

Call for EoI
Mid Term Evaluation
Better Work Global Programme Phase IV

ILO/EVAL is looking for a sole evaluator for the mid-term evaluation of Better Work Global Phase - IV (GLO/17/55/MUL) to conduct the evaluation during June-September 2020.

The evaluation should take about 30 working days in total for the sole evaluator. The evaluation will be home –based for the consultant with face-to-face interaction only when feasible according to the COVID 19 pandemic situation at the time of starting the evaluation.

Application deadline: 26 June 2020

Type of contract: External Collaboration Contract

PROFILE OF THE CONSULTANT:

- No previous involvement in the delivery of the Better Work programme;
- Master Degree with minimum 8 years of strong and substantial experience in programme evaluation (independently);
- An evaluation expert in development field with demonstrated technical expertise in evaluation methodologies and previous proven skills and experience in undertaking evaluations of similar programmes;
- Strong background in organizational and institutional capacity building, Human Rights-Based Approach programming, and Results-Based Management and Monitoring;
- Extensive knowledge of, and experience in applying, qualitative and quantitative research methodologies;
- Experience in mainstreaming gender, disability inclusion concerns in evaluations would be an advantage
- Excellent analytical and communication skills;
- Demonstrated excellent report writing skills in English;
- Knowledge of ILO's roles and mandate and its tripartite structure as well as UN evaluation norms and its programming is desirable;
- Experience in participatory evaluation techniques;
- Experience in social dialogue and industrial relations in emerging economies will be an advantage. An understanding of Global Supply Chains (ideally the Garment and footwear sectors) will be an advantage

For further details about the evaluation, please see the ToR (below).

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

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 (maximum 2 pages).
2. A list of previous evaluations that are relevant to the context and subject matter of this assignment, indicating the role played by then consultant(s) applying (they can be highlighted in the CV).
3. A statement confirming their availability to conduct this assignment, and the daily professional fee expressed in US dollars (indicating also fees received for similar assignments in the last 2 years as a reference).
4. A copy of the candidate's curriculum vitae.
5. A statement confirming that the candidates have no previous involvement in the implementation and delivery of the project to be evaluated or a personal relationship with any ILO Officials who are engaged in the project.
6. The names of two referees (including phone and email) who can be contacted.
7. Two reports in which the evaluator team leader has been the sole evaluator or the team leader.
8. ILO accepts no liability in the event of death, injury or illness of the External Collaborator. Therefore, you are requested to enclose a copy of INSURANCE as adequate coverage for these risks. And this is a must if you are 62 years and above.

The deadline to submit expression of interest for undertaking the evaluation is 26 June 2020. Please send an e-mail with the subject header "MTE of BWG Programme Phase IV" to the Evaluation Manager **Mr. Tahmid Arif (arift@ilo.org)** copying **Ms. Deborah Schmidiger (schmidiger@ilo.org)**.

Terms of Reference for International Consultant

Mid-Term Evaluation of Better Work Global – Phase IV

ILO Programme Code	GLO/17/55/MUL
Country	Global
P&B Outcome and Indicator	Outcome 7: Promoting workplace compliance through labour inspection Indicator: 7.1, 7.2, 7.3.
SDG linkage	1, 5 and 8
Technical field	Better Work
Administrative unit	Better Work
ILO responsible official	Dan Rees
Collaborating units	RO-Arab States; RO-Latin America and the Caribbean, RO-Asia and the Pacific, CO-Bangkok, CO-Hanoi, CO-Jakarta, ILO-Yangon, DWT/CO-San José, CO-Addis Abeba, ACTRAV, ACTEMP, SOC/PRO, ENTERPRISE, LABADMIN/OSH, IN-WORK, NORMES, SOCPRO, DCOMM, EVAL, FUNDAMENTALS, PARDEV, SECTOR, RESEARCH, GENDER
Time frame	July 2017 – June 2022
Budget	USD 35 million for the Global programme
Funding Agencies	The Netherlands, Switzerland, Denmark, Germany, European Commission
Type of Evaluation	Independent
Timing of Evaluation	Mid-term, cluster
Duration of the Assignment	30 Days
Duty Station of the Evaluator	Home based, (with face-to-face interaction only when feasible according to the COVID 19 pandemic situation at the time of starting the evaluation.)
Evaluation Manager	Tahmid Arif, from ILO CO Dhaka, Bangladesh

Table of Contents

Introduction and rationale for the evaluation.....	3
Background and description of the programme.....	3
Stakeholders and partners of the BWG programme	4
Programme objectives.....	5
Management arrangements	6
Strategic fit.....	6
Purpose and scope of the evaluation.....	8
Evaluation criteria and questions	9
Proposed methodology.....	12
Main deliverables.....	13
Management arrangements and work plan	14
Indicative time frame and responsibilities	14
Legal and Ethical Matters	15
Proposed work days for the evaluation.....	15
Annex 1: List of links	16
Annex 2: Description of core function of each team shown in the organizational chart.....	17

Introduction and rationale for the evaluation

This Terms of Reference for the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of Better Work Global programme is in compliance with the ILO Policy Guidelines for Evaluation published in 2017. The ILO evaluation policy (October 2017) and results-based strategy (March 2018) commits to promote “use of strategic cluster evaluations to gather evaluative information more effectively” under the overall outcome of enhancing the value of evaluations. A significant advantage of clustering is that by clustering - covering an envelope of evaluations of projects into a single evaluation on the basis of results or strategic, thematic area (e.g. P&B global policy outcomes or) or geographical area or scope (e.g. DWCP countries) - will focus the interconnectedness and help joining the dots between projects and organisational achievements and impact. Better Work being a global programme has already been following a clustered approach to evaluations. The proposed evaluation will therefore follow a clustered approach, whereby the focus will be on aggregating findings to provide strategic learning for the programme. Also this evaluation will be conducted as an independent evaluation i.e. the evaluation is managed by an ILO official and conducted by an international independent evaluator selected through a competitive bidding process in consultation with the ILO Evaluation office (EVAL).

Key stakeholders, ILO constituents, partners and the donors will be consulted throughout the evaluation process. This MTE is planned for the period June – August 2020¹, with the final report expected to be completed by the end of September 2020. This evaluation is being conducted to review the programme performance and enhance learning within Better Work, the ILO and among key stakeholders of the programme. It will be conducted following ILO Evaluation Policy and guidelines which is based on/in line with the context of criteria and approaches for international development assistance as established by: the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard; and the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System. The evaluation findings and recommendations will help guide the programme team in the planning and implementation of remaining duration of the programme. It would also provide valuable inputs and adjustments to potential changes in strategy, reflecting the changes which have occurred in the operational and administrative environment since the beginning of the current phase, when the programme commenced. The Better Work Senior Programming and Partnerships Officer in Geneva will provide technical backstopping for the MTE.

Background and description of the programme

Better Work, a partnership between the International Labour Organization (ILO) and the International Finance Corporation (IFC), a member of the World Bank Group (WBG), has proven that it is possible to simultaneously improve working conditions and boost competitiveness in the global apparel industry. Building on its extensive experience and understanding of what drives change in supply chains, the programme now seeks to significantly scale its impact.

Better Work’s vision is of a global garment industry that lifts millions of people out of poverty by providing decent work, empowering women, driving business competitiveness and promoting inclusive economic growth. During this phase (2017-2022), Better Work will leverage existing and new partnerships to expand its impact from 3 to 8 million workers and to 21 million family members. In addition, ILO and WBG will support garment producing countries to strengthen the policy and enabling environment for decent work and competitiveness to drive positive outcomes on a much larger scale. This will be achieved through two areas of intervention.

¹ Given the current Covid-19 crisis, it is possible that these dates may have to be reviewed if required in discussion with the Evaluation manager

Intervention 1 focuses on influencing business practices in the global garment supply chain to:

- build on what works best in garment factories by focusing on services with the greatest value addition, tackling the root causes of non-compliance, redoubling efforts to build worker-management dialogue, improving business competitiveness and strengthening the role of women.
- to Influence global brands and manufacturers to adopt the business practices that drive transformational change in labour conditions and competitiveness across their supply chains. Influencing global brands and manufacturers can impact supply chains beyond the garment sector and beyond those countries where Better Work has established programmes.

Intervention 2 focuses on strengthening the enabling environment for decent work by:

- strengthening public institutions and advancing policies at the national level by leveraging ILO and WBG to improve the enabling environment for decent work, business competitiveness and inclusive economic growth.
- influencing the global policy dialogue on decent work by providing credible data and evidence to influencers and policy makers concerned with decent work in global supply chains.

Activities under intervention 2 can impact public institutions and policies beyond the garment sector and beyond those countries where Better Work has established programmes.

Better Work consists of a Global Secretariat (the Better Work Global Programme or Better Work Global) and 8 Country Programmes in Bangladesh, Cambodia, Indonesia, Vietnam, Jordan, Ethiopia, Haiti and Nicaragua. The Better Work Global team acts as a secretariat to its country programmes and is responsible for: strategy development, financial and budget management oversight, fundraising, global stakeholder engagement including businesses, programming and country expansion, research and impact and global policy dialogue, communications, quality assurance and technical support to delivery of factory services, and development of key strategic partnerships.

This mid-term evaluation will focus on the Better Work Global function and how it supports the country programmes.

Stakeholders and partners of the BWG programme

Direct stakeholders

- (i) International Organisation of Employers (IOE)
- (ii) INDUSTRIALL, ITUC
- (iii) International business partners (including brands, retailers, manufacturers and their supply chain partners)
- (iv) Development partners

Other collaborating agencies and organizations

- (v) CSR initiatives and labour rights NGOs
- (vi) Academics

Ultimate beneficiaries

Workers in global supply chains, in particular young women, are the ultimate beneficiaries of the programme. Employment in the garment sector is composed predominantly of unskilled workers, young women, a large number of internal migrants, and workers on short-term contracts. The sector is also characterized by low levels of trade union representation. In many countries, garment manufacturing may be the only opportunity to move into the formal sector. Additionally, the sector remains among the most labour-intensive industries, despite advances in technology and workplace practices.

Better Work seeks to ensure that workers, in particular women, benefit from increased respect for their rights and better working conditions, as well as improved productivity and the opportunity for better pay and greater job security. The programme creates opportunities for workers to participate in addressing problems identified at the workplace. Better Work also promotes ensuring a place for unions in sectoral- and national-level discussions of topics such as labour law reform and competitiveness strategies.

Programme objectives

Better Work's overall desired developmental impact, as articulated for Phase IV, is a competitive and inclusive global industry that lifts millions out of poverty by providing decent work and empowering women. This overall desired impact is based on an analysis of the garment sector as providing a significant number of jobs in those countries in which BW works, and whereby there is a need for improved decent work opportunities and gender equality within the sector as a means to achieve effective business competitiveness and growth. Achieving industry competitiveness and growth with improved decent work and gender equality, and sustaining that achieved outcome indefinitely is implicit in the wording of the overall desired developmental impact for Phase IV.

The four outcome areas contributing to the overall developmental impact statement relate to BW's work in garment factories across the eight BW country programmes; influencing partners to promote decent work outcomes in global supply chains; influencing policy and promoting an enabling environment for decent work at the national level; and promoting regional and global policy dialogue on decent work and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The desired programme outcomes are wide-ranging, covering the garment industry itself at the country, regional and global levels, as well as the contribution of those achievements made in the industry to the realization of decent work at the national level through influencing policy and supporting the strengthening of institutions. Ultimately, BW aims to use the achievements gained within the garment industry to impact decent work at the regional and global levels.

Outcome 1: By 2022, Better Work will have accelerated improvements in working conditions and business competitiveness through in-factory services.

Outcome 2: By 2022, Better Work will have influenced global retailers, brands and manufacturers in the establishment of business practices that promote decent work outcomes in supply chains.

Outcome 3: At the national level, ILO, IFC and WBG will have strengthened institutions and influenced policies that create an enabling environment for decent work and improved business competitiveness.

Outcome 4: Better Work will have influenced the regional and global policy dialogue on decent work and the SDGs with its unique evidence base and proven examples of success.

The wording of each outcome is explicit in their indication of BW's inputs and activities as impacting these outcomes. Further, the outcomes may be seen as hierarchical. Achievement of the first outcome associated with improvements in the industry becomes a catalyst and contributes toward realization of

the second outcome. The demonstration of improved working conditions and increased business competitiveness becomes a “case” for advocating for Outcome 2. Similarly, demonstration of both the first and second outcomes may contribute toward realizing the third and fourth outcomes. The demonstration and communication of concrete achievements in the garment industry are used to advocate for improved policy and the fostering of an enabling environment for realizing decent work across industries at the national, regional and global levels.

Critically, the four outcome areas may be seen as outcomes achieved within a complex and dynamic system. A successful industry relies not only on factories that exhibit a culture of compliance within its sector, but also with the participation of buyers that uphold sound business practices and an enabling environment at the national level that supports and incentivizes compliance and growth of the industry.

The formation of partnerships is key to achieving these desired outcomes, in particular partnerships forged out of a commitment to build capacity, engage and take ownership over sustaining gains in the industry under both outcomes 2 and 3. Related to this is the aim to capitalize on the ILO and IFC partnership that governs BW.

Given the complex environment in which the BWG operates and the broad and significant change it seeks to support, the desired outcomes and their associated outputs reflect a causal link that may be characterized as one of contribution, not attribution.

Management arrangements

The BW global programme team leads are as follows since July 2017. It includes eight functions supported by multi-disciplinary teams working across three duty stations in Washington DC (IFC), Geneva (ILO) and Bangkok (ILO).

- Chief Better Work
- IFC Better Work Programme Lead (IFC Washington DC)
- Head of Better Work in Asia (ILO Bangkok)
- Head of Buyer Engagement, Communications and BW Americas (ILO Geneva)
- Head of Programme Development, Learning and Country Programs (ILO Geneva)
- Head of Operations, Quality and Innovation (ILO Geneva)
- Finance and HR Project Manager (ILO Geneva)
- Research and Policy Officer (ILO Geneva)

Description of core function of each team is shown in the organizational chart in Annex 2.

Strategic fit

Links to SDGs

Better Work contributes to advancing the global dialogue for better working conditions, focusing the attention of ILO, IFC, and World Bank Group on the contribution to the SDGs, particularly combatting poverty (SDG1), supporting women’s empowerment (SDG5), and inclusive growth (SDG8).

SDG 1 looks to combat poverty. Within the targeted goals, Better Work works towards eradicating extreme poverty (target 1.1) and reducing by half the proportion of men, women, and children living in poverty (target 1.2) by promoting the expansion of decent work opportunities in the garment industry.

Related activities are mainstreamed through work at the factory level to improve working conditions and productivity, and through policy work. Furthermore, Better Work contributes towards creating sound policy frameworks that include pro-poor and gender sensitive development strategies (1.b) through work on national and international policy.

SDG 5 focuses on gender, relating directly with the vast majority of Better Work's activities and beneficiaries. Better Work has contributed, and will continue to contribute, towards ending forms of discrimination towards women (target 5.1) and ensuring equal opportunities for leadership (target 5.5) by reducing the gender pay gap, promoting fair wage structures and incentives at work, and increasing women's opportunities for promotion on the factory floor and beyond. By providing training and advisory services targeted at curbing verbal abuse and sexual harassment, BW has reduced violence against women (target 5.2). It has also improved access to maternal health care (target 5.6) in factories, and plan to continue to focus on access to maternal health services and compliance with maternity leave requirements. BW's policy work promotes a gender lens to reduce gender discrimination and promote the empowerment of women via decent work.

In terms of **SDG 8**, Better Work will contribute directly to almost all of the targets under SDG 8. Better Work helps sustain per capita economic growth (target 8.1), promote development oriented activities and decent job creation (target 8.3) and to achieve full and productive employment (target 8.5) by:

- working with the ILO and World Bank Group to improve the enabling environment for businesses working in the garment industry;
- promoting productivity at the factory level by improving supervisor relations, social dialogue and technical skills in productivity (e.g. line management);
- improving access to finance by connecting Better Work Buyer Partners and factories with IFC's innovative financial services. Furthermore, the work with gender outlined above and the planned work with youth outlined below ensure inclusivity in these tasks.

Through the factory facing services, Better Work promotes labour rights, pushes for safe and secure working environments (target 8.8) and tackles the eradication of forced labour and child labour (target 8.7). As shown in the section "Results from Phase III" above, Better Work assessments, advisory, and training have lowered non-compliance in all Better Work countries. Better Work will continue to provide and/or oversee these factory-facing services in this next phase, with an increased emphasis on tackling the root causes of these challenges.

BW's factory facing services also promote technological upgrading and value-add (target 8.2) to ensure that technology is harnessed in a way that allows factory jobs to be safer, more efficient, and more productive as outlined in the paragraph on "Industry trends" in section 1.

Purpose and scope of the evaluation

Purpose of the evaluation

The main purpose of the independent MTE is four folds.

- (1) Independently assess the progress of the Better Work Global programme against the planned objectives and long term goals as mentioned in the log frame;
- (2) Inform the stakeholders on whether the current programme strategy is working, and providing recommendations on what could be changed to increase the likelihood that the programme reaches its objectives (Including gender equality, disability inclusion and COVID19 impact);
- (3) Inform the stakeholders on the progress with regard to the sustainability strategies of the programme; and
- (4) Identify good practices and lessons learned that would contribute to learning and knowledge development of the programme and its stakeholders.

Specific objectives of the MTE are:

- (1) To assess whether the programme strategy is still coherent with the ILO's strategic objective, current economic, political and development circumstances in the global garment sector;
- (2) To assess performance of the Global programme in terms of relevance and strategic fit, effectiveness, efficiency, and timeliness of producing the expected output (including intended and unintended, positive and negative results), the challenges affecting the achievement of the objectives, factors that hindered or facilitated achievement so far; and monitoring and reporting mechanism.
- (3) To identify the contributions of the project to the SDGs, the ILO objectives and its synergy with other projects and programmes;
- (4) To assess the quality and timeliness of inputs of the BWG team;
- (5) To assess the relevance of the BWG's management arrangements; identify advantages, bottlenecks and lessons learned with regard to the management arrangements;
- (6) To identify constraints, failures, achievements and good practices and provide strategic recommendations to make adjustments to ensure the achievement of the programme within its remaining lifetime;
- (7) To analyse underlying factors beyond ILO's control that affected the achievement of the programme output and outcome.

Gender mainstreaming and inclusion of Persons with Disability (PWD)

The gender dimension and PWD inclusion should be considered as crosscutting issues throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the MTE. In terms of this evaluation, this implies involving both men-women and PWDs in the consultation and evaluation analysis as well as an assessment of the implementation of the programme's Gender Equality Mainstreaming (GEM) and Disability Inclusion strategy. Moreover, the evaluator should review data and information that is disaggregated by sex, disability and assess the relevance and effectiveness of gender and disability-related strategies and outcomes to improve lives of women-men and persons with disability. All the information should be accurately included in both the "inception" and "evaluation" reports.

Client

The primary end users of the evaluation findings are the Better Work Global programme management team, the donors and the ILO's constituents.

Evaluation criteria and questions

In line with United Nations good practices for evaluations as defined in the ILO Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation 2017², the ILO expects that the evaluation will assess the following the most updated version of OECD/DAC criteria³, viz. relevance and strategic fit, coherence, validity of design, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. ..

The core ILO crosscutting priorities, such as gender equality, disability inclusion and non-discrimination, promotion of international labour standards, environment, tripartite processes, social dialogue and constituent capacity development should be considered in this evaluation. In particular, gender dimension and disability inclusion will be considered as cross-cutting issues throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation as mentioned above. To the extent possible, data collection and analysis should be disaggregated by sex as described in the ILO Evaluation Policy Guidelines and relevant Guidance Notes (Annex).

It is expected that the evaluation addresses all of the questions detailed below to the extent possible. The evaluator may adapt the evaluation criteria and questions, but any fundamental changes should be agreed upon between the ILO evaluation manager and the evaluator.

Suggested evaluation criteria and evaluation questions are summarised below:

Relevance and strategic fit of the interventions

- To what extent is the programme consistent and relevant to the needs of the global garment sector and other stakeholder requirements? What have been the most effective approaches to increase relevance for stakeholders?
- Have the current areas of interest of key stakeholders (govt., employers, trade unions, buyers) changed since the beginning of the current phase? To what extent the programme has adapted to those changes?
- To what extent does the Global programme reflect and implement the recommendations that were provided by previous evaluations?
- To what extent do the stakeholders take ownership of the programme's approaches, its vision of creating sustained compliance in the sector?
- Is the programme strategy appropriate for achieving the stated purpose?
- How does the current and adapted strategy remain relevant and within the strategic fit

Coherence

- To what extent is the interventions of BW programme coherent with ILO gender equality priorities, disability inclusion strategy, interventions of other ILO programmes (internally), UN Programmes, other programmes with similar objectives and the donor's policy?
- How the programme objectives are coherent with current or new national/international actions or obligation?
- Are the intervention and implementation strategy coherent with other repurposed, adapted response to the Covid19?
- Is the Better Work strategy and operation consistent with and in line with the ILO P&B 2018/2019?

² https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_571339.pdf

³ [http://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=DCD/DAC\(2019\)58/FINAL&docLanguage=En](http://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=DCD/DAC(2019)58/FINAL&docLanguage=En)

Validity of intervention design

- Does the intervention design including any agreed adjustments in the design through the current life of the project, remain valid in the context of Covid19
- Are the project activities, strategies, outcomes (indicators) and assumptions sufficient and realistic to achieve the results or overly ambitious?
- Are risks properly assessed, analysed and managed?
- Does the programme adequately consider the gender and disability inclusion dimension of the interventions in design, and M&E framework? How?
- How consistent has the M&E system been across countries? Do they provide aggregated information across countries?

Intervention progress and effectiveness

- To what extent have planned programme outputs been achieved, in relation to the original programme document and logical framework? Have the quantity and quality of the outputs produced so far been satisfactory?
- What obstacles (at the country as well as global level) were encountered in programme implementation and how are they hindering progress towards results?
- How have the Global stakeholders supported the programme's outcomes over the life of the programme?
- Have there been new intervening factors/actors (e.g. other ILO or donor programmes) that have emerged since the inception of the programme which may have impaired or enhanced programme performance? What have maximized synergies and improved collaboration with these new actors, if there any?
- To what degree is the programme adapting ILO's approach based on what is being learnt? E.g. is it agile enough to respond to the country programmes' needs, is it developing needs-based services?
- How effective has the programme been in establishing new country programmes as ONE ILO programmes and does it have the potential to become the model for the future?
- Has the programme achieved the desired scale by establishing partnerships? How effectively has the programme been working with brands and global manufacturers? What have been successful partnership models and approaches?
- To what extent has the BWG programme supported greater understanding and buy-in of international labour standards, social dialogue, gender equality and disability inclusion among its key partners/collaborators?

Efficiency of resource usage

- Were resources (technical and financial) allocated/used strategically to achieve the programme outputs and outcomes? Has the programme received adequate administrative, technical and political support from the collaborating ILO technical unit at headquarters?
- Were activities completed on-time/according to work plans, with desired quantity and quality? If not, what were the factors that hindered timely delivery and what were the counter measures taken to address this issue?
- To what extent were the programme activities cost-effective? What level of the programme activities (individual, institutional, systemic) has provided the most cost-effective benefits?
- How effectively have the M&E and communication activities been performed in advancing objectives? Any lessons learned?

Effectiveness of management arrangements

- Were the management and governance arrangement of the BWG programme adequate and worked strategically with all key stakeholders, donors? What other opportunities would exist for a stronger engagement with donors and stakeholders?
- How has the partnership with the IFC evolved and how does it impact the achievement of Better Work's overall goals?
- Does the programme team have adequate resource allocation, gender, disability expertise, and was technical backstopping sought and received from specialists when needed?
- Is the BW advisory committee working effectively and are the right people represented in the committee?
- Is the institutional arrangement with the partners, the role of tripartite constituents appropriate and effective?
- How effective is the support provided to the programme team by the ILO, donors, and tripartite constituents in delivering results? What could have been done differently?
- How well has the programme been in training our own staff to effectively support Country Programmes? How have Better Work Global and Country Programmes been working with each other to be mutually beneficial?
- How the programme is managing implementation activities during the COVID19 pandemic in terms of its impact on deliverables, budgets and managing partnerships? Is there any alternative work modality or mitigation measure planned? How was the support exchange between BWG and country programmes in this regards?

Orientation to Impact

- How is Better Work Global integrated into ILO's global supply chain work? Is the collaboration making any change?
- From the differences of impacts across countries, what are the most significant element and country conditions that can influence impact?
- To what extent the BWG programme results are leading towards competitive and inclusive global industry; improved decent work and women empowerment?

Sustainability

- Is the project strategy and management steering towards sustainability (financial, technical and institutional)?
- Is there any effect of COVID19 on sustainability strategy as well as exit strategy of the project?
- How the key partnerships of BWG (between ILO and IFC, other stakeholders, etc.) contribute to the sustainability of its initiatives?
- To what extent has the programme strengthened the capacities of direct stakeholders to ensure improved governance and management?
- To what extent the programme has promoted the relevant ILS or ratification and application of the ILS, social dialogue and tripartism?

Proposed methodology

- The evaluation will comply with evaluation norms and standards and follow ethical safeguards, all as specified in ILO's evaluation procedures. The ILO adheres to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) 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 consultant in consultation with the Evaluation Manager.
- The evaluation will apply a mix methods approach, including triangulation to increase the validity and rigor of the evaluation findings, engaging with key stakeholders of the project, as much as feasible, at all levels during the design, data collection and reporting stages.
- Due to the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on the world of work, this evaluation will be conducted in the context of criteria and approaches outlined in the ILO internal guide: Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO: An internal Guide on adapting to the situation⁴. The evaluation will be carried out remotely.
- Desk review, including the following information sources:
 - Project documents (logframe, budget, implementation plan, etc.)
 - Progress reports and outputs
 - Research and studies conducted by the Project
 - Project finance documents and records
 - Mission reports
- The desk review may suggest a number of preliminary findings that could be useful in reviewing or fine-tuning the evaluation questions. The desk review will include briefing interviews with the project team and the donor. Emphasis may vary and weight may be placed on questions in order to optimise the use of time. This should be explained in the inception report.
- Online/email questionnaires and telephone and video interviews: due to travel restrictions and no possibility of face-to-face engagements with project staff and stakeholders, the evaluation will employ email/online questionnaires and especially virtual interviews as the main sources for information gathering – to replace field visits and face-to-face interviews. An indicative list of persons to be interviewed will be prepared by the Project in consultation with the Evaluation Manager.
- The evaluator should pick two Country Programmes to be interviewed virtually with regard to the questions on collaboration between Global and Country Programmes and results achieved at country level. He/she will be referred to ongoing evaluations in the selected countries if timeline permits. This might include referring to draft reports or having a debriefing sessions (online) with the evaluation teams. This will be coordinated by the project team and the evaluation manager.
- The evaluator is furthermore suggested to interview selected Advisory Committee and Management Group members, as well as representatives of partner organisations, donors, brands and ILO. These interviews will be organized virtually using online platforms as per convenience.
- The quantitative evidences will be acquired mostly from the programme documents including donor reports, the monitoring and evaluation plan, workshop and meeting reports and other knowledge products produced by the programme.

⁴ http://www.ilo.ch/eval/WCMS_744068/lang--en/index.htm

- A virtual stakeholders' workshop (if feasible) will be organized to validate findings and complete data gaps with key stakeholders, ILO staff and partners. The objective of this workshop will be (i) to present initial MTE findings and (ii) receive feedback and comments. The workshop will be designed to achieve dual objectives of validating and adjusting the initial findings whilst also serving as a final data collection step. In addition to various stakeholders the workshop will also be attended by the programme donors. A complete list of interviews and visits must be annexed in the final MTE report.
- At the end of the data collection process the evaluator will develop the draft report (see below main deliverables for details). The draft will be subject of a methodological review by the evaluation manager and upon the necessary adjustments will be circulated among the key stakeholders. Then, the evaluation manager will consolidate the comments and will be provided to the evaluator for develop the final version addressing the comments or explain the reason for not address any, if that would be the case.

Main deliverables

1. Inception report (with detailed work plan and data collection instruments) following ILO EVAL Checklist 3, the report should include:
 - Description of the evaluation methodology and instruments to be used in sampling, data collection and analysis and the data collection plan mentioned above.
 - Guide questions for questionnaires and focus group discussions;
 - Detailed fieldwork plan should be developed in consultation with the Evaluation Manager and project manager
 - The proposed report outline structure.
2. A draft and a final versions of evaluation report in English (maximum 30 pages plus annexes) as per the following proposed structure:
 - Cover page with key project and evaluation data
 - Executive Summary
 - Acronyms
 - Description of the project
 - Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation
 - Methodology and limitations
 - Clearly identified findings for each criterion or per objective
 - Conclusions
 - Recommendations (i.e. for the different key stakeholders)
 - Lessons learned and good practices
 - Annexes:
 - TOR
 - Inception report
 - List of people interviewed
 - Schedule of the fieldwork
 - Documents reviewed
 - Project outputs and unexpected results achieved versus planned as per the Project logical framework targets
3. ILO templates for the Executive summary, Lessons learned and Good practices completed.

All reports, including drafts, will be written in English.

All the formats and templates mentioned in this section will be made available by evaluation manager.

Management arrangements and work plan

- The evaluation consultant will report to the evaluation manager Mr. Tahmid Arif (arift@ilo.org) should discuss any technical and methodological matters with the evaluation manager should issues arise.
- The evaluation will be carried out with full logistical support and services of Better work global team at the ILO HQ, Geneva.

Indicative time frame and responsibilities

No.	Task	Responsible person	Time frame (may be revised assessing COVID19 situation)
1	Issuance of Call for Interests, advertisement of consultant, and selection of consultant	Evaluation Manager/ DEFP and EVAL	4 June 2020
2	Issuance of contracts		By 6 July 2020
3	Brief evaluator on ILO evaluation policy and the programme and share documents for review	Evaluation Manager and CTA/BWG programme staff (focal for MTE)	By 8 July 2020
4	Inception report submitted to Evaluation Manager	Evaluator	13 July 2020
5	Inception report approved	Evaluation Manager	15 July 2020
6	Preparation of list of key stakeholders to be interviewed	Evaluation Manager and CTA/BWG programme staff (focal for MTE)	16 July 2020
7	Virtual meetings - interviews and workshops with BWG team members, stakeholders (donor, ILO RO and HQ, etc.)	Evaluator	16 to 31 July 2020
8	Stakeholder Workshop (Virtual) and Debriefing with BWG programme team at Geneva.	Evaluator	3 August, 2020
9	Draft report submitted to Evaluation Manager	Evaluator	10 August, 2020
10	Sharing the draft report with all concerned stakeholders for comments for two weeks after primary review	Evaluation Manager	12 August, 2020
11	Consolidated comments on the draft report and send to the evaluator	Evaluation Manager	27 August, 2020
12	Finalization of the report and submission to Evaluation Manager	Evaluator	3 September, 2020
13	Review and approval of the final report	Evaluation Manager and Evaluation Office	TBD

Legal and Ethical Matters

- The evaluation will comply with UN Norms and Standards.
- The TOR is accompanied by the code of conduct for carrying out the evaluations.
- UNEG ethical guidelines will be followed.
- It is important that the evaluator has no links to programme management or any other conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of evaluation.

All reports, including drafts, will be written in English and following ILO templates for (each section). Ownership of data from the evaluation rests jointly with the ILO and the consultants. 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 evaluation report in line with original purpose & with appropriate acknowledgement.

Quality assurance and Oversight of Independence of Process: Senior M&E officer ILO EVAL will provide quality control throughout the evaluation process. The final evaluation report will only be considered final when it gets approved by the ILO Evaluation Office.

Administrative and logistic support: The Better Work Global Senior Programme and Partnership Officer will provide relevant documentations, administrative and logistic support to the evaluation team. She will also assist in organizing a detailed evaluation mission agenda and ensure that all relevant documentations are up to date and easily accessible by the evaluator.

Roles of other key stakeholders: All stakeholders particularly the relevant ILO staff programme staff at the Regional office and HQ, the donor, tripartite constituents, relevant government agencies, and key project partners – will be consulted throughout the process and will be engaged at different stages during the MTE. They will have the opportunities to provide inputs to TOR and draft final evaluation report.

Proposed work days for the evaluation

Phase	Responsibilities	Tasks	No of days
I	Evaluator	○ Briefing with the evaluation manager & project team ○ Desk Review of programme related documents ○ Inception report	6
II	Evaluator with organizational support from ILO	○ Consultations and Interviews with programme staff in Bangkok and Geneva ○ Interviews with partners beneficiaries ○ Stakeholders workshop for sharing findings ○ Debriefing with the BWG Geneva team	14
III	Evaluator	○ Draft report based on consultations, interviews, desk review and the stakeholders' workshop	7
IV	Evaluation Manager	○ Quality check and initial review ○ Circulate draft report to stakeholders ○ Consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to evaluator	0
V	Evaluator	○ Finalize the report including explanations on why comments were not included	3
TOTAL			30

Annex 1: List of links

- 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
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
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm
- Guidance note 4 Integrating gender equality in M&E 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>
- <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

Annex 2: Description of core function of each team shown in the organizational chart

Team Lead	Core Function
Chief Better Work	Ultimate accountability to the IFC/ILO Better Work Management Group for the programme's global strategy and for ensuring that the programme has the resources and partnerships needed in order to implement agreed plans. Also responsible for the implementation of Better Work's governance arrangements. Ensures strategic and technical oversight of all of the BW programmes, the development of global partnerships such as buyers, global constituents, donors and other ILO/IFC programs.
IFC Better Work Programme Lead (IFC Washington DC)	Coordinates across IFC and WB Group to ensure coherent input to Better Work and deliver specific technical inputs at country programme level. Supports governance, partnerships, communications and resource mobilisation objectives.
Head of Better Work in Asia (ILO Bangkok)	Leadership of the BWG team in Bangkok Regional lead for relationships with ILO ROAP and Asia region and development of BW's donor business and other partnerships in Asia (including global manufacturers) Technical reviewing Chief for Cambodia, Indonesia and Vietnam.
Head of Buyer Engagement, Communications and BW Americas (ILO Geneva)	Strategic and team lead for all aspects of buyer engagement in all regions. Leads influencing work with buyers, including purchasing practices and strategies to increase buyer engagement in policy influencing and with constituents. Strategic and team lead for Global Communications. Lead BWs engagement with IFC/World Bank Group. Technical Review Chief for Better Work programs in the Americas – BWN & BWH. Develops profile and partnerships in the Americas including donors and manufacturers (in coordination with other Management Team members).
Head of Programme Development, Learning and Country Programs (ILO Geneva)	Leads new country programme development, development and implementation of the Better Work Academy and HQ focal point for ensuring coordinated DC interventions with other ILO programmes at the country level. Leads the technical team responsible for the programme's influencing work. Technical oversight of the Jordan, Bangladesh and Ethiopia and emerging programmes.
Head of Operations, Quality and Innovation (ILO Geneva)	Strategic and team lead for BWG on operations and support to CPs, including the operations teams support to factory service delivery, constituent engagement, capacity building and influencing. MT lead on Building Bridges (in coordination with other MT members leading on engagement with global brands and manufacturers). Strategic and team lead on systems and technology innovation. Lead on ensuring quality assurance processes are in place for Better Work operations. MT lead on global gender and IR strategies and their implementation. Develops external partnerships (excluding business/buyer partnerships).
Finance and HR Project Manager (ILO Geneva)	Manages the Finance, HR and Administration team members based in Geneva. Manages the Global Programme budget, including allocation, reporting, forecasting and monitoring. Liaises with ILO Finance in order to support Country Programme finance functions to meet ILO's quality standards. " Develops and supports CTAs and Country Programme staff in the management of their budgets and implementation of financial sustainability strategies including pricing, revenue management and cost recovery. Maintains oversight of funding situation globally and liaises with Programming Team on donor proposals and funding gaps. Manages and guides Better Work's administration of HR including implementation of recruitment programmes and provision of support to HR staff in Better Work Country Programmes.

	Develops and administers the career development plan for BWG and Better Work Country Programmes. Supports management of governance meetings including preparation of budgetary information. Provides support to large scale procurement and contracting.
Research and Policy Officer (ILO Geneva)	Oversees Better Work impact assessment activities across all programmes. Manages the implementation of Better Work research activities by external partners to ensure quality. Supervises M&E officer responsible for compliance and M&E data and evaluations and the Technical Officer responsible for implementation of impact assessment and research work. Ensures that Better Work's impact and research findings are widely shared and feed into Better Work and relevant policy debates (including ILO, IFC and WB). Gender and sexual harassment focal point.