the key results (i.e. figures and qualitative results) achieved per objective (expected and unexpected)
 - v. Clearly identified conclusions and recommendations (identifying which stakeholders are responsible)
 - vi. Lessons learnt, emerging better practices in accordance with ILO templates
 - vii. Relevant annexes including this TOR, questionnaires, list of informants, etc.
 4. Final evaluation report incorporating feedback from the Stakeholders' /Validation Workshops of approximately 40-50 pages (not including annexes). Please be noted that there may be more than one round of comments and the report is only considered final when it is approved by ILO Evaluation Office.
 5. Preliminary and final PowerPoint presentation summarizing the report
 6. Notes with reflections on the process of the evaluation identifying the lessons learnt and suggestions for future ILO evaluations
 7. Other deliverables, as applicable
 8. Statement of the Team Leader that the quality of the report will be assessed against the relevant EVAL Checklists.
44. All drafts and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided in electronic versions compatible with Word for Windows. Ownership of data from the evaluation rests jointly with the ILO and the Consultant. The copyright of the evaluation report will rest exclusively with the ILO. Use of the data for publication and other presentations can only be made with the written agreement of the ILO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.
45. Report submission procedure.
The following procedure will be followed in submitting the inception report, draft and final evaluation reports:
 - a) The Evaluation Team Leader will submit the report to the Evaluation Manager.
 - b) The Evaluation Manager will forward a copy to the WIF programme, donor and other key stakeholders for comments, inputs and factual corrections.
 - c) The Evaluation Manager will consolidate all comments and send them to the Evaluation Consultant.
 - d) The revised report will be submitted to the Evaluation Manager with any explanation why certain comments might not have been reflected in the report.
 - e) Once the report is approved, it will be forwarded to key stakeholders and disseminated by the EM. Evaluation report is considered final when it is approved by ILO Evaluation Office.

14. Resources and Management

46. Budget

Proposed budget breakdown is as follows¹¹:

Expenses	Computation	Rate	Amount
International Consultant's (Lead Consultant's) fees inclusive of: - Professional fee - Local DSA in programme locations - Travel from consultant's home residence to select programme countries in line with ILO regulations and rules	44 days ¹²		
3 National Consultants 1 consultant for the Arab States covering Jordan, Lebanon and Kuwait (preferably Arabic speaker) 1 consultant for India (preferably Hindi speaker) 1 consultant covering both Nepal and Bangladesh (preferably a Bangla speaker)	At least 8 days for each National Consultant		
In-country travel (long distance transportation)			
Meetings and workshops' expenditure (if any)			

47. Management

The ILO Evaluation Manager for this exercise is Kaji Ratna Awaley, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer based in the ILO Country Office for Nepal. Regional Evaluation Officer will provide quality assurance to the evaluation process. Evaluation Office will approve final evaluation report.

The Evaluation Team Leader will report to the ILO Evaluation Manager and should discuss any technical and methodological matters with them should issues arise. The Team Leader is responsible for coordinating with national consultants to ensure the evaluation meets the requirements specified in the TOR. The WIF programme team will provide administrative and logistical support during the evaluation mission.

15. Legal and Ethical Matters

The evaluation will comply with UN Norms and Standards. The evaluator will abide by the EVAL's Code of Conduct for carrying out the evaluations. UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) ethical guidelines will be followed. The evaluator should not have any links to project management, or any other conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of the evaluation.

Evaluators should have personal and professional integrity and abide by the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for evaluation and the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system to ensure that the rights of individuals involved in an evaluation are respected. Evaluators must act with cultural sensitivity and pay particular attention to protocols, codes and recommendations that may be relevant to their interactions with women. Evaluators will be expected to sign the respective ILO Code of Conduct to show that they have read and understood the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System process.

Ownership of data from the evaluation rests jointly with the ILO and the consultant. The copyright of the evaluation report will rest exclusively with the ILO. The use of data for publication and other presentations can only be made with written agreement of the ILO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

¹¹ Budget will be affected depending on the methodology applied due to the COVID-19 situation in the targeted countries.

¹² Days depend on the COVID-19 situation and methodology adopted.

Annex A: List of key stakeholders (to be finalized in consultation with the WIF programme team/stakeholders in each project country)

Organization	Name
ILO Country Office, India	- Director (or Deputy Director) of ILO India Country Office and DWT Team - Specialist on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, DWT Team - Programme Officer, DWT/CO-New Delhi - National Project Coordinator, WIF programme - ILO colleagues from other relevant projects (tbd)
ILO Country Office, Nepal	- Director of ILO Nepal Country Office - Senior Programme Officer - National Project Coordinator, WIF - Technical Officer (M&E) - ILO colleagues from other relevant projects (tbd)
ILO Country Office, Bangladesh	- Director (or Deputy Director) of ILO Bangladesh - Programme Officer - National Project Coordinator (vacant position) - Programme and Admin Assistant, WIF - ILO colleagues from other relevant projects (tbd)
ILO Regional Office for Arab States (covering 12 Arab States and territories, including Jordan, Lebanon and Kuwait)	- Deputy Regional Director, Director DWT Arab States, RO-Arab States/DWT-Beirut - Senior Migration Specialist, DWT Team - Chief Technical Advisor, WIF programme - National Project Coordinator, WIF programme - ILO colleagues from other relevant projects (tbd)
ILO Office, Jordan	- Senior Specialist, Gender Equality and Coordinator of Jordan DWCP, RO-Arab States/DWT-Beirut - National Project Coordinator, WIF programme - Junior Project Technical Officer, In-charge of the Workers' Center - Workers' Center personnel - ILO colleagues from other relevant projects (tbd)
ILO Office, Kuwait	- Technical Officer, RO-Arab States/DWT-Beirut (WIF focal person for Kuwait and Oman)
ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok	- Chief, Regional Programme Services
ILO HQ	- Fundamentals Principles and Rights at Work Branch (FUNDAMENTALS) (tbd)
Advisory Board Members	- - -
FCDO, UK	- - -
IFPRI	-
	Few beneficiaries (tbd)

Contact details of WIF partnerships in different programme countries will be shared separately at the desk review and sampling framework development stage.

48. Annex B: RELEVANT POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

ILO Policy Guidelines for evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 3rd ed. http://www.ilo.ch/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS_571339/lang--en/index.htm

Code of conduct form (To be signed by the evaluators)

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206205/lang--en/index.htm

Checklist No. 3: Writing the inception report

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165972/lang--en/index.htm

Checklist 5: preparing the evaluation report

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165967/lang--en/index.htm

Checklist 6: rating the quality of evaluation report

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165968/lang--en/index.htm

Template for lessons learnt and Emerging Good Practices

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206158/lang--en/index.htm

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206159/lang--en/index.htm

Guidance note 7: Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation

https://www.ilo.org/global/docs/WCMS_165982/lang--en/index.htm

Guidance note 4: Integrating gender equality in the monitoring and evaluation of programmes

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm

Template for evaluation title page

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_166357/lang--en/index.htm

Template for evaluation summary

<http://www.ilo.org/legacy/english/edmas/eval/template-summary-en.doc>

UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation

<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/548>

Protocol on collecting evaluative evidence on the ILO's COVID-19 response measures through project and programme evaluations, effective on 9 Oct 2020

https://www.ilo.org/eval/WCMS_757541/lang--en/index.htm

Guidance Note 3.2: Adapting evaluation methods to the ILO's normative and tripartite mandate

https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_721381.pdf

49. Annex C: Documents to be reviewed:

It is proposed that the consultants review the following (but not limited to) documents:

1. [LessonsLearntWIF 2019](#) of the WIF programme
2. Programme Document, logframe, theory of change, value for money measures, etc.

3. Annual Technical progress reports
4. Baseline reports, if applicable
5. Sample work plans
6. Studies and research undertaken
7. Monitoring and evaluation data, including evaluability assessment and annual reviews
8. Phase 1 Evaluation reports, External Evaluation Partner (LSHTM and IFPRI) reports

50. Annex D

Results Chain (WiF Phase II)

impact level

Reduce vulnerability to trafficking and forced labour of women and girls across migration pathways leading to the care sector and manufacturing sector

= equals

outcome level

1. Women have greater ability to make their own choices during the entire migration process in an enabling environment for safe migration into decent work

+ plus

2. Increased levels of collaboration, accountability and respect between key actors along migration pathways towards an enabling environment for safe migration into decent work

x times

3. Strengthened laws, policies, practices and systems for social protection, safe labour migration and decent work for women

output level

1. Women understand how to negotiate and take decisions that affect their lives especially in relation to accessing protections and entitlements, mobility and local or outbound employment.

2. Migrant women, men and children in targeted sectors enjoy better collective representation, support services, and recognition of their rights along the pathways of their migration.

3. Employers and labour recruiters adopt more accountable recruitment practices along migration pathways based on international labour standards and are subject to better monitoring, regulation and enforcement.

4. Advocacy work ensures that policy makers have improved knowledge and commitment to reform laws and policies to protect migrant worker rights

5. Improved analytical understanding of risks and vulnerabilities in the migration process leads to improved intervention measures and evidence bases

underlying challenges to be addressed

1. Migration under duress as a result of agrarian crisis (described under [background section 1.2](#))

[Lesson 17-22](#)

2. Abusive working and living conditions and asymmetrical power (described under background section 1.3)

[Lessons 11-16](#)

3. Recruitment that is perceived by migrant workers to be deceptive (described under background section 1.4)

[Lesson 7-10](#)

4. Legal gaps (harmful policies) and weak advocacy (described under background section 1.5)

[Lesson 1-6 and 12](#)

5. Limited evidence base for policy makers (described under background section 1.6)

[Lesson 24 and 25](#)

key related international labour standards

Addressing discrimination ([C111](#)) & [CEDAW](#)

Freedom of association, right to organize and CB ([C87](#), [C98](#))

Forced labour ([C29](#), [C105](#) and [P29](#))

Migrant worker and recruitment standards ([C97](#), [C143](#), [C181](#)) and [CPRAMWE](#)

Decent work for domestic workers ([C189](#)), home based workers ([C172](#)), Child labour ([C182](#)), other.