

**Call for Expressions of Interest
Independent Final Evaluation
Developing a New Industrial Relations Framework in respect of the ILO Declaration on
Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (NIRF Project)**

Project Location	Hanoi, Vietnam and main field locations of the project within the country
Application deadline	20 February 2020
Type of contract	External Collaboration Contract
Post Level	Independent Evaluation Specialist as team leader National Evaluation consultant (Vietnamese) as team member
Languages required	Proficiency in written and spoken English and Vietnamese
Expected duration	Team leader 25 working days (1 March – 31 May 2020) Team member 20 working days Proposed Field mission dates within 16 –31 March 2020)

The ILO's Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific is seeking expressions of interest from a team of experts or from qualified Individual as team leader together with a national consultant as part of the team to conduct an independent final evaluation of *Developing a New Industrial Relations Framework in respect of the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (NIRF Project)* and the ILO, implemented in Vietnam by the ILO, funded by the Government of Japan.

For further details about the evaluation, please see the Terms of Reference below.

Candidates intending to submit an expression of interest must supply the following information:

- 1) A description of how the candidate's skills, qualifications and experience are relevant to the required qualifications of this assignment.
- 2) A list of previous evaluations that are relevant to the context and subject matter of this assignment.
- 3) A statement confirming their availability to conduct this assignment and the daily professional fee expressed in US dollars.
- 4) A copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae (which must include information about the qualifications held by the candidate).
- 5) A statement confirming that the candidate has no previous involvement in the delivery of the captioned project in Vietnam or a personal relationship with any ILO Officials who are engaged in the project.
- 6) The names of two referees who are able to be contacted.

Please note that special consideration will be given to the national consultant.

The deadline to submit expression of interest for undertaking the evaluation is by **5.00 pm (Bangkok time) on Friday, 20 February 2020**. Please send an e-mail with the subject header "Evaluation of NIRF Project" to the **Evaluation Manager, Diane Respall (respall@ilo.org)** and copied to **Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka (pamornrat@ilo.org)**.



TERMS OF REFERENCE

FINAL INDEPENDENT PROJECT EVALUATION

Title of project being evaluated	Developing a New Industrial Relations Framework in respect of the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work (NIRF Project)
Project TC Code	VNM/16/06/JPN (IRIS No – 106044; Award No. 501947)
Donor	Government of Japan
Dates of Project Implementation	20 Dec 2016 – 30 June 2020, based on PARDEV Approval Minute
Administrative unit:	ILO Country Office for Viet Nam (CO-Hanoi)
ILO Responsible Official:	Mr. Chang-Hee Lee, Country Director
Technical Backstopping Unit:	Decent Work Team, ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
Collaborating ILO Units:	Labour Law and Reform Unit (LABOURLAW); NORMES; INWORK Others: Bureau for Employers' Activities (ACTEMP); Bureau for Workers' Activities (ACTRAV); Social Protection Department (SOCPRO).
Timing of evaluation	Final, end of project evaluation
Evaluation Dates	1 March – 31 May 2020
Type of evaluation	Independent final evaluation
Preparation period of TOR	January 2020
Total Project Funds	US\$ 2,181,976.68
Evaluation Manager	Diane Lynn C. Respall

Contents

I- Introduction and Rationale.....	4
II- PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION	4
III- Scope of the Evaluation.....	5
IV- Stakeholders and Users of the Evaluation	6
V- Evaluation Questions	7
A. Project's design, relevance and strategic fit.....	7
B. Effectiveness and progress	7
C. Effectiveness of management arrangements.....	8

D.	Efficiency and Resource Use.....	8
E.	Impact.....	8
F.	Sustainability	8
G.	Cross-Cutting Issues	9
VI-	Roles and Responsibilities.....	9
VII-	Evaluation Methodology	10
VIII-	Evaluation Milestones and Timelines.....	11
IX-	Evaluation Report and deliverables	14
X-	Legal and Ethical Matters	15
XI-	Annex	15
H.	List of documents	15
I.	Annex 2: All relevant ILO evaluation guidelines and standard templates.....	16

I- Introduction and Rationale

The Project funded by Japan entitled *Developing a New Industrial Relations Framework in respect of the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work* (heretofore referred to as *NIRF Japan Project*) is part of a broader group of projects, designed to support Vietnam's goal for global integration, where observance of ILO's Fundamental Principles and Rights At Work is one of the main requirements.

The Project's overall goal is to build the legal and institutional foundations for a new industrial relations framework based on ILO FPRW Declaration, with a special focus on Convention 87 on Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise and Convention 98 on Right to Organise and Collective Bargaining, and in full consideration of national contexts effectively established in Viet Nam

NIRF Project has four medium-term objectives (MTO) as follows:

- **MTO 1:** National labour laws and legal instruments are consistent with the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work
- **MTO 2:** Labour administration system effectively administers new industrial relations framework
- **MTO 3:** Labour inspectorate effectively enforces and promotes compliance with national labour laws in employment and industrial relations
- **MTO 4:** Workers and Employers representative functions reinforced under the new IR framework

Through a multi-pronged approach, this programme aims to establish mutually reinforcing outputs leading to system-wide changes (in law, policy and practice) by adopting a full policy cycle approach which can generate long term systems level practice change.

The **MTO 4 is funded by the Government of Japan** covering the mid-term objective : "Workers' and employers' representative functions reinforced under the new industrial relations framework".

Based on the Project Approval Minute, the component supported by the Government of Japan started in 20 December 2016 covering a total amount of USD 2,181,976.68.

Since the project is ending on 30 June 2020 and consistent with ILO evaluation policy on projects involving above 1 million US dollars, the NIRF Japan project will undergo an independent final evaluation, which will be conducted within the period February to May 2020, inclusive of preparations. Ms. Diane Respass, a Programme Officer of CO-Manila who has no prior involvement in the NIRF Japan Project, will serve as the evaluation manager with the guidance of Ms. Pamornat Prinsulaka as the Regional Evaluation Officer of Asia and the Pacific.

The NIRF Japan project underwent a midterm internal evaluation conducted in February 2019.

Key stakeholders, including tripartite constituents, donors, key partners and the ILO CO-Hanoi in Vietnam will be consulted throughout the evaluation process. The evaluation process and report will follow ILO guidelines and the ILO Evaluation Office will approve the final evaluation report. The evaluation will comply with the United National Evaluation Group (UNEG)'s Evaluation Norms and Standards.

II- PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

Main purpose of independent evaluation is for accountability of the ILO and the local implementing partners. The **independent final evaluation** will also give an independent assessment of the progress of project, ascertain what stated objectives which the project has or has not achieved; what the results of project interventions have been on target stakeholders and institutions; the strategies and implementation modalities chosen which show how activities have been implemented; how it is perceived and valued by targeted groups and stakeholders; the appropriateness of the project design, project constraints and opportunities; and the effectiveness of the project's management structure.

The evaluation will promote the partnership mechanism, and enhance learning culture of both the ILO and social partners. The evaluation also intends to identify effective practices and assess the prospects for sustaining

them beyond the life of the project. Overall, the evaluation will also provide recommendations to inherit of the successes of current phase to the future design of NIRF project covering the components funded by Japan.

The evaluation will cover project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. Specifically, the evaluation will examine:

- (i) Project's design, implementation strategy, institutional arrangements and partnerships, as well as project set ups within the broad multi-project context of NIRF
- (ii) Relevance of project's interventions within any recent or current development circumstances in Vietnam;
- (iii) Progress made towards achieving its planned medium- and short term objectives
- (iv) Effectiveness of project implementation and management, which include the following:
 - a. Coordination mechanisms among the partners and the effectiveness and efficiency of programme implementation in general,
 - b. Identification and analysis of factors that hinder or facilitate the project delivery.
 - c. How the recommendations of the previous mid-term evaluation have been followed up and implemented by the project.
- (v) Good practices and lessons learnt, as well as replicability, including what worked and what did not work. Where activities have been particularly successful, the reasons for successful implementation. This includes the approaches or implementation practices that have important demonstration effect and provide an important source of results based learning.
- (vi) Follow ups for future IR related work to be implemented by partners and by a future ILO project.

The evaluation will assess the positive and negative changes produced by the project – intended and unintended, direct and indirect – as reported by respondents and reflected in the project's performance data. The final report should provide recommendations for possible changes that could be made to the implementation arrangements of the project or to be included in the design of a similar project that may be implemented in the future

III- Scope of the Evaluation

1. The evaluation will focus on the NIRF Japan Project component covering the Medium-term objective 4 and its 5 Short-term objectives reiterated as follows
 - a. **Medium-Term Objective 4: Workers and Employers representative functions reinforced under the new IR framework**
 - i. **Short-term Objective 4.1:** Bi-partite/tripartite social dialogue strengthened to improve industrial relations through sharing experiences and lessons learnt
 - ii. **Short-term Objective 4.2:** VGCL increased engagement in law reform and activated renovations of trade unions organizational and operational structure for better performance
 - iii. **Short-term Objective 4.3:** Trade unions at all levels enhanced their capacity in organizing, collective bargaining and social dialogue through pilot initiatives
 - iv. **Short-term Objective 4.4:** VCCI and business associations increased engagement in labour law reform and renovation plans
 - v. **Short-term Objective 4.5:** Cooperation mechanism enhanced between business and employers' community, and workplace IR improved in pilot localities
2. The timeframe of the project for this evaluation is from 20 December 2016 until **30 June 2020**.
3. The gender dimension should be considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report. 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 gender and assess the relevance and effectiveness of gender-related strategies and outcomes to improve the lives of women and men. All this information should be accurately included in the inception report and evaluation report.

4. Taking into account section *F. Project Locations* identified above, the geographical coverage for the field visits for the evaluation may include Hanoi and selected provinces where the pilot activities have been implemented. These are as follows:
 - a. Hanoi
 - b. Hai Phong city (North)
 - c. Da Nang and Quang Nam (Central)
 - d. Dong Nai, Binh Duong (South)

5. **Reference to Previous Evaluations and Reviews.** The review identified immediate and long-term recommendations, as follows: (Please refer to this link to find the evaluation report - <https://www.ilo.org/DevelopmentCooperationDashboard/#bpus93v>)
 - a. **Immediate actions:**
 - Accelerate the planning and approval of activities for their implementation in the second and third quarter of the year. Avoid as much as possible the last quarter (the project practice up to now).
 - Support Binh Duong PIU to complete the social dialogue pilot among furniture companies.
 - Build organizational capacity and collective bargaining capacity of the METU in Quang Nam province.
 - Enhance cooperation between the project two components (VGCL and VCCI) to achieve greater efficiency. For example, FOLs are engaging VCCI, business associations and HR Clubs in the process of persuading companies to join MECBA or MESD.
 - Strengthen the enforcement or labour regulations related to SD and CBA by labour inspection work. This could be done by working with the USDOL component on labour inspection (MTO 3).
 - Cooperate with the Better Work project to recognise MESD/MECBA as of equal value as enterprise SD/CBA.
 - Cooperate with the Score project to link compliance with labour standards to productivity issue to gain greater interest from employers.
 - Transfer all training contents done by international trainers to national trainers.
 - Strengthen capacity of PIUs in reporting to meet ILO standards
 - Support VGCL to advocate for MESD/MECBA in the revised Labour Code as an equal option to enterprise SD/CBA that employers can choose to do.
 - Integrate gender equality and non-discrimination principles into project training and contents for HR Clubs.
 - Revise the project's outcome indicators to reflect the qualitative contributions of the project in the field of IRs. Examples of such indicators include:
 - Evidence of adoption of piloted approaches in the revised labour legal framework.
 - Evidence of adoption of piloted approaches in renovation plans of VGCL and VCCI.
 - Evidence of linkages between advocacy issues promoted by VGCL and VCCI and the pilots supported by the project.
 - b. **Long-term actions:**
 - Conduct a research on direct election to find a cost-effective way to replicate the approach.
 - Advocate for VGCL to recognise workers in micro enterprises as a special group of concern, so that separate organisational and membership development targets can be put in place for this group.
 - SD and CBA in the context of multiple workers' organisations.

IV- Stakeholders and Users of the Evaluation

The primary users of the evaluation are the ILO CO Hanoi, ILO's NIRF Japan project team, VGCL, VCCI and NIRF National Project Steering Committee (NPSC)

The users of the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations clients are as follows:

- The project management (ILO Office for Vietnam) and ILO NIRF Japan who will be able draw lesson and adapt the strategy for future IR interventions;
- Other projects of the NIRF programme who establish synergies with NIRF Japan and may draw lessons on the strategy and implementation particularly involving common partners;
- Other projects of the ILO who can gain experiences, good practices and lessons learnt from evaluation for their partnership mechanism and activities implementation;
- The ILO constituents in Vietnam (trade unions and employers together with their branches/members at localities);
- MoLISA as well as all the project's implementation partners (IPs) who will be actively involved in the evaluation;
- The ILO Decent Work Team for East Asia and the Pacific and any relevant ILO technical backstopping units
- Government of Japan.
- Possible users of this evaluation, besides its clients, are all the direct beneficiaries of the project.

V- Evaluation Questions

A. Project's design, relevance and strategic fit

- To what extent is the design of the project relevant to the strategy, in meeting the Programme & Budget outcomes in the ILO Strategic Framework, Country Priority Outcomes (CPO) and SDG which aims to support? Is it relevant to national, regional and international development frameworks?
- To what extent are the project's immediate objectives consistent with the needs of and expectations beneficiaries, partners, key stakeholders at both national and local levels and relevant to the needs of the government, workers and employers' organizations and the ILO? How does the project align with and support national development plans/ with strategic priorities of key partners? Was there a review of needs or gap analysis or validation process carried out at the beginning? Were the issues or needs still relevant? Have new, more relevant needs emerged that the project should have addressed?
- To what extent have stakeholders taken ownership of the project concept and approach?
- How well does the project complement and fit with programmes and priorities of the constituents related promotion of sound industrial relations? Describe the extent of synergies and interlinkages between the NIRF interventions and other interventions carried out by ILO Hanoi, Government and social partners. Did the project complement, enhance, and build upon existing activities and programmes of the partners? Describe the extent to which other interventions and policies support or undermine the NIRF interventions, and vice versa.
- Have there been new intervening factors/actors (e.g. other donor assisted programmes) that have emerged since the inception of the NIRF which may have impaired or enhanced project performance or future ILO development assistance in these strategic areas?
- Were principles of Results Based Management applied?

B. Effectiveness and progress

- Is the project on track to achieve the indicator targets according to schedule of Medium-Term Objective 4 and all of its Sub-objectives and outputs? Is the quantity and quality of these outputs satisfactory? What factors influenced the effectiveness of the project capacity building and other activities?
- Which sub-objective has the project shown the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? What were the good practices and lessons learned from the pilot initiatives? What have been the obstacles to achievement both in terms of factors that project is enable to influence and external factors beyond its control?
- Have there been any additional achievements of the project over and above what was foreseen in the project document?
- Has the nature of industrial relations among the project partners changed because of the implementation of the project activities? To what extent?

- How have stakeholders been involved in project implementation? Has the project effectively and efficiently succeeded in mainstreaming industrial relations in its areas of work (outputs) and its processes?
- Is there any evidence that the trainees have effectively applied gained knowledge into their daily work? Were the training services provided relevant? What are the areas for improvement? How has the training thus far addressed the key gaps identified in compliance with international labor standards?

C. Effectiveness of management arrangements

- Are management capacities adequate and facilitate good results and efficient delivery? Is there a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities by all parties involved?
- Did the IR project receive sufficient political, technical and administrative support from its national partners, the ILO, and the donor?
- Do the programs' performance measures and monitoring systems provide an objective and gender sensitive assessment of program performance? Is information being regularly analysed to feed into management decisions?
- Has cooperation with the project's implementing partners been efficient? Has a participatory/consultative approach been applied? Were there effort to ensure equal participation of women and men?
- How strategic are the implementing partners in terms of mandate, influence, capacities and commitment?

D. Efficiency and Resource Use

- Are resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) allocated strategically and efficiently to achieve outcomes?
- Is budget expenditure progressing as expected (i.e. expenditure rate)? Have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
- Have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost effective? In general, do the results justify the costs? Could same results be attained with fewer resources?
- Have efforts been duplicated in other projects related to NIRF? Are there ways the project and partners can improve efficiencies? To what extent have the Project been able to build on other ILO initiatives and create synergies that allowed for more efficient use of resources?
- Does the project have monitoring system to ensure efficient use of time and resources?
- How effective is the backstopping support provided by ILO throughout the project implementation? Did the project maximize the specialists' expertise and leveraging other existing other relevant project to help push forwarded the expected results?

E. Impact

- How was the project able to contribute to the establishment of the legal and institutional foundations for a new industrial relations framework? Are the results consistent with or support the application of ILO convention C.87 and 98?
- To what extent has the project contributed changes in attitudes, policies, laws, capacities, institutions that relate to the new industrial relations framework? Identify the social, environmental, and economic effects of the intervention
- What are the impacts of gender mainstreaming at policy and institutional levels? To what extent have the pilots addressed the different needs of women and men, in policies and practices on organizing, social dialogue and collective bargaining? Have women been given opportunity in organizing? Were gender concerns integrated in pilots for social dialogue and collective bargaining?
- To what extent have the pilots been institutionalized?
- Can/should the project/pilots be scaled up?
- The innovative approaches and methodologies piloted?

F. Sustainability

- Did the project designs include an integrated and appropriate strategy for sustainability? How effective and realistic is the exit strategy of the IR project?
- How effective and realistic is the exit strategy of the IR project? Is the project gradually being handed over to the national partners?
- Once external funding ends, will national institutions and key implementing partners be likely to continue the project or carry forward its results? (What is the nature of the commitment from stakeholders? Are they willing to sustain the results? What results have been achieved, including through tools and research papers developed, to assist implementing partners secure and sustain on-going operations?) Does the project have a strategy in place to sustain these elements?
- Which strategies can be taken forward by partners and which strategies should be incorporated into any future ILO project?
- What are the follow-up actions required to sustain the project's initiatives?
In how far is the project making a significant contribution to broader and longer-term development impact?

G. Cross-Cutting Issues

Gender equality, international labour standards, social dialogue including tripartism, environmental sustainability, along with development, has been identified by the ILO as a crosscutting issue of the strategic objectives of its global agenda of Decent Work. Constituent capacity development should also be considered in this evaluation.

To the extent possible, data collection and analysis will be disaggregated by gender as described in the ILO Evaluation Policy Guidelines and relevant Guidance Notes.

VI- Roles and Responsibilities

An evaluator (independent consultant) together with the national consultant as part of the team will be selected according to ILO procedures to implement. The evaluator will be responsible for the task and outputs set out in this TOR. The choice of the external collaborator will be approved by the ILO's Evaluation Unit along with the Terms of Reference for the evaluation.

Responsibilities and profile of Evaluator is provided in the table below.

Responsibility	Profile
• The Evaluator will draft a brief inception report, a draft report and a final report. evaluation tools, • Elaborating and refining any technical and methodological approaches necessary for this evaluation. • Ensuring the quality of data (validity, reliability, consistency and accuracy) throughout the analytical and reporting phases. • Ensuring the evaluation is conducted per TORs, including following the ILO EVAL guidelines methodology and formatting requirements. • Coordinate and guide the work of the national consultant/national team member during evaluation process	• No previous involvement in the delivery of the project • Adequate contextual knowledge of the UN, ILO and Vietnam, especially on topics relevant to industrial relations, social dialogue and collective bargaining. • Adequate technical specialization, demonstrated knowledge and expertise on international labour standards, industrial relations, social dialogue and collective bargaining. • At least 10 years' experience in evaluation policies, strategies and organizational effectiveness. • Experience in conducting evaluations for ILO projects. • Expertise in qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and an understanding of issues related to validity and reliability. • Fluency in spoken and written English and an understanding of the ILO crosscutting issues.

	• Working knowledge of Vietnamese is an advantage or can engage an interpreter or translator.
--	---

The evaluator maintains over-all responsibility for the outputs, including that of a national consultant who also serves as evaluation team member and the translator/interpreter as well. The national team member will provide translation;/interpretation throughout process and will translate of the outputs in Vietnamese.

National Team Member , Desired skills and competencies:

- No previous involvement in the delivery of the NIRF project;
- Master Degree with minimum 7 years of strong and substantial professional experience working on social dialogue and industrial relations issues in Vietnam;
- S/He should be knowledgeable in gender sensitive program evaluation methodologies, programming and organizational and institutional capacity building;
- Experience in conducting evaluations for ILO projects (preferable)
- Excellent analytical skills and interview skills;
- Excellent command of oral and written English;

It is estimated that the scope of effort required by the evaluation will be approximately **25 days**. The work of the **national consultant** will cover **20 workdays**. The successful Evaluator will be remunerated on an output based total fee. Travel and DSA at the prevailing UN Common Systems rate will be provided. The evaluator will be required to book his/her own travel, in consultation with the ILO.

The suggested timeline and work plan is provided **below**.

The **evaluation manager** will manage and participate in the evaluation process under the oversight and guidance of both the **Senior Evaluation Officer and the Regional Evaluation Officer**. Inputs from **Eval** may be sought through the evaluation process. The evaluation manager's responsibilities include managing the contract with the Evaluator, consulting on methodological issues and facilitating access to primary and secondary data.

The ILO NIRF Japan Project staff based in ILO CO-Hanoi will provide the overall coordination, administrative and logistics support. These include the following:

- Ensure access to relevant project information.
- Providing additional information and comments to the evaluation manager and external Evaluator.
- Providing input to ToRs.
- The ILO Evaluation Management Handbook, 2nd edition
- Coordinating logistics of the evaluation team with the partners during the evaluation, particularly during the field mission.
- Ensure access to/Provide required data
- Arranging meetings and coordinate exchanges between the evaluation team and partners and participating in evaluation workshops.
- Providing inputs to the evaluation manager on the draft report.
- Co-ordinating follow-up plans.

VII- Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation will be carried out in accordance with ILO standard policies and procedures comply with evaluation norms and follow ethical safeguards. The evaluation will address the overall ILO evaluation criteria as defined in the ILO Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation: principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations (3rd ed. 2017). The evaluation will also take into account the gender issues into the evaluation process as guided by the ILO guidelines on Integrating gender equality in monitoring and evaluation of projects (2014). The ILO adheres to the United Nations system evaluation norms and standards as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.

The evaluation will use mix of approaches and ensure triangulation of information. It will, in part, use a results-based approach to examine the achievements. In will, in part, use a case study approach to examine the pilots under review.

The evaluation shall include the following methods:

- **Desk review including review of operating and financial data**
- **Key informant interviews (KIIs).** Interviews are to be conducted with key program stakeholder (by phone or in-person) including (but not limited to):
 - o Relevant ILO project staff and representatives , ILO CO Vietnam representatives, including Director and Programme backstopping official, Social Dialogue specialist from DW Team in Bangkok or Geneva; ACTRAV/ACTEMP specialists in Bangkok and/or Geneva. Other ILO representatives may include those from Geneva and the ILO DWT in Thailand,
 - o Ministry of Labour- Invalid and Social Affairs IR Bureau of MOLISA and DOLISA
 - o Members of the VGCL and Federations of Labour who have been involved in or are familiar with program implementation
 - o VCCI and Officials of related employer organizations that were involved with or interacted with the projects
 - o Embassy of Japan and Other donor representatives who have been involved with the projects
- **Focus group discussions (FGDs).** The team conducted three FGDs, one each with government, union representatives, and employer informants.
- **Field visit to Vietnam (Hanoi and provincial visits) and field interviews.** The exact itinerary will be determined later based on scheduling and availability of interviewees in coordination with the NIRF Japan Project team, in accordance with the evaluator's requests and consistent with these terms of reference. The evaluator should conduct meetings without the participation of any project staff.
- **Stakeholders debriefing workshop in Vietnam.** Presentation of preliminary findings at the end of the mission.
- **End of mission debriefing with ILO CO-Hanoi** the evaluation team to present preliminary findings and recommendations virtually for reactions and recommendations.

ILO's Evaluation Handbook provides the basic framework, the evaluation will be carried out in accordance with ILO standard policies and procedures. The ILO adheres to the United Nations system evaluation norms and standards as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.

The evaluation is an independent evaluation and the final methodology and evaluation questions will be determined by the Evaluator in consultation with the Evaluation Manager.

The details of the methodology will be elaborated by the evaluator based on the TORs and documented in the Inception Report, which is subject to approval by the Evaluation Manager.

At the completion of the field mission, a stakeholder workshop will be organized by the ILO in Hanoi to present the preliminary findings and proposed recommendations. Draft evaluation TORs and report will be shared with relevant stakeholders for their comments and inputs.

All data should be sex-disaggregated and different needs of women and men and those marginalized groups should be considered throughout the evaluation process.

VIII- Evaluation Milestones and Timelines

Task Name	Responsible	Start	Finish	Work days	Outputs
Develop Evaluation Work plan	Evaluation Manager	10-Jan-20	13-Jan-20		

Task Name	Responsible	Start	Finish	Work days	Outputs
Formulation and Finalization of TOR	Evaluation Manager	13-Jan-20	03-Feb-20		
Recruit consultant (advertisement)	Evaluation Manager, Regional Evaluation Officer	03-Feb-20	20-Feb-20		
Contact stakeholders to schedule meetings with the evaluator	Project Team	03-Feb-20	28-Feb-20		
Signing contract with consultant	Project Team	24 Feb-20	28-Feb-20		
Briefing of evaluator by Evaluation Manager, subsequently with Project Staff and CO-Hanoi	Evaluation Manager	29-Feb-20	03-Mar -20		
Data Collection, desk review and initial analysis	Evaluator	03 Mar 20	05 Mar 20	4	Inception report: Final eval. questions -Methodology section -Instruments
Draft Inception report	Evaluator				
Approve Inception report	Evaluation Manager, Regional Evaluation Officer	06-Mar-20	12-Mar-20		
Meetings with Project and partners, Field visit, follow up interviews, Drafting and Presentation of initial findings at the end of the mission, End of mission	Evaluator	16-Mar-20	31-Mar-20	11	Stakeholder presentation Debriefing with NIRF Japan Project Team and CO-Hanoi
Draft evaluation report completed and delivered, based on desk review and consultations from field visits	Evaluator	01-Apr-20	10-Apr-20	4	

Task Name	Responsible	Start	Finish	Work days	Outputs
Draft evaluation report submitted to Evaluation Manager	Evaluator	10-Apr-20	10-Apr-20		Draft report 1
Share evaluation report to Project Team, for any necessary corrections to prepare draft for circulation	Evaluation Manager	11-Apr-20	13-Apr-20		
Circulate draft evaluation report to key stakeholders	Project Team	13-Apr-20	24-Apr-20		
Send draft evaluation report to Regional Evaluation Officer	Evaluation Manager	13-Apr-20	24-Apr-20		
Convey comments to the consultant for possible inclusion	Evaluation Manager	27-Apr-20	27-Apr-20		
Report writing, comments consolidation & finalization including explanations on why comments were not include	Evaluator	27-Apr-20	30-Apr-20	6	Draft Report 2 and Final Report
Submit draft to evaluation manager (Evaluation Manager)	Evaluator	30-Apr-20	30-Apr-20	0	
Review Report for quality control	Evaluation Manager	03-May-20	06-May-20		
Submit Report to Regional Evaluation Officer for EVAL for Approval	Evaluation Manager	06-May-20	06-May-20		
Review Report Approval	Regional Evaluation Officer, EVAL	06-May-20	20-May-20		
Dissemination to national partners	Project Team	20-May-20	31-May-20		
Follow-up to recommendations	Project Team, CO-Hanoi	31-May-20	Onwards		
TOTAL Workdays				25	
NOTE: Total workdays allocated for the <u>national</u> consultant is 20 workdays.					

IX- Evaluation Report and deliverables

The evaluation process will yield the following outputs, in **both English and Vietnamese**

1. **Brief inception report** (maximum 5 pages, excluding Annexes if any) upon the review of the available documents and an initial discussion with the project's management, including the following elements.
 - Refined evaluation questions
 - Describe the conceptual framework that will be used to undertake the evaluation.
 - Sets out in some detail the approach for data collection, the evaluation methodology; i.e. how evaluation questions will be answered by way of data collection methods, data sources, sampling and selection criteria, and indicators.
 - Sets out the work plan for the evaluation, which indicates the phases in the evaluation.
 - Sets out a plan for data collection, interviews or Focus Group Discussions (FGD).
 - Sets out the list of key stakeholders to be interviewed.

This inception report should set out any changes proposed to the methodology or any other issues of importance in the further conduct of the evaluation.

2. **Stakeholders workshop.** The evaluator will conduct a stakeholders' workshop. The stakeholders' workshop will be organized to validate information and data collected through various methods and share the preliminary findings with the ILO and local stakeholders at the end of evaluation mission. The stakeholders' workshops will be organized by the project team. Powerpoint presentation should be prepared and presented at the workshop and shared with Evaluation Manager.
3. **Draft evaluation report and its timing.**
 - Evaluator to submit a complete and readable draft report to the evaluation manager.
 - Draft report should reflect the evaluative reasoning and critical thinking that were used to draw values-based conclusions following the evidence.

Evaluation report should include action-oriented, practical and specific recommendations assigning or designating audiences /implementers /users. The draft evaluation report should be prepared as per the ILO Checklist 5: Preparing the Evaluation Report (see Annex D).

The first draft evaluation report will be improved and commented by the evaluation manager who is responsible for checking the quality of the draft report in terms of adequacy and readability. The evaluation manager circulates the report among the stakeholders for comments.

4. **Final Independent Evaluation report** (with Title Page, Executive Summary and Annexes, including lesson learned and emerging good practices in the ILO Template).

The report should not be longer than 30 pages, excluding annexes.

Evaluation manager will compile the comments received and forwards them in a single communication to the evaluator. The evaluator will incorporate comments as they deem appropriate and show how they have or have not addressed each comment using a comment matrix and submit the final report and comment matrix to the evaluation manager, who will disseminate these simultaneously to the donor and immediate project stakeholders.

The quality of the report will be assessed against the EVAL checklist 5, 6 and 7 (see Annex D).

The final version is subjected to final approval by EVAL (after initial approval by the Evaluation manager/Regional evaluation officer)

5. **Evaluation Summary** (EVAL checklist 8 see Annex D), lessons learnt and good practices must be developed using ILO standard format.

All draft and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided in electronic version compatible with MS WORD for Windows.

The copyright of the report from the evaluation rests exclusively with the ILO. Use of the data for publication and other presentation can only be made with the agreement of the ILO.

Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgment.

The main deliverable of this evaluation is the **Independent Final Evaluation** report to be written in accordance with the **ILO House Style Manual** (5th edition). The content of the report should include:

- Cover page with key project data (project title, project number, donor, project start and completion dates, budget, technical area, managing ILO unit, geographical coverage); and evaluation data (type of evaluation, managing ILO unit, start and completion dates of the evaluation mission, name(s) of evaluator(s), date of submission of evaluation report).
- Table of contents
- Executive summary
- Acronyms
- Background and project description and its intervention logic
- Purpose, scope and clients of evaluation
- Evaluation methodology, evaluation questions and limitations
- Review of project results including high level achievements by outcome against plan
- Presentation of findings by evaluation criteria
- Conclusions and recommendations ((including to whom they are addressed, resources required, priority and timing))
- Impacts, lessons learnt and potential good practices and models of interventions – to provide standard annex templates as per EVAL guidelines.
- Annexes (study tools, list of interviews, overview of meetings, proceedings stakeholder meetings, other relevant information).

The Evaluation Manager will assess it against the EVAL checklist 8 (see Annexes) and will finalise the evaluation summary.

X- Legal and Ethical Matters

The ILO Code of Conduct for independent evaluators applies to all evaluation consultants. The principles behind the code of Conduct are fully consistent with the Standards of Conduct for the International civil Services to which all UN staff is bound. UN staff is also subject to any UNEG member specific staff rules and procedures for the procurement services. The selected evaluator shall sign and return a copy of the code of conduct with the contract.

XI- Annex

H. List of documents

- Project document
- Baseline reports and related data
- Monitoring reports conducted during the project
- Progress and status reports, Extensions and budget revisions
- Previous phase or related evaluation reports of the project
- Project outputs: national and international case studies, training modules, other relevant studies and research undertaken by the project

- Project beneficiary documentation, Project documentation: workshop reports, PSC meeting reports, consultation meeting reports, concept notes, minutes of monthly calls/meetings with the Donor, and relevant correspondence
- Project staff directory
- Directory of (implementing) partners
- ILO or National documentation -
 - o National development framework
 - o One UN Plan
 - o ILO Decent Work Country Programme Documents
 - o ILO Strategic Programme Framework and Programme and Budget

I. Annex 2: All relevant ILO evaluation guidelines and standard templates

- ILO Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation, 2012
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_176814/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](#)
https://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
- Checklist No. 7 [Filling in the title page](#) with link to template
https://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_166363/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
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm
- Guidance note 4 Integrating gender equality in M&E of projects
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>
<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>