Call for Expression of interest

Evaluability Assessment: <u>Work in Freedom</u> Programme

ILO Country Office for Nepal is seeking expression of interest from qualified individuals or by a team of two individual experts to conduct Evaluability Assessment of the ILO's <u>Work in Freedom</u> project, a bi-regional programme on Fair Recruitment and Decent Work for women migrant workers in South Asia and the Middle East. Please refer to the Term of Reference for more information about scope of assignment and eligibility. If interested, please send your expression of interest explaining your relevant experience, CV, daily consultancy fee (in USD), and details of 2 referees.

Candidates intending to submit an expression of interest please specify clearly which consultancy opportunity that you apply (Thematic Expert or M&E Expert) or apply as a team.

Interested candidates are invited to submit individually:

1. A short description of how the candidate's skills, qualifications and experience are relevant to the required qualifications of the assignment.
2. The CV of the candidate that will undertake the work, with a list of previous evaluations/evaluability assessments that are relevant to the context and subject matter of the assignment, indicating the role played by then consultant.
3. A proposal setting out the daily professional fee (expressed in US dollars)
4. The names of two referees (including phone and email) who are able to be contacted.
5. A statement confirming that the candidate(s) has/ve no previous involvement in the implementation and delivery of the interventions of Work in Freedom project or a personal relationship with any ILO Officials who are engaged in the named interventions.
6. A timeline with proposed dates for contract start and end dates and tentative dates for country visits;

The deadline to submit expression of interest for undertaking the Evaluability Assessment is **29th March 2020**. Please send an e-mail with the subject header "Evaluability Assessment of WIF: Thematic Expert / M&E Expert" to the M&E Technical Officer, Narendra Bollepalli (bollepalli@ilo.org) and copied to the Chief Technical Adviser, Igor Bosc (bosc@ilo.org).

Terms of Reference
for
Evaluability Assessment of Work in Freedom Programme, Phase II

Title/Purpose:	Consultancy service to conduct Evaluability Assessment (EA) of ILO's Work in Freedom (WiF) programme
Programme:	ILO-DFID Partnership Programme on Fair Recruitment and Decent Work for women migrant workers in South Asia and the Middle East
Programme Duration	63 months
Start date:	01 April 2018
End date:	31 March 2023
Countries covered	India, Nepal, Bangladesh, Jordan, Lebanon, Kuwait, and Oman
Technical field:	Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work
Donor/Development Partner	Department of International Development (DFID), United Kingdom
Programme Budget: :	GBP 12,495,090
Administrative unit:	ILO Country Office for India (CO-Delhi)
Technical backstopping unit:	Fundamental principles and rights at work department (FUNDAMENTALS)
Collaborating ILO Units:	The International Migration Programme (MIGRANT), Conditions of Work and Employment Branch (IN-WORK), ILO Country Offices in India, Nepal, Bangladesh, Jordan and ILO Regional Offices in Bangkok and Beirut.
Recruiting Officer:	Chief Technical Advisor, Work in Freedom Project, CO-ROAS
EA Contract modality:	External Consultants
EA Contract duration:	Spread over 3 months (April – June 2020)
Languages required:	English. Arabic, Hindi, Bangla or Nepali an asset.
Location:	Home-based, with travel to programme countries

Terms of Reference: Evaluability Assessment of the Work in Freedom (ILO-DFID Partnership Programme on Fair Recruitment and Decent Work for Women Migrant Workers in South Asia and the Middle East) RAS/17/11/GBR

Page 2

Context, Challenge and Proposed Response:

1. For millions of poor or socially marginalized people in South Asia, migration is an important alternative to the realities of home. People move long distances in pursuit of jobs for varying reasons ranging from economic aspirations or loss of habitat resulting from processes of economic transformation, poverty, climate change, gender based violence or conflict. While some migrate internally, many also migrate abroad. For women and girls, especially of indigenous, *Dalit* or low-income backgrounds, the experience of further impoverishment and discrimination makes migration a viable option. While many are able to improve their livelihoods in cities at home or abroad, many also face exploitation by employers– practices that amount to forced labour.

2. Domestic work and the garment sectors in West Asia and India employ women and girls from South Asia. Reports of abuse from these workplaces include unpaid wages, confiscation of identity documents, long working hours without days off, restrictions on movement, deception about terms and conditions of work, sexual violence and intimidation – all indicative of instances of forced labour and trafficking. ILO estimates that 12.3 million of the nearly 21 million women, men and children in forced labour globally are found in the Asia and Pacific and Middle East regions. The majority are exploited in economic activities outside the sex industry, such as domestic work or the textile and garment sector. Some 55 per cent of all victims of forced labour are women and girls.

   Key factors contributing to situations of forced labour include weak labour protections for migrant garment and domestic workers, ineffective recruitment and contracting policies and practices, poor access to basic services in source communities, and information asymmetries shaping labour markets.

3. To address these challenges, the Work in Freedom Programme has set up a series of interventions engaging migrants, civil groups, businesses and regulators in a collaborative effort to begin addressing the multiple facets of forced labour in source and destination areas of migrant domestic and garment workers. Interventions are designed to reduce vulnerability to forced labour along those pathways and shape fairer labour markets. Activities focus on promoting mobility by choice, fair recruitment to decent jobs and safety and dignity for migrant workers.

The Project

4. The Work in Freedom (WiF) programme is a ten year regional programme which aims to reduce vulnerability to forced labour. It started with a first phase from 2013 to 2018 and is followed by a second phase from 2018 to 2023. The programme has adopted an integrated and targeted approach supporting mobility by choice among women and girls from South Asian countries of origin (e.g. India, Bangladesh and Nepal), more accountable recruitment pathways and better jobs with safety and dignity of workers in destination countries (e.g. India, Lebanon, Jordan, Kuwait, Oman) through multi-sectorial policy measures. In the first phase, the programme reached out to 380,000 women at risk of trafficking and forced labour in South and West Asia. If policy recommendations are implemented, the programme could indirectly reach over one million.

5. Key stakeholders include governments, social partners, the private sector, NGOs and importantly, the voice and participation of women migrant workers themselves. The programme is consistent with the ILO Decent Work Country Programme of the targeted countries, and contributes to the national development frameworks by addressing key drivers and vulnerabilities of forced labour, and in particular Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) target 8.7.

6. The **Development Objective** of the programme is to reduce vulnerability to trafficking and forced labour of women and girls across migration pathways leading to the care sector and textiles, clothing,

Terms of Reference: Evaluability Assessment of the Work in Freedom (ILO-DFID Partnership Programme on Fair Recruitment and Decent Work for Women Migrant Workers in South Asia and the Middle East) RAS/17/11/GBR

Page 3

leather and footwear industries of South Asia and Arab States.

7. **Immediate Objective**: WiF addresses key drivers and vulnerabilities of human trafficking, such as (a) gender and other forms of discrimination, distress migration and poor working and living conditions, through an integrated prevention strategy of (1) targeted social protection and empowerment, (2) fair recruitment practices and (3) and evidence based policy advocacy for decent work options.

8. The WiF Programme has the following five **Outputs**:

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

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

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

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

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

9. The Project Document, logical framework, theory of change and WiF first phase reports will be made available to the Evaluability Assessment team.

Evaluation Process in ILO

10. ILO considers evaluation as an integral part of the implementation of technical cooperation activities. Provisions are made in all projects in accordance with ILO evaluation policy and based on the nature of the project and the specific requirements agreed upon at the time of the project design and during the project as per established procedures.

11. Evaluations of ILO projects have a strong focus on utility for the purpose of organisational learning and planning for all stakeholders and partners in the project.

12. ILO Evaluation policy considers that all projects with budget over 5 million dollars should be subjected to an Evaluability Assessment (EA) during the first year of its implementation for the quality and completeness of the monitoring and evaluation plan and two independent evaluation (midterm and final).

13. The EA is implemented by the project, while the independent evaluations are managed independently from the project by EVAL, the Evaluation Office of ILO.

14. The EA will be guided by an overarching question, namely, to what extent does the Work in Freedom (WiF) programme has the technical and strategic elements to achieve intended results, and to credibly demonstrate such results in future evaluations?

Purpose

15. As the programme nears the timing for a mid-term evaluation, it is important, before undertaking the mid-term evaluation, to determine the evaluability of the programme so that adjustments can be made that may enable and or improve the effectiveness of the mid-term and final evaluations of the programme.

The purpose of the evaluability assessment is to:

Review measurability: determine whether interventions are designed such that, once they are complete, they will be able to demonstrate their effectiveness in achieving established results and whether they are replicable. Recommendations, if and when needed, will be provided on (1) the logical framework, (2) the theory of change, (3) options for evaluation design, (4) value for money indicators and (5) adaptive learning. In addition the exercise will:

a) **Clarify data availability and adequacy** of data in reflecting progress towards results. The assessment will identify information needs and possible sources of information for the mid-term evaluation and the final evaluation.

b) **Raise awareness among the users of the project on what WIF intends to achieve** during the projects' period, and how they need to ensure the availability of adequate evidence to demonstrate such achievements. This includes orientating key staff on monitoring systems that should be developed and/or put in place to measure results, and evaluation questions of concern to stakeholders.

The following table illustrates how the evaluability assessment will be used:

Primary Users of Evaluability Assessment	Role
Mid-term evaluation team	Use of means provided by evaluability assessment to measure progress
IFPRI evaluators	Further define quantitative and qualitative analytical inputs that facilitate measurement of progress within the programme
ILO evaluation department	Monitor and vet quality of evaluability assessment. Provide technical guidance to CTA
ILO CTA, TA and NPCs	Liaise with partners and make necessary adjustments in work-plans
Secondary Users of the Evaluability Assessment	**Role**
UK Aid and Advisory Board	Suggest best practices to modify programme as necessary to enable a better evaluation
Project Steering Committee (National Level)	Review proposed modifications to work-plan modifications that may arise as a result of the findings of the evaluability assessment

Scope

16. The evaluator may adapt the evaluation criteria and questions, but fundamental changes should be agreed between the evaluation manager and the evaluator, and reflected in the inception report.

The evaluator will ask questions on whether expected impact, outcome and output of the programme is (1) measurable, (2) whether information is reliable. Criteria including *relevance*,

effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability will be used in relation to respective outcomes measurability of interventions in the fields of migrant women (a) empowerment (enhancing agency), (b) fair recruitment and (c) governance; and three cross-cutting dimensions including (i) poverty and gender, and (ii) political and environmental context and (iii) labour markets.

(3) Does the WiF programme of work (interventions and activities) have clear objectives and whether programme has a coherent, feasible and relevant logical framework and theory of change?

Technical questions

17. **Impact**. Impact statement, impact indicators, baseline, targets and milestones

    The impact indicator posits that the project will reduce of vulnerability of women through systemic policy changes and direct project interventions. Is the programme documenting structural vulnerabilities to forced labour in each relevant context? Is there a clear political economy analysis of the structural factors underpinning vulnerability to forced labour in each context? How is the project keeping track of fluid policy environments so that changes that are not influenced by the programme are visibilized and regularly compared with those influenced by the programme?

    Are there SMART indicators at impact level which can measure the reduced vulnerability and can be tracked over time?

18. **Outcomes**. Outcome indicators, baseline, targets and milestones

    Outcome 1: **Women have greater ability to make their own choices during the entire migration process in an enabling environment for safe migration into decent work**. List drivers that both enable and prevent women from having choices (in relation to mobility and working/living conditions) and suggest how to account for progress generated by the programme in contrast with adverse trends that should be highlighted. More specifically review how women being able to choose is affected by the programme but also by the agrarian crisis, patriarchal and other discriminatory trends tied with caste, class and religion (e.g. politics of identity), trends in access to social protection and the absence/existence of decent work jobs. Are programme interventions sufficient to offset adverse trends?

    Outcome indicator 1.1: In view of the above, how can changes in women's decision making ability be assessed (negotiating power/ shifts in power relations) within the family, in the choice to migrate and the method of migration and finally at destination? Review current baseline and targets or propose changes as needed.

    Outcome indicator 1.2: Review past occurrence of replication processes of successful empowerment by the WIF programme and define possible scope of replications.

    Outcome indicator 1.3 and 1.4: Suggest methods and practices to systematically document cases of targeted women being able to collectively negotiate fair and equal wages and better working conditions and having faced violations.

    Outcome 2: **Increased levels of collaboration, accountability and respect between key actors along migration pathways towards an enabling environment for safe migration into decent work.** Describe how cooperation is happening in support of the enabling environment and how cooperation is happening in a way that undermines the enabling environment for safe migration and decent work. For example, are efforts to promote non-binding commitments on safe, orderly and regular migration (or ethical recruitment) intended or sufficient to offset efforts to promote bilateral agreements between source and destination countries that pit migrants against each other and enable a racialized race to the bottom in terms of wages and working conditions? Is the fight against modern

slavery focusing or deflecting attention away from decent work and how do efforts of the programme compare with them? What is the political economy of cooperation on migration and decent work and to whom is it benefiting? What is the programme doing about it? Are the programme's interventions sufficient to offset adverse cooperation trends?

Outcome indicator 2.1: Given the above, describe the status of the discourse on women's right to migration and safe mobility in two destination countries/states and two source areas, and provide recommendations. Suggest outcome targets for future years.

Outcome indicator 2.2: List current recruitment regulations in each country including recent changes and review targets.

Outcome indicator 2.3: List recruitment practices that WIF has assessed with potential for replication and suggest/review targets.

Outcome 3: **Strengthened laws, policies, practices and systems for social protection, safe labour migration and decent work for women.** List these laws and policies and describe positive and negative trends of what is happening to them in each country. Offer insights to apply a political economy analysis regarding such trends for each country. In view of adverse trends, suggest alternative wording that would enable better measurement of policy outcomes of the programme.

Outcome indicator 3.1: List categories of evidence that have been used to influence policy discussions and suggest possible targets.

Outcome indicator 3.2: Suggest way of documenting reforms/changes made at legislative and policy levels that address violation of migrant women worker rights and upholding of greater accountability levels.

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

Describe how WIF interventions under Output 1 are different of similar to other pre-departure or women empowerment interventions and institutional frameworks. How is the spectrum of such interventions and similar institutional frameworks framed by political economy imperatives? In comparison with those other interventions and set ups, what makes the WIF's interventions more or less effective?

How do dynamics generating economic scarcity (caused by the agrarian and job crises) combined with gender and class segregation (triggered by politics of identity and structural discrimination caused by laws, policies and norms) concurrently disempower women in spite of programme interventions to empower women? How do these dynamics affect measurability of women empowerment interventions? How can women empowerment interventions be accounted for more effectively in the context of such trends? Explore other possible ways of measuring such an output (other than those listed as output indicators) and or confirm the current ones. Do staff need to invest more time and resources in making data available, analysing it and ensuring that lessons are documented for replicability?

Output indicator 1.1 – 1.5: Review output indicators and argue and suggest changes if needed including baselines, data sources and targets.

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

Describe how WIF interventions under Output 2 are different of similar to other interventions or institutional set ups aiming to (1) build collective voice and representation of workers, (2) ensure that employers uphold fundamental principles and rights of workers. How is the spectrum of such interventions and similar institutional set-ups framed by political economy imperatives? In comparison with those other institutional frameworks and interventions, what makes the WIF's interventions more or less effective?

How do measures to prevent organizing and collective representation of migrant women workers, measures to prevent women from minority groups from accessing services and measures that block access to justice for migrant women influence the programme's interventions to improve collective representation and access to justice and remedies for migrant workers? Do programme interventions offset adverse trends within this Output? Analyse the political economy of organizing and collective bargaining by and for migrant workers in destination locations and alternative ways to measure programme interventions seeking to tilt the balance to reduce power asymmetries.

Output indicator 2.1 – 2.3: Review output indicators and argue and suggest changes if needed including baselines, data sources and targets.

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

Describe how WIF interventions under Output 3 are different of similar to other fair or ethical recruitment interventions and institutional frameworks. How is the spectrum of such interventions

and similar institutional frameworks framed by political economy imperatives? In comparison with those other interventions and set ups, what makes the WIF's interventions more or less effective?

How is labour intermediation being affected by the scale and quality of work that is available? Does it make sense to fix recruitment practices if decent work options are diminishing and labour intermediation processes are increasing? Would it be better to reformulate this output to make it focus on working and living conditions (Advisory Group recommendation) or add an output indicator on "initiatives to improve working conditions"? Given the significant amount of research undertaken by WIF, would it make sense to document in more depth how poor working and living conditions affect labour intermediation?

Output indicator 3.1 – 3.3: Review output indicators and argue and suggest changes if needed including baselines, data sources and targets.

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

How does the political economy of work affect possibilities of policy advocacy? What are adverse policy advocacy initiatives that co-exists with the WIF interventions on laws and policies? Who are the actors and how influential are they in contesting WIF positions even when they are known to be backed by solid evidence? How are other policy narratives undermining advocacy for labour rights and what is the programme doing about it? What else can the progamme do if its interventions are often insufficient to offset adverse policy trends? How should the programme keep track of these dynamics and strengthen its political economy analysis? Does staff need to invest more time and resources in analysing policy narratives?

Output indicator 4.1 – 4.3: Review output indicators and argue and suggest changes if needed including baselines, data sources and targets.

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

Review research strategy and provide recommendations on it.

Output indicator 5.1 – 5.2: Review output indicators and argue and suggest changes if needed including baselines, data sources and targets.

Geography and timing

24. **Geographical coverage**: The EA will cover the national and sub-national level in the sampled programme countries, viz., at least four targeted countries.

25. **Period to be covered**: The Evaluability Assessment will cover the second phase of WiF and will include activities implemented during April 2018-March 2020. However, some lines of enquiry might require looking before the current phase and should include WiF lessons and the activities that were carried over from the first phase and/or similar activities that were reintroduced/improved under the current phase.

III. Suggested Aspects to be addressed

26. The consultancy should be carried out in context of criteria and approaches of [ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation](#) and the technical and ethical standards and abide by the [Code of Conduct for Evaluation on the UN System](#).

27. Gender concerns should be addressed in accordance with ILO Guidance note 4: "[Considering gender in the monitoring and evaluation of projects](#)". All data should be sex-disaggregated and different needs of women and men and of marginalized groups targeted by the programme should be considered throughout the evaluation process.

28. The consultancy should address specially to the ILO-EVAL guidelines in Evaluability Assessment. These are the Guidance Note 11 "Using the Evaluability assessment Tool", Guidance Note 12 "Dimensions of the Evaluability instrument" and the Guidance tool "[Tool for Evaluability Review of ILO Projects over US$5 million](#)".

29. Guidance Note on Adapting Evaluation Methods to the ILO's Normative and Tripartite Mandate: https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_721381.pdf

30. The EA should include the following items:
    - Internal logic and assumptions
    - Indicators, baselines, targets and milestones
    - Data sources/means of verification and methods for data collection and reporting
    - Resources required
    - Partners' participation in the use of information
    - Project risk management
    - Outcomes sustainability

IV. Expected outputs of the Evaluability Assessment

31. The EA should be completed within 3 months (April-June 2020) with a final report formatted for submission to ILO. Expected deliverables by the two member EA team are as follows:
    - A desk-based review and analysis of appropriate material.
    - Briefing meetings (in person and by Skype/phone) with the project team (CO-Beirut and other offices in targeted countries), the FUNDAMENTALS technical staff, the DFID and relevant national and regional level selected stakeholders.
    - An inception report based on the desk review and the briefing; centred on the work plan and deliverables. This report should include a succinct literature review chapter, methodology chapter or annex, data files from the desk review, and an updated data collection instruments and data analysis plan; an outline of the final report, including proposed annexes.
    - Informal feedback meetings with WiF/ILO staff as the outputs are being developed.
    - Validation workshop to present Zero version of deliverables, in Beirut or Delhi, with participation of other relevant stakeholders by VC or Skype to collect inputs for the preparation of the draft version.
    - The first draft of the EA report that includes a complete set of findings, overall assessments of the evaluability of the ILO/WiF supported interventions to achieve results, draft recommendations, draft TORs for a future evaluation, and all annexes. The contents of first draft should include, at the minimum:

- ✓ Programme coherence
- ✓ Comments and suggestions on Theory of Change including proposed alternative (graph and narrative)
- ✓ Answers to Technical Questions within the report
- ✓ Indicators matrix – output, outcome and impact levels (definitions, methodology of measurement, source, who and when)
- ✓ Propose monitoring and evaluation methodology for data collection, processing, reporting and use, provide comments and suggestions on current Monitoring and Evaluation Operational Plan)
- ✓ Targets indicators tables (baseline, milestones and targets)
- ✓ Outline of next steps for implementing the proposed M&E methodology and tools
- ✓ Conclusions and recommendations (with considerations on M&E and identification of which stakeholders are responsible for each action)
- ✓ Appropriate Annexes including present TORs, schedule of the EA, individuals interviewed and documents reviewed.

- o Upon considering the feedback and inputs on first draft, <u>the second and penultimate draft</u> of the EA report that includes all elements in discussed above, and the executive summary.
- o <u>Final report</u> incorporating feedback from stakeholders. The final draft of the EA report, duly reviewed for quality, and conforming to the ILO publishing standards.

32. The draft final report will be circulated to key stakeholders for their review. Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated by the WiF M&E Officer and provided to the EA team following consultations with CTA. In preparing the final report, the consultants should consider these comments, incorporate them as needed, and provide a brief note explaining why any comments might not have been incorporated.

33. All drafts and final outputs will be in English.

34. All drafts and final outputs, including supporting documents and analytical reports should be provided in electronic version compatible for Word for Windows. Ownership of data from the EA rests jointly with ILO and the consultants. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the reports in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

V. Evaluability Assessment Methodology

35. In order to understand the various aspects of the programme, its direction of interventions and in order to elicit information of quality, the following is the proposed indicative methodology. The EA team to propose a variety of data collection approaches (e.g., semi-structured and informal interviews and discussions with stakeholders, focus group discussions with beneficiary groups, observation and listening to the narratives of women migrants etc.,) and other participatory methodologies. Appreciative inquiry based data collection approach is suggested. While the EA team can propose changes in the methodology, any such changes should be discussed with and approved by the ILO responsible officer, provided that the purpose is maintained and the expected outputs can be produced at the required quality.

36. The EA will be carried out using a desk review of appropriate materials, including the Project Documents, Logical framework, ToC, VFM and other M&E documents, Annual Technical Progress Reports (TPRs), WiF Phase I evaluation reports, other outputs of the programme (policy briefs, research reports, lessons learnt etc.,), Annual Review Reports by DFID, Advisory Board Meeting Reports, and relevant materials from secondary sources. WiF/ILO will provide the EA team with key programme documents for review and the documents should provide a sense of the intent of the programme as well as what is actually occurring. At the end of the desk review period and after having initial discussions with key project staff, it is expected that the EA team will prepare an Inception report

indicating the methodological approach to the EA to be discussed and approved by the ILO responsible officer.

37. **Sampling strategy/criteria**: Based on criteria to be determined with inputs from the WiF Programme and considering status and breadth of implementation, the EA team to propose the sampling methodology of specific locations, stakeholders and partners for data collection. The assignment will focus on India and Lebanon. During the initial briefing meetings, ILO/WiF will ensure that the EA team gets as complete a picture as possible about the implementation status of WiF activities and prevailing context in different programme countries. Independent Purposive sampling with strong justification could be one of the options. This will enable careful selection of EA sites such that maximum learning can be derived from. The inception report by the EA team should identify the sites visits and it should elaborate on the selection criteria for those sites selected.

38. During the inception phase, the EA team will carry out a needs assessment through interviews of key informants such as the project team in the various country offices, the DFID representatives and relevant ILO and country stakeholders identified during the inception phase through conference calls or face-to-face interviews.

39. Desk review and analysis, preparation of inception report and other deliverables will be home-based in close consultation with the WiF team.

40. Field visits (e.g., Lebanon, India, Nepal) and discussions.

41. The EA team will also facilitate a stakeholders' workshop in Beirut or Delhi at the end of the work to validate a Zero draft of the outputs.

42. The stakeholders' workshop will be attended by the project staff, DFID and key stakeholders (i.e. partners, ILO constituents) by phone/Skype. This will be an opportunity for the EA team to gather further data, present the preliminary tools and obtain feedback.

43. The consultant will be responsible for organizing the methodology of the workshop. The identification of the number of participants of the workshop and logistics will be the responsibility of the project team in consultation with the EA team.

44. The EA team will be responsible for drafting and finalizing the evaluability assessment report. The draft report will be circulated to stakeholders in English for their feedback and comments. The team leader will further be responsible for finalizing the report incorporating any comments from stakeholders as appropriate.

45. It is expected that the EA team members will work to the highest evaluation standards and codes of conduct and follow the UN evaluation standards and norms.

VI. Evaluability Assessment Team, Profile and Roles

46. The EA will be executed by a team of two professionals. The roles of the two members of the team will be complementary, with the Evaluation Expert (Team Member 1) leading on methodological and evaluative aspects of conducting the evaluability assessment, and a Senior Political Analysis Expert with experience reviewing labour and mobility issues (Team Member 2). Paragraph 49 & 50 lays out the qualifications required for each member of the EA team.

47. Former ILO staff or consultants that have worked on ILO's programmes may be members of the EA team if they meet technical qualifications for skills and if no conflict of interest exists, i.e. they have not

been involved in designing or implementing the programme under scrutiny. Any prior involvement with ILO must be declared during the bidding/contracting stages so that prospective team members can be cleared of possible conflicts of interest.

48. The level of effort for the EA is estimated at 60 person days, to be divided between the two consultants (30 days for the M&E specialist and 30 days for the thematic specialist, the latter with strong academic background on Gender, Labour and Mobility issues). A preliminary breakdown is indicated in Table 2.

Table 2: Proposed work plan and tentative workdays

Description of Milestone / Process	No. of workdays
The EA team selection and hiring process	April 2020
Inception activities • Briefing and planning meetings with WiF team, ILO • Desk-based review and analysis • Articulating the EA approach and methodology • Developing instruments for the EA • Compilation of the desk review and inception report • Finalization of inception report	6 days
Regional and country-level consultations • Country level visits and interviews with key stakeholders and beneficiaries • Compilation of findings, and preliminary analysis	12
Preparing draft reports and validation of findings • Drawing conclusions, preparation of first draft report and making recommendations • Stakeholder meeting to validate and discuss EA findings and recommendations • Integration of comments and completion of second draft of deliverables	8
Report writing and final adjustments • Finalise EA report with all annexures	4

Each member of the EA team is expected to commit to 30 working days spread over three months (April – June 2020).

49. The evaluation professional (Team Member 1) should offer the following:
    a. Has not been involved in the programme;
    b. At a minimum the candidates should hold a graduate degree in social sciences. PhD would be an advantage.
    c. Extensive experience (10 years) in planning, monitoring and evaluation of large development programmes especially in the area of labour and mobility regimes;
    d. Skills and experience in leading evaluation teams;
    e. Skills and experience in developing results frameworks, design of Theory of change based M&E tools or guides for monitoring and evaluation;
    f. Proven expertise in evaluating multi-country programmes focusing on human rights, or gender equality, social inclusion, mobility and labour issues.
    g. Extensive knowledge and use of participatory and mixed evaluation data collection methods.
    h. Familiarity with results-based management orientation and practices and preparing products in the UN style; familiarity with ILO or UN programming and management systems will be an added advantage;
    i. Relevant sub-regional experience; and,
    j. High proficiency in language and communication and report writing skills, in English. Functional proficiency in other languages commonly spoken in WiF targeted countries (e.g., Hindi, Bengali, Arabic, Nepali) is preferred. Fluency in English is essential. Speaking Hindi, Bangla, Nepali or Arabic is an advantage.
    k. Experience in facilitating workshops for collecting and validating of evaluation findings;

50. The thematic professional (Team Member 2) – Senior Political Economy Analyst should offer the following:

    a. Has not been involved in the programme;

    b. PhD in political sciences or other social science. Published record conducting political economy analyses.

    c. Some experience in the design and implementation of rights-based development programmes; Experience reviewing programmes and national policies in the areas of labour rights, gender equality and human rights an asset;

    d. Experience in participating evaluations in the UN system, DFID or similar international development context including preferably international and national development framework an asset;

    e. Relevant sub-regional experience; and,

    f. High proficiency in language and communication and report writing skills in English. Functional proficiency in other languages commonly spoken in WiF targeted countries (e.g., Hindi, Bengali, Arabic, Nepali) is preferred.

Terms of Reference: Evaluability Assessment of the Work in Freedom (ILO-DFID Partnership Programme on Fair Recruitment and Decent Work for Women Migrant Workers in South Asia and the Middle East) RAS/17/11/GBR

Page 14

Appendix 1: Rubric for assessing evaluability of activities/interventions

Evaluability elements	High evaluability	Mostly evaluable	Limited evaluability	Not evaluable
Theory of change and/or results framework, goals and objectives	ToC/ results framework explicit stated Programme logic coherent	ToC implicitly stated and/or reasonable results framework; coherent	ToC/ results framework incomplete Programme logic incoherent	No ToC/results framework; goals, objectives not stated; programme logic not offered
Target population	Clearly specified Fully described	Implied; incomplete description	Not specified	Not specified
Baseline data available	Clear data sources; Complete dataset High quality data	Clear data sources; incomplete dataset Good quality data	Poor description of data needs and sources; poor quality/unusable data	Data needs, sources not specified; baseline data not available
Indicators	An appropriate and sufficient set; SMART	An appropriate by not sufficient set; Mostly SMART	Indicators stated, but not sufficient, valid or SMART	No indicators offered/stated
Plan of implementation	Clear implementation plan; implementation underway for most planned activities	Reasonable arrangements; implementation underway for about half of the activities	Rudimentary implementation arrangements; implementation delays for most activities	No implementation plan; implementation not commenced
Implementation resources and capacities	Adequately resourced; resources disbursed for all activities	Reasonably resourced; resources disbursed for key activities	Limited resources; delays in disbursing resources	No resources allocated
Monitoring system, tools and capacities	Adequate capacities; Monitoring tools user friendly; resources disbursed	Adequate capacities; significant revision required for monitoring tools; resources disbursed for key activities	Rudimentary monitoring tools and capacities; Resource disbursement delayed	No monitoring plan/capacities; resources for monitoring not allocated
Management structure and responsibilities	Clear and efficient management structure; clear accountabilities	Clear management structure; accountabilities not assigned clearly	Rudimentary management structure; no accountabilities assigned	Management structure not specified; no accountabilities assigned
Key stakeholders and beneficiaries	Stakeholder analysis undertaken; key stakeholders fully accessible and engaged	Stakeholder analysis undertaken; limited accessibility or engagement of key stakeholders	No stakeholder analysis; limited accessibility or engagement of key stakeholders	No stakeholder analysis; stakeholders not engaged
Intervention areas and/or populations	Intervention areas and/or populations fully accessible; safe working environment	Intervention areas and/or populations mostly accessible; limited safety/security risks	Limited accessibility to intervention areas or populations; moderate safety/security risks	Intervention areas and/or populations not accessible; high safety/security risks