

Call for proposals

Independent Midterm Evaluation

ILO Evaluation Office is calling for proposals from teams of consultants (*preferably an International consultant as team leader and a Timorese national consultant as team member*), firms, or individuals to conduct an independent midterm evaluation of “ILO Enhancing Rural Access Agro-Forestry - Improving access to agro-forestry areas” (ERA Agro-Forestry) (ERA AF) project.

Teams of consultants, firms, or individuals intending to submit an application should supply the following information:

- A brief technical proposal detailing evaluation approach and methodologies
- Budget proposal i.e. the daily professional fee expressed in US dollars
- A statement confirming their availability to conduct this assignment
- CV of all individual team members (which must include information about the qualifications held by the candidate)
- A statement confirming that the individual team members have no previous involvement in the delivery of the ERA-AF project, or a personal relationship with any ILO Officials who are engaged in the project
- The names of two referees who are able to be contacted

The deadline for submitting the proposal is by **Sunday 4 October 2020**. Please send an email with the subject header “ERA AF” to the **Evaluation Manager, Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka** (pamornrat@ilo.org)

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

Terms of Reference
18 September 2020
Independent Mid-Term Evaluation

Project Title	Enhancing Rural Access Agro-Forestry “ improving access to agro-forestry areas” (ERA Agro-Forestry) (ERA AF)
TC project code	TLS/16/04/EUR; TLS/16/02/EUR
Donors	European Union
Total approved budget	EURO 12,200,000
ILO Administrative unit	ILO Country Office for Indonesia and Timor Leste (CO-Jakarta)
ILO Technical Units	DEVINVEST
Type and scope of Evaluation	Independent Mid-Term Evaluation (from the start of the project until October 2020)
Evaluation date and field work dates	October- January 2020 November 2020 for field mission
Project Duration	53 months (1 June 2017 to 31 October 2021)
Evaluation Manager	Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka, Regional Evaluation Officer, ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok
TOR preparation date	August 2020

Introduction and Rationale for the Mid-Term Evaluation

This Terms of Reference (TOR) covers a Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of the ERA AF Project. The project is funded by the European Union and implemented by ILO Jakarta.

The project is part of Euro 32.2 million Partnership for Sustainable Agroforestry (PSAF) - funded by the European Union (EU), the Government of Germany (BMZ), and the ILO, and managed by GIZ and the ILO. The overall objective of this joint partnership is “to contribute to a peaceful, inclusive and sustainable development in Timor Leste, through improved rural access, the creation of employment, economic and domestic revenue opportunities, and a durable reduction in food insecurity and malnutrition in rural areas”. The partnership has two specific objectives.

Specific Objective 1 (SO1): "To develop a sustainable, market oriented, competitive and prosperous agro-forestry system in order to increase employment and income in rural areas" and this component is being implemented by GIZ.

Specific Objective 2 (SO2): "To implement a capacity building and labour-based programme to rehabilitate and maintain rural roads in order to improve access to the agro-forestry areas, employment and economic opportunities for local population" – This SO2 is being implemented by ILO under the ERA AF project.

The scope of this ToR will cover only SO2 of which ILO is responsible to implement and accountable for the results achieved, but the Evaluation Manager and Evaluation Team will consult and gather inputs from all the key partners throughout the evaluation process.

The donor conducted a Mid-Term Evaluation of the PSAF in Oct 2019. Recommendations were made in regard to revision of project targets, project extension, project sustainability and connectivity to markets. ILO did not agree to many of the findings and provided an Opinion.

As per ILO evaluation policy, projects with budgets of 5 million and beyond are subject to independent evaluation for both midterm and final evaluations. The purpose of the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is to review and take stock of what has been achieved, and of any constraints/opportunities faced by the project, which may affect the achievement of the project outputs and objectives. The MTE will also provide lessons learnt, good practices, and recommendations for possible adjustment within the remaining period. It aims to be a light exercise and will review and validate the project's technical progress report, previous monitoring and evaluation reports and other relevant documents as much as possible.

In addition, the current COVID-19 pandemic has adversely impacted on socio, economic and political context of countries all over the world with Timor Leste also faced with such challenges. The MTE will also provide an opportunity for the project to engage with key stakeholders and target communities and to gather their views and the impact with which COVID-19 may have on the project strategy, objectives etc. and consider possible adjustment in the interventions as part of the COVID-19 response. Gender equality and non-discrimination, mainstreaming of the involvement of persons living with a disability, promotion of international labour standards, tripartite processes and environmental issues will also be considered throughout this evaluation. The evaluation will be carried out in a COVID-19 responsive manner by adhering to the health guidelines imposed by the government, the ILO Evaluation guidance note in responding to COVID-19 and the ILO EIIP COVID-19 OSH Protocol.

This evaluation is planned for October to December 2020, with the final report expected to be completed by end of December 2020. The evaluation findings and recommendations will help guide the project team in the planning and implementation of the remaining duration of the project. The ERA Agro-Forestry's Project Manager will provide all necessary documents and information required by the evaluation team and will facilitate and support the evaluation team on the logistics needed in the evaluation process.

The MTE will be managed by an independent evaluation manager, Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka, Regional Evaluation Officer based at ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific. The evaluation manager prepares this TOR and will subsequently finalize it in a consultative process involving project team, ILO tripartite constituents, donor, and other key stakeholders of the project. The evaluation will comply to the United Nations Evaluation Guidelines (UNEG) Norms and Standards¹, ILO policy guidelines (3rd edition)² and the ethical safeguards.

Background of the Project

As mentioned above, the ERA-AF programme is responsible for implementing Specific Objective 2 (SO2) of the PSAF "to implement a capacity building and labour-based programme to rehabilitate and maintain rural roads to improve access to agroforestry areas, employment, and economic opportunities for the local population" with the following results and corresponding outputs:-

Result 1: Improved market access, through rural roads being rehabilitated and maintained by local contractors, using labour based approach

Output 1.1: Rural access roads leading to agro-forestry plantations rehabilitated and maintained using labour-based methods.

Output 1.2: Sustainable institutional capacity developed for enhanced private sector performance.

Result 2: Skills of construction companies and local authorities improved

Output 2.1: Sustainable institutional capacity developed for enhanced private sector performance

Output 2.2: Local authorities competent in managing rural road maintenance.

¹ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2787>

² http://www.ilo.ch/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS_571339/lang--en/index.htm

The set targets³ of the project are as follows:

- i) Rehabilitating 90 [77] km of roads, and maintaining another 165 [90] km. to the standards of the Ministry of Public Works (MPW), Directorate of Roads Bridges and Flood Control (DRBFC).
- ii) Improving access to rural roads for 6,000 [5,133] households.
- iii) Generating 450,000 [238,500] workdays of which at least 30 percent for women.
- iv) Offering employment opportunities on the road works to 6,000 [5,133] workers and their families, so they will benefit directly from this opportunity.
- v) Supplying 400 [200] accredited certificates to trainees by the training providers (Don Bosco Training Centre and Institute for Business Development Support (IADE).
- vi) Granting 40 [34] contracts for rehabilitation and maintenance to trained local construction companies.
- vii) Providing capacity building for government staff, to at least 40 public works and municipal officials actively involved in rural road management and maintenance.
- viii) Providing at least 1,000 days of training for Municipal staff in rural road management and maintenance.

Under this project, the ILO provides support to the MPW, through its Directorate of Roads, Bridges and Flood Control (DRBFC), and Municipalities in cooperation with training providers Don Bosco Training Centre and IADE to train local construction companies to rehabilitate and maintain rural roads. The Project aims to create a new section, the Private Sector Development and Coordination Section (PS-DCS) within DRBFC,.

It is important to maintain the access roads which service agroforestry areas to facilitate market access. Cross-cutting issues such as gender, youth, and protection of the environment have been fully integrated into the design of this partnership, as 50% of the contractors are women, and most of the workers are youth. The project is built on the following narrative Theory of Change:

- When road access is improved and maintained, then development does take place through agro-forestry communities better accessing inputs, basic services, agricultural extension services, and improved linkages to markets for outputs, leading to food security, and an increase in economic activities from agro-forestry products.
- Equally, capacitating of local training institutions who in-turn train local contractors in executing rural road works has shown benefits beyond the confines of the project as these entrepreneurs continue to carry out public works funded by other sources than the ERA project, including improving and maintaining rural roads elsewhere in the country.

The project works in four Municipalities of Baucau, Viqueque, Manatuto and Lautem.

Contribution to other ILO programmes and SDGs

ERA-AF contributes to the Timor-Leste Strategic Development Plan (SDP) 2011-2030 in the areas of rural infrastructure development, private sector and entrepreneurship, vocational training and employment creation.

The project also contributes to Timor Leste's UNDAF (2015-2019) outcome 2, and to DWCP (2016-2020) Outcome 2.1: More effective labour-based rural infrastructure programmes for socio-economic development. It has also contributed to ILO 2016-17 and 2018-19 Programme and Budget Outcome 1; More and better jobs for inclusive growth and improved youth employment prospect, Indicator 1.4: Institutional development and capacity programmes in industrials, sector, trade, skills, infrastructure, investment or environmental policies for more and productive and better quality jobs. It is also contributing to ILO 2020-21 Programme and Budget Outcome 3: Economic, social and environmental transitions for full, productive and freely chosen employment and decent

³ xx Original Targets [xx Revised Targets]

work for all, Indicator 3.2.1: Number of member States with measures for decent work in rural areas.

The project also aligns with SDGs 1, 5, 8, 9, and 16.

Institutional set up and ILO technical assistance

Institutional set up and staffing

'ERA Agro-Forestry' works across several ministries and institutions, including MPW/DRBFC, IADE and Don Bosco Training Centre. A Partnership for Sustainable Agro-Forestry - Ai ba Futuru (PSAF-AbF) Project Steering Committee and ERA AF Project Advisory Committee, comprising of representatives of the Project's stakeholders⁴, provides policy guidance to the project.

The Training and Private Sector Development Coordination Section (PS-DCS) has been embedded in the expanded Department of Training and Co-operation (DTC) of the DRBFC. The expanded Support Unit has two key support functions, including (i) training coordination and (ii) support to creating an enabling environment for contracting.

The PS-DCS is staffed with one Training Coordinator, one Private Sector Co-ordinator, and one M&E and Information Officer. They work closely with other relevant Departments of MPW, and specifically with DRBFC's R4D-SP contracts management and supervision functions. PS-DCS is supported by the ERA-AF through an Implementation Agreement

ILO Technical Assistance

The ILO Project Manager is in charge of the implementation of the project. The Project Manager is supported by an international Contractor Training Officer (Training Advisor) and Labour-Based Field Engineer, two national Training Engineers and national Private Sector Coordinator, Community Development Officer, and M&E and Information Officer. The ILO experts and support team work directly (embedded) with the appointed staff of DTC and the two training providers Don Bosco Training Centre and IADE. A provision for the inputs of national and international consultants has been made in the budget to cater for specific expertise that may be required for short-term inputs

Progress made to the date (as of May 2020) – see Annex 2

Stakeholders and target groups

The main target group for ERA-AF are the private sector (local contractors and private sector training providers) for their important role in the provision of services, especially on road rehabilitation and job creation. Local construction companies, including those who benefitted from training under a previous EU-ILO programme, will benefit from work opportunities in the rehabilitation and maintenance of rural roads. The private sector training providers (in particular Don Bosco Training Centre) is the main target groups as one of the objectives of the project is to build training capacity for the training of small contractors among Timorese private sector training providers.

Communities are also expected to benefit directly from training and work opportunities related to the labour-based rehabilitation/maintenance of rural roads. Local authorities and technical staff from the Directorate of Roads, Bridges, and Flood Control (DRBFC) will also benefit from the training programme.

⁴ Members of the ERA-AF PAC include: European Union (EU), National Authorizing Office (NAO), PSAF-AbF GIZ Component, Ministry of Public Works (MoPW)/ DRBFC, Chamber of Commerce Industry (CCI-TL), Don Bosco Training Centre (DBTC), Municipal Administrators and Roads for Development (R4D-SP)

The ultimate beneficiaries are the rural poor, including women, youth and otherwise impoverished members of rural communities, including persons with disabilities.

Purpose, Scope and Clients of the Evaluation

Purpose: The ILO evaluation's main purpose relates to accountability, learning and building knowledge, and recommendations for possible project improvement. The MTE provides an opportunity to ensure accountability to stakeholders in managing for results and reviewing progress. It is also a useful learning exercise, especially in relation to validating the design and assess the possible need to adjust the project and its approaches,

The main **objective** of this mid-term independent evaluation is to assess project progress towards the achievement of the project outcomes and outputs as specified in the project document and work plans, and assess signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended outputs and results. OECD/DAC evaluation criteria covering Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability will be followed.

The specific objectives of the midterm evaluation are as follows: -

1. Assess the continued relevance of the project, the effectiveness of the approach (including the inclusion of cross-cutting aspects), and the sustainability of the intended outcomes and outputs and PSAF objectives. Assess the contribution of, and collaboration with, the project's key stakeholders and other projects (in particular with R4D-SP and PSAF-AbF GIZ component).
2. Assess whether and how unexpected factors, including the COVID-19 pandemic, have affected project implementation, and whether the project has effectively addressed these unexpected factors.
3. Assess and review any evaluations and technical progress reports whether status of implementations and recommendations are still valid, and to what extent these recommendations have been followed-up.
4. Identify lessons learnt, good practices, recommendations and related innovative approaches, including those related to social dialogue, tripartism, management, the implementation of activities, and achieving results.

Scope of the evaluation:

The scope of the Mid-Term Evaluation is guided by the main objective and the specific objectives as outlined in the above section. The Mid-term Evaluation will cover the period 1st June 2017 to 31st October 2020. The geographical coverage of the evaluation will include all geographical locations where project operates. However it is proposed that the MTE data collection focuses on two of the Municipalities where the project is being implemented. For practical reasons this will be the Municipalities of Baucau and Viqueque. Baucau because some of the project staff are based there where internet connectivity is relatively better than in the other 3 Municipalities and this will facilitate conducting on-line meetings). Viqueque has also been chosen, because there may still be on-going works which can be assessed during the evaluation period.

The evaluation will integrate gender equality and disability as cross-cutting concerns throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation. Considering the restrictions related to COVID-19 and the light footprint of the Mid-term Evaluation, these cross-cutting concerns will be addressed as much as practically possible - in line with EVAL's Guidance Note n° 4. Similarly, EVAL's Guidance Note n° 7 will be followed as much as practically possible to ensure stakeholder participation (web links to the Guidance Notes are provided in the Annexure).

To the extent available, the evaluators should review secondary data and information disaggregated by sex, gender, and people living with a disability. It is important to assess the relevance and effectiveness of the project's strategy related to gender equality and the inclusion of people living with a disability. All this information should be included in the Inception Report and Mid-Term Evaluation report.

Clients and users of the evaluation:

- PSAF-AbF Project Steering Committee and ERA-AF Project Advisory Committee
- Government of Timor Leste e.g. National Authorising Office Services, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation, Ministry of Public Works, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Directorate of Roads, Bridges and Flood Control (DRBFC), Department of Training and Co-operation of DRBFC, Secretariat of State for Vocational Training and Employment (SEFOPE),
- Chamber of Commerce and Industry of Timor Leste (CCI-TL), Syndicate of Timorese Trade Union (KSTL), Don Bosco Training Centre (DBTC), Association of Women Entrepreneurs of Timor-Leste (AEMTL)
- ILO Country Office for Indonesia and Timor Leste
- DWT Bangkok, DEVINVEST,
- Donors –European Union
- ILO Regional Office for Asia and Pacific (ROAP)
- The project team

Evaluation criteria and Key evaluation questions

Evaluation criteria

The evaluation should address OECD/DAC and ILO evaluation criteria and concerns, i.e. relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact as defined in the ILO Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation, 2017⁵ As this will be a mid-term evaluation, it is acknowledged that it may still be too early to evaluate the impact of the project.

Suggested key evaluation questions are mentioned below. Given the purpose of the evaluation, the evaluator may suggest additional questions – in consultation with the evaluation manager. Any fundamental changes to the evaluation criteria and questions should be agreed between the evaluation manager and the evaluator, and reflected in the inception report.

Suggested Evaluation Questions - should respond to the specific objectives above.

a) Relevance and strategic fit

The extent to which the intervention objectives, design and approach continue to respond to beneficiaries, country, and partners/institution/donors' needs, policies, and priorities, and is expected to continue to do so if circumstances change (or have changed).

- The extent to which the project has responded to the need of the tripartite constituents, beneficiaries and recipients.
- The extent to which the project has contributed to the PSAF-AbF objectives?
- The relevance of the project in support of the goals outlined in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the ILO Programme & Budget, and the ILO Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) for Timor-Leste?

b) Coherence of the project (How well does the intervention fit?)

The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution

⁵ https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/--eval/documents/publication/wcms_571339.pdf

- The extent to which other interventions and policies support or undermine the ERA-AF interventions, and vice versa.
- The compatibility of interlinkages between the ERA-AF interventions and the PSAF-AbF GIZ component (SO1 of PSAF), other interventions carried out by Government of Timor Leste and ILO such as R4D-SP, ILO and social partners.
- Are there possible ways to maximize synergies and improve collaboration with new or existing actors? Has there been a duplication of efforts/resources
- The extent to which the ERA-AF interventions adhere to decent work principles including International Labour Standards, human rights- based approach and gender equality

c) Validity of intervention design

The extent to which the design is logical and coherent.

- Is the project realistic (in terms of expected outputs, outcome and impact), given the proposed intervention logic, time and resources available, and the changing social, economic, political environment and other challenges faced to date? Do targets of specific outputs (including social targets) need adjustment? If so, why and in what way?
- How are target beneficiaries selected by ERA-AF? Is the selection done on following an inclusive approach and in close consultation with communities concerned?
- Is the project design still valid vis-à-vis the COVID-19 pandemic? To what extent has the pandemic affected the project and what measures – if any – have been taken to address encountered effects from the pandemic?
- Does the project have a Theory of Change or Results Framework? If so, to what extent is it used to guide project implementation towards the project objectives. Are the indicators of the achievements clearly defined, describing the changes to be brought about? Were the indicators designed and used in a manner that enabled reporting on progress under specific SDG targets and indicators?
- Were the project risks properly identified and assessed. How effective were the mitigation measures taken by the project in addressing the identified and assessed risks?

d) Effectiveness:

The extent to which the interventions achieved, or are expected to achieve, its objectives and its results, including any differential results across groups?

- What progress has been made towards achieving the overall project outputs and results? To what extent have already achieved outputs (*like improved market access using labour based approach, and skills of construction companies and local authorities improved*) benefited women and men and the agro-forestry communities. Is the project likely to achieve the result's targets at the end of the project.
- Assess the validity of the recommendations of previous monitoring and evaluations on the project. To what extent has the project managed to follow-up on those recommendations. Assess the validity of ILO's comments on those recommendations and findings that were contested by the ILO.

e) Effectiveness of management arrangement

- Has the Project Steering Committee, Project Advisory Committee and the management and governance structure put in place, worked effectively with all the project's key stakeholders and partners to achieve project goals and objectives?

- To what extent is the monitoring and evaluation system results-based and to what extent is it being used to take management decisions? To what extent are the M&E data supporting project decision making related to gender and non-discrimination?

f) Efficiency of resource use

The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way

- Have resources (financial, human, technical support, etc.) been allocated efficiently and strategically to achieve the project outputs and outcomes?
- Were the project's activities implemented in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the work plan? If not, what are the factors that hindered timely delivery and what were the counter measures taken to achieve the project's envisaged outputs, outcomes and impact during the life of the project?
- Are there sufficient resource allocated to integrate gender and disability in the design, implementation and M&E of the project outputs and outcomes
- To what extent has ERA-AF leveraged resources with PSAF-AbF GIZ component, , with other projects/programmes, and through partnerships with other organizations, to enhance the project impact and efficiency?

g) Impact orientation

The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.

- Has the ERA-AF project made (or is likely to make) a difference to specific higher goals to which they are linked (like PSAF-AbF, SDGs, DWCP, Timor Leste's Development Plan)? What level of influence is the project having on policies and practices at national and municipal level?
- The extent to which the project has contributed or is likely to contribute to Timor Leste's capacity in the rural roads sector, , in employment generation, and eventually poverty reduction in Timor-Leste

h) Sustainability

The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are likely to continue.

- Which project-supported activities, capacities, products and tools have been sustained and institutionalized, or are expected to be sustained and institutionalized during the remainder of the project, by partners external organizations e.g. the capacity of Don Bosco Training Institute?
- To what extent are the maintained/rehabilitated roads and developed capacities likely to have a long term, sustainable positive contribution to the SDG and relevant targets for the project's targeted groups? (explicitly or implicitly)
- Does the project implement an exit strategy?

i) Tripartism, social dialogue, Gender equality and non-discrimination

- What are so far the key achievements of the project on gender equality and women's empowerment?
- Has the use of resources on women's empowerment activities been sufficient to achieve the expected results?

- Has the project been able to leverage the ILO contributions, through its comparative advantages including ILS, social dialogue and tripartism?

Evaluation Methodology

The independent Mid-Term Evaluation will comply with ILO's evaluation norms and standards and follow ethical safeguards, all as specified in ILO's evaluation procedures. The ILO adheres to the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) evaluation norms and standards as well as 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, engaging with key stakeholders of the project at all levels during the design, field work, validation and reporting stages. To collect the data and information for analysis, the evaluation will make use of the techniques listed below (but not limited to). The data from these sources will be triangulated to increase the validity and rigor of the evaluation findings.

Methodology should also include examining the interventions' Theory of Change, specifically in the light of logical connect between levels of results, its coherence with external factors, and their alignment with the ILO's strategic objectives, DWCP, SDGs and related targets, national and ILO country level outcomes.

As earlier mentioned, this MTE is proposed to be rather a "light" evaluation and that review and assessment of secondary data will constitute a main element of the methodology – to be complemented with on-line interviews/meetings with selected key stakeholders and review of some video recording of physical infrastructure work undertaking by the project. The followings are proposed methods, of which the evaluation team may modify as needed but it is to be done in consultation with the evaluation manager.

Desk review of project design and strategy documents (PRODOC), progress reports, activity documents, communications, research, and publications.

- Project documents and related PSAF documents
- Technical Progress reports
- Research products
- Project monitoring plans
- DWCP Timor Leste (2016-2020)
- Relevant government development plans
- Evaluations and Monitoring Reports
- Curricula that has been developed for the training and mentoring

Key informant interviews with project staff, relevant ILO specialists and technical support units, Donors, Government, Implementing Institutions, tripartite constituents, civil society organizations and other stakeholders and partners mentioned above

Focus group discussions (FGDs) with beneficiaries e.g. women and men in the target districts - this is likely to be done via virtual means. Or it may be done face-to-face as **Field In-depth interviews/or FGDs in Timor Leste** - where possible by the national consultant, the Evaluation team is expected to meet project beneficiaries' men and women to undertake more in depth reviews on the project work and results. The evaluator must indicate the criteria selection for individuals to interview.

Survey: The evaluation team may explore the possibility to conduct phone interviews/ send out some survey relevant questionnaires to different specific target groups, if it's feasible.

Case studies: Possible case studies may be used where appropriate

Due to the current COVID19 situation, the methodology may need to be flexible and field visits to the project sites may face some challenges. The evaluation team once on board will review relevant documents and will discuss with the project management to prepare a detailed inception report. The inception report will elaborate in detail proposed methods of data collection (face-to-face or remotely etc.) and that they have to be reliable, most practical and sensitive to the situation faced by different key stakeholders to be interviewed etc. Secondary data and information will constitute the main data/information to be used by the evaluator – complemented with on-line interviews/meetings and some video recordings that the project team can make and send to the evaluator

Debriefing/ Stakeholders' workshop

At the end of the data collection the evaluation team will present preliminary findings to ILO and/or the project key stakeholders in a workshop (or via Webinar) to discuss and refine the findings and fill information gaps.

The data and information should be collected, presented and analyzed with appropriate gender and disability disaggregation. Multiple methods and triangulation will be applied to analyze both quantitative and qualitative data. A more detailed methodology for the assignment will be elaborated by the evaluator on the basis of this TOR, in consultation with ILO Evaluation Manager in the Inception report that has to be approved by the Evaluation Manager.

Main Deliverables

1. [An inception report](#) - upon the review of available documents and an initial discussion with the project management and the donor (*following ILO EVAL Policy Guidelines–Checklist 3 and Checklist 4 “Validating methodologies*) The inception report will:
 - Describe the conceptual framework that will be used to undertake the evaluation; Have a session with project team to understand better the project on relevant issues e.g. private sector, gender, disability, scaling and approaches before finalising the evaluation questions
 - Elaborate the methodology proposed in the TOR with adjustments and precisions as required;
 - Set out the evaluation matrix to indicate how each evaluation question will be answered in terms of evaluation indicators, data sources, (emphasizing triangulation as much as possible) data collection methods, and sampling;
 - Selection criteria for locations to be visited at national and sub-national levels;
 - Detail the work plan for the evaluation, indicating the phases in the evaluation, their key deliverables and milestones;
 - Set out the list of key stakeholders to be interviewed and the guides to be used for interviews, observation, focal groups and other techniques that may be applied;
 - Develop data and information collection tools and questionnaires;
 - Set out the agenda for the stakeholders workshop; and
 - Set out outline for the evaluation report.

The Evaluation Manager, before proceeding with the fieldwork, should approve the Inception report.

2. [On-line debriefing](#) to present preliminary findings at the end of field work phase. The evaluator will organize a workshop (virtually) to discuss the preliminary findings of the evaluation after data collection is completed. The workshop will be technically organized by the evaluation team with the logistic support of the project.
3. [First draft of Evaluation Report \(see outline below\)](#). *The ILO EVAL Policy Guidelines Checklist 5 "Preparing the evaluation report" should be consulted.* The report will be reviewed methodologically by the evaluation manager. After that, it will be shared with all relevant stakeholders for two weeks for comments. The comments will be provided to the evaluator to arrive to a final version that integrates the comments. Each lesson learnt or good practices identified must be accompanied by a one page to elaborate on the lesson learnt/good practices as per ILO standard template (see annexure).
4. [Final version of the evaluation report](#) incorporating comments received (or a specific justification for not integrating a comment). The report should be no longer than 35 pages excluding annexes. The quality of the report will be assessed against the EVAL checklist 6 (see annexure). The report should also include a section on output and outcome level results against indicators and targets of each project and comments on each one. The final version is subjected to final approval by EVAL (after initial quality assurance and endorsement by Regional Evaluation Officer)
5. [Stand-alone evaluation summary](#) in standard ILO format (max 4 pages)

The draft and final versions of the evaluation report in English in Word file (maximum 35 pages plus annexes) will be developed under the following structure:

- 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
- Acronyms
- Executive Summary
- Background of the project and its intervention logic
- Purpose, scope and clients of evaluation
- Methodology and limitations
- Review of project results
- Presentation of findings (by evaluation criteria)
- Conclusions
- Recommendations (including to whom they are addressed, resources required, priority and timing) Recommendations, emerging from the evaluation, should be strongly linked to the findings of the evaluation and should provide clear guidance to stakeholders on how they can address them.
- Lessons learnt and potential good practices
- Annexes (TOR, table with the status achieved of project indicators targets and a brief comment per indicator, list of people interviewed, Schedule of the field work overview of meetings, list of Documents reviewed, Lessons and Good practices templates per each one, other relevant information).

All reports, including drafts, will be written in English. Ownership of data from the evaluation rests jointly with the ILO and the evaluator. The copyright of the evaluation report will rest exclusively

with the ILO. Use of the data for publication and other presentations can only be made with the written agreement of the ILO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

Management arrangements and work plan

Evaluation Manager: Ms Pamornrat Pringsulaka, Regional Evaluation Officer, ILO RO Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, Thailand who has not had prior involvement in the project, will manage this Mid-Term Evaluation. Evaluation team leader reports to the evaluation manager.

The Evaluation Manager is responsible for completing the following specific tasks:

- Draft and finalize the evaluation TOR with inputs from key stakeholders (draft TORs to be circulated for comments);
- Develop the Call for expression of interest and select the independent evaluator;
- Brief the evaluator on ILO evaluation policies and procedures;
- Initial coordination with the project team on the development of the field mission schedule and the preliminary results workshop;
- Approve the inception report
- Circulate the first draft of the evaluation report for comments by key stakeholders;
- Ensure the final version of the evaluation report addresses stakeholders' comments (or an explanation why for any that has not been addressed) and meets ILO requirements.
- Share the report with EVAL for final approval and uploading in the public e-discovery repository.

The evaluation team leader has the responsibility to undertake the evaluation and deliver all the required deliverables as per this TOR. He/she will be supported by a national consultant.

Desired competencies and responsibilities for evaluators

The table below described desired competencies and responsibilities for an international evaluator as team leader

Responsibilities	Profile
Conduct evaluation and deliver all deliverables under this TOR • Desk review of programme documents and other related documents • Development of the evaluation instrument • Briefing with ILO • Telephone interviews with HQ and DWT-Bangkok specialists [and virtual interviews with stakeholders in Timor-Leste if situation does not allow for field visit] • May undertake a field visit in Timor Leste (if situation permits) • Facilitate stakeholders' workshop/ debriefing with the programme and key stakeholders • Draft evaluation report • Finalize evaluation	• No previous involvement/engagement in the design and delivery of ERA-AF project • University Degree with minimum 10 years of experience in international project /program evaluations; • Have proven expertise and experiences in evaluating labour-based infrastructure development programmes and/or rural employment related development projects/programs • Sound understanding on ILO employment intensive investment approach will be an asset • Substantive experience in project evaluations in the UN and/or EU system, or other international context, human rights based approach, inclusiveness • Experience in using results-based management principles, Theory of change /LFA analysis for programming • Ability to bring gender and non-discrimination dimensions into the evaluation, including in data collection analysis and writing • Demonstrate an understanding of the ILO mandates and tripartism • Excellent analytical skills and communication skills; • Experience in Timor Leste will be an advantage • Fluency in spoken and written English • Experience in facilitating workshops for evaluation findings. • Be flexible and responsive to changes and demands; client oriented; and open to feedback.

• Draft stand-alone evaluation summary as per standard ILO format	
---	--

The table below described desired competencies and responsibilities for National evaluator as team member

Responsibilities	Profile
The national consultant (a national of Timor Leste) will support the team leader in conducting a participatory and inclusive evaluation. • collect background information and preparing a summary in English as required; • contribute to a desk review of relevant program and non-program documents; • pro-actively provide relevant local knowledge and insights to the international consultant; • take part in the data collection e.g. interviews with key stakeholders and assisting the international consultant in taking notes during interviews, or conduct other data collection methods as required by the team leader • contribute to the main report to be prepared by the team leader • maybe requested to write certain sections in the draft report as requested by the team leader • participate in and jointly facilitate the stakeholders workshop • provide interpretation during the evaluation data collection as required	• No previous involvement in the delivery of the ERA-AF project • University Degree with minimum 7 years of strong and substantial professional experience in project evaluations and/or experience in local economic development context; • Knowledgeable in program/project evaluation methodologies • Excellent analytical skills, writing and interview skills; • Excellent command of oral and written English; • Understanding of Tetum local language; • Sound knowledge on the socio economic conditions of Timor Leste and gender equality, disability inclusion and non-discrimination is desirable • Knowledge of ILO's roles and mandate and its tripartite structure as well as UN and/or EU system evaluation norms and its programming will be an advantage

Administrative and logistic support

The ERA-AF project management team and ILO-Jakarta Office will provide all required logistical support to the evaluation team and will assist in organizing a detailed evaluation mission agenda. The project management will ensure that all relevant documentations are up to date and easily accessible by the evaluation team.

Roles of other key stakeholders

All stakeholders, particularly the relevant ILO staff, the donors, tripartite constituents, relevant government agencies, NGOs and other key partners will be consulted throughout the process and will be engaged at different stages during the process. They will have the opportunity to provide inputs to the TOR and to the draft Mid-Term Evaluation report.

Evaluation Timetable and Schedule

The Mid-Term Evaluation will be conducted during October-January 2021.

Task	Responsible person	Timeline
Preparing and drafting TOR Evaluation Manager and gathering inputs from project team	Evaluation Manager	September 7, 2020
Sharing the TOR with all stakeholders for comments/inputs	Evaluation Manager	September 8-15, 2020
Finalization of the TOR and Expression of Interest	Evaluation Manager	September 18, 2020
Approval of the TOR EVAL	Regional Evaluation Officer	September 18, 2020

Task	Responsible person	Timeline
Call for expression of interest and Selection of consultant	Evaluation Manager/ROAP/EVAL	September 21-30, 2020
Draft mission itinerary or possible virtual interview schedule?	Project team	By end September
Contract preparation/Contract signed and brief evaluators on ILO evaluation policy	Project CTA/team Evaluation Manager	By Oct 15, 2020
Desk review, and audio/skype/video conference with project, and inception report submitted	Project and evaluators (at home based)	Submission of inception report is by end October 2020
Evaluation Mission or Data collection	Evaluators	November 2020
Debriefing workshop	Evaluators/CTA	TBC
Drafting of evaluation report and submitting to the Evaluation Manager	Evaluators	December 10, 2020
Sharing the draft report to all concerned for comments	Evaluation Manager	December 11-21, 2020
Consolidated comments on the draft report, send to the evaluator	Evaluation Manager	December 22, 2020
Finalisation of the report	Evaluators	End of December, 2020
Review of the final report	Evaluation Manager	January, 2021
Submission of the Mid-Term Evaluation report	Evaluation Manager	January, 2021
Approval of the Mid-Term Evaluation report	EVAL	January, 2021

Proposed workdays (payable days) for the evaluation team

Phase	Responsible Person	Tasks	Proposed number of days	
			Team leader	Team member
I	Evaluation team	- Briefing with the evaluation manager, the project team and the donors - Desk Review of project related documents - Inception report submission	6	4
II	Evaluation team with organisational support from ILO	- Data collection: In-country (Timor Leste) consultations with project staff and other relevant stakeholders - Field visits (if possible?) - Interviews with projects staff, partners beneficiaries - Debriefing and/or Stakeholders workshop for sharing findings	10	10

III	Evaluation team	- Draft report based on consultations from field visits and desk review and the stakeholders' validation workshop	8	5
IV	Evaluation Manager	- Quality check and initial review by Evaluation Manager - Circulate revised draft report to stakeholders - Consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to team leader	0	0
V	Evaluation team leader	- Finalize the report including explanations on why comments were not included	2	1
TOTAL			26	20

Resources

Funding will come from Project, estimated resource requirements at this point:

- Team leader: consultant fee
- National Evaluator: fee
- Travel cost to the project target areas and DSA days as per the ILO rules and regulations
- Actual communication cost (in case of virtual meeting e.g. telephone or skype calls if needed)

Legal and Ethical Matters

- The evaluation will comply with UN Norms and Standards.
- The TORs are accompanied by the Code of Conduct document for carrying out evaluations.
- UNEG ethical guidelines and anti-sexual harassment policy of ILO will be followed.
- It is important that the evaluator has no links to program management or any other conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of evaluation.

ANNEX 1: RELEVANT EVALUATION POLICY AND GUIDELINES

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

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

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

Checklist No. 3: Writing the inception report

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

Checklist 5: preparing the evaluation report

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

Checklist 6: rating the quality of evaluation report

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

Template for lessons learnt and Emerging Good Practices

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

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

Guidance note 7: Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation

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

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

UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation

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

ILO Handbook on “How to design, monitor and evaluate peacebuilding results in employment for peace and resilience programmes” https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/documents/instructionalmaterial/wcms_712211.pdf

ANNEX 2: PROGRESS MADE TO DATE

ERA-AF Project 3rd Annual Technical Progress Report (June 2019 - May 2020)

Page 1



Development Cooperation Progress Report (DCPR)

IRIS Project No.: 106139
TC Symbol: TLS/16/02/EUR
Donor: European Union
Administrative Unit: CO Jakarta

Country or Region: Timor-Leste

Title: Enhancing Rural Access Agro-Forestry (ERA Agro-Forestry): Improving access to agro-forestry areas

P&B Outcome: Outcome 1: More and better jobs for inclusive growth and improved youth employment prospect.
Indicator 1.4: Institutional development and capacity programmes in industrial, sectoral, trade, skills, infrastructure, investment or environmental policies for more and productive and better quality jobs.

Report: ☒ Annual For projects reporting on an annual basis, all sections must be completed and the report must cover the previous 12 months.
☐ 6-month For projects reporting twice per year, all sections must be completed and the report must cover the previous 6 months.
☐ Quarterly For projects reporting on a quarterly basis, every second and fourth report (i.e. twice a year) should complete all sections. The other reports may leave out sections 3 and 4.

Sequence: ☐ 1st report ☐ 2nd report ☒ 3rd report ☐ 4th report ☐ 5th report ☐ 6th report ☐ 7th report ☐ 8th report ☐ 9th report ☐ 10th report ☐ 11th report

Related project(s): N/A

Reporting Information	
Reporting period:	From 1 June 2019 to 31 May 2020
Report prepared by:	Albert Uriyo, Project Manager
Report reviewed by:	Bas Athmer, Senior Specialist, EIIP, Bangkok I have reviewed the classifications and agree they are a fair and accurate reflection of progress Reviewer initials:
Report approved by:	Michiko Miyamoto, ILO Director for Indonesia and Timor-Leste I have reviewed the classifications and agree they are a fair and accurate reflection of progress Approver initials: