

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

### SCORE (Sustaining Competitive and Responsible Enterprises) Phase III

#### Independent Mid-Term Evaluation

#### Key facts

Title:	Sustaining Competitive and Responsible Enterprises (SCORE)
TC Code:	<b>Global SCORE (GLO/17/54/MUL)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• SCORE China (CHN/17/50/MUL)</li><li>• SCORE India (IND/17/50/MUL)</li><li>• SCORE Indonesia (IDN/17/50/MUL)</li><li>• SCORE Myanmar (MMR/17/51/MUL)</li><li>• SCORE Vietnam (VNM/17/51/MUL)</li><li>• SCORE Ghana (GHA/17/50/MUL)</li><li>• SCORE Bolivia (BOL/17/50/MUL)</li><li>• SCORE Colombia (COL/17/50/MUL)</li><li>• SCORE Peru (PER/17/50/MUL)</li></ul>
Backstopping unit	SME Unit
Type of evaluation	Independent Mid-Term Evaluation
Evaluation Manager	Maria Borsos

#### Table of contents

List of Acronyms.....	2
Introduction .....	3
Background on project and context of the SCORE project between November 2017 and April 2019.....	4
Purpose and objectives of the independent mid-term evaluation .....	5
Evaluation scope .....	6
Evaluation criteria and questions .....	6
Methodology to be followed .....	8
Deliverables by the contractor .....	10
Management arrangements and tentative time frame .....	12
Application requirements .....	12
Compliance with UN norms and standards for evaluation .....	14
Annexes.....	14

## List of Acronyms

AA	Administrative assistant
BDS	Business development services
CTA	Chief technical advisor
DCED	Donor Committee for Enterprise Development
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
EM	Evaluation manager
EVAL	Evaluation office
HQ	Headquarters
ILO	International Labour Organization
IOE	International Organization of Employers
ITUC	International Trade Union Confederation
KPIs	Key performance indicators
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
NORAD	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
NPC	National project coordinator
NPO	National project officer
P&B	Programme and budget
PPPs	Public private partnerships
SCORE	Sustaining Competitive and Responsible Enterprises
SECO	Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs
SMEs	Small and Medium Enterprises
TA	Technical assistant
TAC	Tripartite Advisory Committee
TC	Technical committee
TO	Technical officer
UN	United Nations
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
USD	United States dollar

## Introduction

Sustaining Competitive and Responsible Enterprises (SCORE) is an ILO global programme improving productivity and working conditions in SMEs, contributing to achieving outcome 4: Promoting sustainable enterprises under the ILO's Programme & Budget 2018-2019. The key intervention of the global programme is support for the implementation of SCORE training, which combines practical classroom training with in-factory consulting. SCORE Training demonstrates best international practices in the manufacturing and service sectors and helps SMEs to participate in global supply chains.

The ILO is assisting government agencies, training providers, industry associations and trade unions in emerging economies in Africa, Asia and Latin America to offer SCORE Training to enterprises. The SCORE project has been funded by the Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (SECO) and the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD) since 2009. During Phase I (2009-2014), the donors contributed USD 9.7 Million to the ILO; Phase II of the SCORE project (2014-2017) was funded with USD 19.4 Million; and, during the Phase III, both donors funded USD 19.4.

This document describes the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the independent mid-term evaluation to be undertaken, adhering to ILO's policies and procedures on evaluations (see Annex 1). It will be conducted by an external independent evaluator and managed by an Evaluation Manager who is an ILO staff member with no prior involvement in this project.

The project's performance will be reviewed with strict regards to the following six evaluation criteria and will mainstream gender equality:

- 1) Relevance and strategic fit of the intervention
- 2) Validity of intervention design
- 3) Intervention progress and effectiveness
- 4) Efficiency of resource usage
- 5) Effectiveness of management arrangements
- 6) Impact orientation and sustainability of the intervention

The evaluation is expected to:

- Independently assess the progress of SCORE Phase III against the log frame;
- Inform the ILO on whether the current project strategy is working, and provide recommendations on what could be changed to increase the likelihood that the project reaches its objectives;
- Inform the ILO on feasible sustainability and exit strategies of SCORE Programme based on the assessment of each country's approaches; and,
- Identify good practices and lessons learned that would contribute to learning and knowledge development of the ILO and project stakeholders.

## Background of the project 2009 to 2019

### Project goals, objectives and strategy

The development objectives of SCORE Programme during Phase III is that SMEs in national and global supply chains have improved productivity and working conditions and provide decent work. The project is expected to achieve the following two outcomes:

1. Public and private implementation partners have embedded SCORE Training in their national programs and budgets for SME development in strategic sectors and clusters
2. Lead buyers support suppliers through SCORE Training or the promotion of its concepts<sup>1</sup>

A global project document describes these objectives and outlines a project implementation framework. For each country component, a specific project strategy document has been drafted which operationalizes the global project strategy at the country level according to the local context. A performance plan with bi-annual milestones and yearly work plans guide implementation of project activities.

Project activities are at different stages of implementation depending on their starting year of intervention and different country projects are offering the SCORE Training services in different economic sectors.

### Institutional and management structure

The SCORE project started operations in September 2009 and is scheduled to end in October 2021. It is funded by the Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (SECO) and the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD) with an overall budget of USD 9.7 Million in Phase I (topped up by USD 1.3 Million USD by NORAD), USD 19.4 Million in Phase II and USD 19.4 Million in Phase III.

The eleven SCORE country projects (with total budgets of USD 232,000 – USD 5,017,500<sup>2</sup> per country, 1-2 National Project Officers plus administrative support) report directly to the Director of the closest ILO Country Office and receive support from regional Decent Work Country Teams. A global component (Chief Technical Advisor, 1.5 technical officer and admin support) based in Geneva coordinates the project and serves as a knowledge hub.

In each country the project works with the appropriate government agencies, industry associations and employers and workers organizations and supports the local Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP). The project is regularly advised by a Tripartite Advisory Committee (social partners and donors) at the national and global level.

---

<sup>1</sup> During the donor meeting held on 28 May 2019, both donors agreed to modify output 6 and output 7 under outcome 2 to expand SCORE Programme's influence in lead buyers' support in improving productivity and working conditions of SMEs in their supply chains.

<sup>2</sup> The total budget of SIYB-SCORE Myanmar component is USD 5,107,500. SCORE Peru and SCORE Vietnam have relatively high total cost at USD 2,176,500 and USD 1,994,000 respectively, due to the presence of Regional Program Managers (P4).

## **Previous evaluations**

### **Phase I**

From April to June 2011, the project conducted an independent mid-term evaluation of phase I. A final independent evaluation was conducted from July to November 2012, covering the period from September 2009 to November 2012. The final evaluation included desk reviews for Indonesia, India and South Africa and field work in Colombia, China, Viet Nam and Ghana. Separate evaluations were conducted in South Africa and India from October to November 2012 and from August to October 2013 respectively.

### **Phase II**

Between September 2015 and February 2016, the SCORE project phase II underwent an independent mid-term evaluation following ILO EVAL standards and in line with donor agreements. The objectives of the evaluations was to assess the progress of the project, provide recommendations and lessons learned for the remaining phase II, and make suggestions for the design of a possible SCORE phase III. The evaluation covered the country projects in China, India, Indonesia, Viet Nam, Ghana, South Africa, Colombia and the global component.

Based on the agreement with donors, three impact evaluations in India, Ghana and Vietnam were conducted at the end of the project Phase II, in lieu of a final evaluation. In 2016, a three year impact evaluation in Peru was initiated. Two reports have been issued and a final report will be issued in 2020.

All evaluation reports will be made available to the evaluator.

## **Purpose and objectives of the independent mid-term evaluation**

As the total budget of SCORE Phase III is over USD 5 Million, the ILO evaluation policy requires that it goes through an independent mid-term evaluation. This requirement was specified in the project document and agreed on with the donors.

The objective of the evaluation is to:

- Independently assess the progress of SCORE Phase III against the log frame;
- Inform the ILO on whether the current project strategy is working, and provide recommendations on what could be changed to increase the likelihood that the project reaches its objectives;
- Assess the degree to which the recommendations from the mid-term independent evaluation of Phase II were implemented;
- Inform the ILO on feasible sustainability and exit strategies of SCORE Programme based on the assessment of each country's approaches; and,
- Identify good practices and lessons learned that would contribute to learning and knowledge development of the ILO and project stakeholders.

The clients of the evaluation are:

- a) The donors SECO and NORAD - close collaboration (such as asking for comments on the draft report and meetings in Geneva) with the donor during the evaluation will ensure

- that donor requirements are met and no additional, external evaluation by the donor will be necessary;
- b) The SCORE project staff, ILO Country Offices and other field and headquarter staff;
  - c) Tripartite members of the global and national advisory committees and partner organizations in the evaluated countries.

The evaluation will be used in the following ways:

- a) Findings and recommendations will inform future project strategy and operations design;
- b) The evaluation report will be disseminated in the ILO for organisational learning through the EVAL's i-Track evaluation database. A summary of the evaluation will be made available in public through EVAL's and SCORE's websites.

## Evaluation scope

The evaluation will cover the period from November 2017 to present, to create an accurate and comprehensive picture of the global project's context and development.

Based on the joint donor/ILO agreement the evaluation will evaluate the SCORE project components in Bolivia (desk review only), China (desk review only), Colombia, Ghana, Indonesia, Viet Nam and the global component.

The evaluation should look at the linkages between the various country projects and the global component, generate findings on the six evaluation criteria for all country projects and the global components and compare the lessons learnt from other countries' implementation.

## Evaluation criteria and questions

The evaluation will examine the project along the following **six standard evaluation criteria, taking into account gender equality concerns**<sup>3</sup>. A more detailed analytical framework of questions and sub-questions will be developed by the evaluator in agreement with the Evaluation Manager:

### 1) Relevance and strategic fit of the intervention

- Are the objectives of SCORE phase III intervention consistent with beneficiaries' requirements and country needs?
- Are the objectives of SCORE phase III intervention in line with Norad's and SECO's priorities?
- Is SCORE phase III intervention linked to national and ILO's development frameworks (Country's national development plan, UNDAF, DWCPs, P&B, SDGs)?

### 2) Validity of intervention design

---

<sup>3</sup> Key questions under each evaluation criteria have been designed to help address the extent to which the mainstreaming of gender equality has been integrated into the implementation of the intervention, the effectiveness and efficiency in mainstreaming gender equality, the outcomes delivered in terms of gender equality, and an estimation of the impact of the policies implemented on the equality of women and men, when appropriate.

- Are the project strategy, objectives and assumptions appropriate for achieving planned results?
- Does the project's Theory of Change allow for impact assessment, including assumptions/hypotheses that are underpinned by evidence and lessons learned from previous project phases?
- Does the project contribute to core ILO issues such as labour standards, and social dialogue?
- How well has the project drafted the exit and sustainability strategy?
- What lessons can be learned for the design of future projects in the similar field of expertise, improving productivity and working conditions in SMEs?
- Within the context of ILO goal of gender equality, disability inclusion and other non-discrimination issues as well as national level policies in this regard, to what extent did the project design take into account specific gender equality and non-discrimination concerns relevant to the project context?

### **3) Intervention progress and effectiveness**

- Is the project on track in delivering its outputs in all countries (mapped out in the performance plans)?
- To what extent has the project so far achieved its objectives (incl. the cost recovery plan) and reached its target groups?
- Concerning the institutional-level, how far has the capacity of partner organizations been built in relation to delivery of the outputs/objectives?
- Concerning the institutional-level, how far has the capacity of partner organizations been built in relation to SCORE exit and sustainability strategy?
- What obstacles did the project encounter in project implementation? What corrective action does the project need to take to achieve its objectives?
- Within its overall objectives and strategies, what specific measures were taken by the project to address issues relating to Gender equality and non-discrimination?
- How well has the project complemented other ILO projects (including Better Work) in the country?

### **4) Efficiency of resource usage**

- Does the project make efficient use of its financial and human resources?
  - Is the implementation strategy cost-effective?
  - Is the distribution of resources between staff and activities optimal?
  - Were the intervention resources used in an efficient way to address gender equality in the implementation?

### **5) Effectiveness of management arrangements**

- Are time frames and work plans respected? How are contingencies dealt with? To what extent corrective action is taken when required?
- Are the Global and National Tripartite Advisory Committees functioning and what value do they add?
- Is the project systematically and appropriately monitoring and documenting information to allow for impact assessment at a later stage? Does the monitoring framework provide data to measure end-line results? What could be improved?

- Is the project systematically and appropriately monitoring, documenting and communicating results, including on gender, at the country and global level?
- Is the monitoring and evaluation system practical, useful and cost effective for project management?
- How effective is the project in sharing good practices between country components and communicating success stories and disseminating knowledge internally and externally (including gender-related results and knowledge)?

#### **6) Impact orientation and sustainability of the intervention**

- How effectively has the project built national ownership and capacity of people and institutions?
- Would SCORE Programme's sustainability model of monitoring and evaluation system work after 2021?
- Are there business models applied in the different countries that seem more promising to reaching financial sustainability?
- Are the gender-related outcomes likely to be sustainable?
- Is the lead buyer engagement strategy sustainable?
- Has the project reached sufficient scale and depth to justify the investment? Has the project found the right balance between scale and depth and the trade-off between them? Is the approach and its results likely to be up-scaled or replicated? Is the project a cost-effective way to improve productivity and working conditions in SMEs?
- To what extent the results of the intervention likely to have a long term, sustainable positive contribution to the SDG and relevant targets? (explicitly or implicitly)

### **Methodology to be followed**

The evaluation will apply a set of mixed-methods, analysing both quantitative and qualitative data, and will integrate gender equality other non-discrimination issues as a cross-cutting ILO concern throughout its methodology and all deliverables, including the final report. Data and information should be collected, presented and analysed with appropriate gender disaggregation even if project design did not take gender into account.

The methodology should include examining the intervention's Theory of Change (or if feasible reconstructing one if the TOC is not in place), specifically in the light of upcoming final impact assessment. The evaluation methodology should allow an assessment of outcomes and of the likelihood of impact by combining quantitative data with qualitative assessments and case studies that demonstrate and visualize the outcome of training. Additionally, a closer review into the relevance and quality of indicators to measure end-line values of the results framework is crucial to ensure robust information is available for the final impact evaluation.

The evaluator may adapt the methodology, subject to the agreement between the evaluation manager and the evaluator, and reflected in the inception report.

The following methodologies will be used during the evaluation:

Document Review:

The evaluator will review the following documents before conducting any interviews or trips to the country projects:

- SCORE Project documents
- SCORE Knowledge Sharing Platform (which can be used to access following materials):
  - Quarterly progress reports
  - Training materials
  - Smartsheet performance plans
  - Mid-term evaluation Phase I report
  - Final independent evaluation Phase I report
  - Mid-term evaluation Phase II report
  - Four impact evaluations in India, Ghana, Vietnam and Peru
- Any other documents that might be useful for the evaluation

Data review / data collection:

The evaluation will review the project's M&E system for tracking project progress in achieving its goal and objectives. The evaluator will review existing quantitative and qualitative data and collect more progress data where necessary.

Interviews:

Individual interviews or focus group discussions will be conducted with project staff, representatives from partner organizations, consultants and SMEs as appropriate at the different project locations. Meetings will be scheduled in advance of the field visits by the ILO, in accordance with the evaluator's requests and consistent with these terms of reference. A tentative list of individuals to be interviewed include:

- ILO staff in Geneva and in field offices who are involved in the management and implementation of the project;
- Selected individuals from the following groups:
  - a) Enterprises (workers and employers) who have participated in project activities;
  - b) Employers organizations, trade unions, and ministry representatives that have received training or worked with the project;
  - c) Service providers/trainers;
  - d) Donor representatives from SECO and NORAD in HQ and embassies in project countries; and
  - e) Other organizations and groups as needed ensuring gender representation.

The evaluator will develop a systematic survey/questionnaire as part of the inception report to guide the interviews, capture qualitative and quantitative data and ensure objectivity and consistency in interviews in the different countries. This will also help the evaluator identify knowledge gaps that need to be verified and validated through the interviews.

The evaluator will ensure that opinions and perceptions of women are equally reflected in the interviews and that gender-specific questions are included.

**Debriefings:** On the final day of the field evaluation, the evaluator will present preliminary findings to the ILO project staff, Country Director and other staff designated by the Director and, if time permits and at the discretion of the ILO Country Director, a debriefing will be held for employer, government, and union representatives. Upon completion of the report, the evaluator will take part in a teleconference to provide a debriefing to SECO, NORAD and the ILO on the evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations as well as the evaluation process.

**Limitations:**

The limitations of the proposed evaluation methodology are acknowledged:

- Quantifying the preliminary impact of SCORE training in SMEs poses many challenges. Many SMEs do not track performance indicators (KPIs) and thus cannot provide accurate baseline data or progress data. Many enterprises consider the data as confidential and are reluctant to share data with trainers or project staff.
- Even where impact is quantifiable, the evaluation will not be able to measure the net impacts of program participation. That would require knowledge of the counterfactual i.e. the outcomes that would have occurred in the absence of the program which can only be measured using control groups.

**Deliverables by the contractor**

The following deliverables are expected by the evaluator:

Outputs	Description	Approx. length	Tentative timeframe (to be completed by - )
<b>0. Contracting</b>	Signature of contract and code of conduct for evaluators are finalized		31 July 2019
<b>1. Desk review and inception report</b>	During the desk review, the evaluator is expected to review relevant documents related to the selected countries of the project i.e. Bolivia and China (desk review only), Colombia, Ghana, Indonesia, Viet Nam and the Global Component and submit an inception report outlining the evaluation approach and methods, a final work plan and questionnaire (refer to Annex 2 Checklist: Writing the Inception Report);	10 pages + Annexes	20 August 2019
<b>2. Field missions</b>	The evaluator is required to visit some of the SCORE projects in Colombia, Ghana, Indonesia, Viet Nam and the global project component at ILO HQ in Geneva.	5 work-days per country, but TBD	15 November 2019

<b>3. Draft evaluation report</b>	The draft evaluation report describes the findings and recommendations for each project component (See Annex 3: Preparing the evaluation report); The report will follow EVAL format template, including a title page (Refer to Annex 4: Filling in the evaluation title page), lessons learned and good practices (following the relevant template). The quality of the report will be determined based on conforming to the EVAL quality standards (See Annex 5: Rating the quality of evaluation reports);	50 pages +Annexes	15 December 2019
<b>4. Final evaluation report</b>	A final evaluation report is to be submitted within one week after receiving final comments on the draft report. The final evaluation report is subject to approval by the ILO Evaluation Office	50 pages +Annexes	10 January 2020
<b>5. Evaluation summary</b>	An evaluation summary is to be submitted based on the evaluation report executive summary (refer to Annex 6 Writing the evaluation report summary).	4 pages	15 January 2020
<b>6. Debriefing</b>	A debriefing is to be provided by the evaluator in each country (at the discretion of the ILO country director) and to SECO, NORAD and the ILO at the end of the evaluation process;	½ day	28 January 2020

**Specifications:**

- Gender equality issues shall be explicitly addressed throughout the evaluation activities of the consultant and all outputs including final reports or events need to be gender mainstreamed as well as included in the evaluation summary.
- All deliverables must be prepared in English, using Microsoft Word, and delivered electronically to ILO. ILO will have ownership and copyright of all deliverables.
- Deliverables will be regarded as delivered when they have been received electronically by the Evaluation Manager and confirmed acceptance of them.
- Acceptance will be acknowledged only if the deliverable(s) concerned are judged to be in accordance with the requirements set out in the contract, to reflect agreements reached and plans submitted during the contract process, and incorporate or reflect consideration of amendments proposed by ILO.

**The Contractor will be responsible for:**

- The design, planning and implementation of the evaluation and the write-up of the evaluation report, using an approach agreed with ILO, and for delivering in accordance with the ILO's specifications and timeline;
- Consulting and liaising, as required, with ILO and any partners to ensure satisfactory delivery of all deliverables;

- Making themselves available, if required, to take part in briefings and discussions, online or, if necessary, at the ILO Geneva Office or other venues, on mutually agreed dates, in line with the work outlined in these ToRs.

## **Management arrangements and tentative time frame**

### **Management Arrangements**

The mid-term independent evaluation will be conducted by an independent evaluator. The evaluator can constitute his/her team as he/she sees fit (hiring additional staff from the local countries for example). All members of the evaluation team (including the additional staff) shall thus fall under his/her supervision and responsibility.

The independent evaluator is responsible for conducting the evaluation according to the terms of reference (ToR).

On the ILO's side, the evaluation will be supervised by the Evaluation Manager. The Evaluation Manager will:

- Ensure meeting schedules are set up;
- Assist in the implementation of the evaluation methodology, as appropriate (i.e., participate in interviews, observe committee meetings) and in such a way as to minimize bias in evaluation findings;
- Review and provide comments on the evaluation report;
- Ensure that the evaluation is conducted in accordance with terms of references, for the preparation of the draft report of the evaluation, discussing it with the evaluator, beneficiaries and stakeholders;
- Liaise with SCORE project staff wherever their engagement is needed to fulfill the requirements above.

## **Application requirements**

Selection of the contractor will be done by the ILO based on their technical and commercial proposals. Proposals to undertake any work under these ToRs will be submitted in English and must contain the following information and documents:

### **1. Technical Proposal**

1. A short summary of profile and capacity of the Contractor to conduct an evaluation of a private sector development project, including a record of relevant work executed in the past five years;
2. A proposal on how the contractor intends to complete the work described in the ToRs;
3. The CV(s) of the lead evaluator and other team members that will undertake the work;
4. A timeline with proposed dates for contract start and end dates and tentative dates for country visits (taking into account visa processing process and time required).

### **2. Commercial Proposal**

1. A proposal setting out the cost for the evaluation including a daily fee (or daily fees in case several team members will be involved in the evaluation), number of work days per staff, and tentative travel costs per mission. The Financial Offer form is enclosed as Annex 7.

## **Requirements of the evaluating company and the evaluator(s)**

### **1. The company**

- Evaluation should be part of the company's core services offer, who has evaluated one small private sector/ international organization development project in the past five years.
- Projects handled by the company should include work with clients in international organizations and/or private sector. Minimum of 1 project with international clients in the past five years are expected.
- The company should demonstrate gender balance and diversity in their staff and commitment to the principles of gender equality and non-discrimination.
- Familiarity with the ILO mandate, its tripartite structure and international labour standards is a plus.
- Operations or presence of local offices in countries which are being evaluated is a plus.

### **2. Lead evaluator**

- Knowledge, skills and experience (at least ten years) in the area of M&E and evaluation, particularly impact evaluations.
- Knowledge and experience (at least five years) of private sector development with a special focus on small and medium enterprises in developing countries.
- Experience as a project manager/team leader (at least five years).
- Relevant country experience in one or more of the project countries under review is an advantage.
- Excellent written and oral communication skills in English (level C2). Proficiency in Spanish and French is required unless it is provided by another team member of the evaluation team.

### **3. Evaluation team members**

The evaluation team proposed by the company should be composed of sufficient number of well-trained project team members to fulfil the obligation of the assignment. The following requirements apply to any team member leading a field visit to a project component:

- Knowledge, skills, and experience (at least five years) in the area of M&E and independent evaluation.
- Knowledge and experience (at least five years) of private sector development with a special focus on small and medium enterprises in developing countries.
- Relevant country experience in one or more of the project countries under review is an advantage.
- Excellent written and oral communication skills in English (level C2). Proficiency in Spanish is required unless it is provided by the lead evaluator or another team member of the evaluation team.
- Gender balance in the team composition is expected.

### **Replacement of evaluation team members**

The Evaluation Team assigned by the Contractor to perform the services under this Contract, which is considered essential for the performance of those services, shall be composed of the Personnel indicated in the Technical and Financial Proposal of the Contractor. Accordingly, in addition to the Terms and Conditions applicable to ILO Contracts for Services (Annex 7):

- if any of the Contractor's Personnel part of the Team is removed or for any reason is no longer available to perform the services then the replacement Personnel shall be of equal or better knowledge, experience and ability to perform the services;
- prior to replacing any Personnel part of the Team, the Contractor shall notify the ILO reasonably in advance and shall submit detailed justifications together with the resume of the proposed replacement Personnel to permit evaluation by the ILO of the impact which such Personnel replacement would have on the work plan;
- no Personnel replacement of the Team shall be made by the Contractor without the prior written consent of the ILO, which approval shall not be unreasonably withheld; and
- The Contractor will not charge the ILO for any additional costs in supplying any replacement Personnel.
- The introduction of replacement of any Personnel part of the Team may constitute considerable losses for the ILO. Therefore, the Contractor's Personnel are expected to perform the services until the completion of the assigned tasks and deliverables.
- In the event of demonstrable poor performance or misconduct of the Personnel part of the Team, if the ILO so decides, the Contractor shall provide an appropriate replacement for such Personnel. The Contractor will provide suitable replacement personnel within 15 work days. The provisions of subparagraphs 9.1 and 9.2 will apply.

### **Compliance with UN norms and standards for evaluation**

This evaluation will comply with UN norms and standards for evaluation and ensure that ethical safeguards concerning the independence of the evaluation will be followed. Please refer to the UNEG ethical guidelines: <http://www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines>

To ensure compliance with ILO/UN rules safeguarding the independence of the evaluation, the contractor will not be eligible for technical work on the project for the next 12 months and cannot be the evaluator of the final project evaluation.

### **Annexes**

[Annex 1: ILO Evaluation policy guidelines](#)

[Annex 2: Writing the inception report](#)

[Annex 3: Preparing the evaluation report](#)

[Annex 4: Filling in the evaluation title page](#)

[Annex 5: Rating the quality of evaluation reports](#)

[Annex 6: Writing the evaluation report summary](#)

Annex 7: Rating the commercial proposals

Candidate Rating Matrix - Date - shortlisting of candidates														Comments							
Name	Adequate Contextual Knowledge		Adequate Technical Specialization		Prior Experience		Clarity and Soundness of Methodology		Other (Language, Social Dialogue, Gender, Labour Standards)		Financial Bid		TOTAL	Adequate Contextual Knowledge	Adequate Technical Specialization	Prior Experience	Clarity and Soundness of Methodology	Others (Language, Cross-cutting issues, etc.)	Financial Bid	OVERALL	
	Raw	Weighted (.15)	Raw	Weighted (.20)	Raw	Weighted (.20)	Raw	Weighted (.20)	Raw	Weighted (.10)	Raw	Weighted (.15)									
		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00								
		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00								
		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00	0.00								

(3 = Highly Qualified; 2 = Qualified; 1 = Somewhat Qualified; 0 = Not Qualified)

**[NOTE]**  
 The rating criteria are based on the concept note and draft TORs and to be assessed on the aspects as below.  
 1. Further assessment of contextual knowledge based on further details on proposals. Further assessment of contextual knowledge based on further details on proposals  
 • Understanding of UN and ILO  
 2. Adequate Technical Specialization (carried out from initial first assessment)  
 • Demonstrated knowledge and expertise on issues related to the management of development, institutional structures for delivery of development cooperation, governance and organisational systems, UN system operations and related areas  
 3. Updated details on recent assignments particularly relevant to the proposed work and why you see those assignments as particularly relevant.  
 • Length of experience  
 • Relevance of experience  
 4. More details on the proposed methodology  
 • Relevant and feasible methodology  
 • Understanding of issues of validity and reliability  
 5. Other (carried over from initial assessment)  
 • Cross-cutting Themes (social dialogue, gender, labour standards)  
 • Languages  
 6. Further assessment of Financial bid  
 • Within budget

**\* The weights for each criterion applied here have been decided based upon the nature and topic of this assignment.**