



Terms of Reference
Final Independent evaluation
10 January 2020

1. Project

DC Code	CHN/15/03/USA (Award ID: S-LMAQM-16GR-1146)
Title	Rights at work: promoting harmonious labour relations through collective bargaining in China
Admin Unit	ILO Country Office for China and Mongolia
Technical Unit	INWORK, ILO Geneva
Project duration	29 August 2016 to 29 February 2020
Size	US\$1.26 million (ILO \$306,491 and USDOS \$951,600)
Donor	U.S. Department of State
Type of Evaluation	Independent Evaluation
Timing of Evaluation	Final
Evaluation duration	January-April 2020
Field mission	17th-25th February 2020
Evaluation manager	Ms Pamornrat Pringsulaka; Ms. Rattanaporn Pongpattana ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific

2. Evaluation background and justification

Since August 2016, the ILO Country Office for China and Mongolia has implemented a project “Rights at Work: Promoting Harmonious Labour Relations through Collective Bargaining in China” (Rights at Work project). The project is coming to an end in February 2020 and as per ILO’s evaluation policy, the project is subject to an independent final evaluation. This independent final evaluation will be carried out for accountability and organisational learning. The evaluation aims to assess the extent to which the project objectives have been achieved and to identify lessons learned and good practices. As per ILO evaluation guidelines, the evaluation will assess the project against the evaluation criteria of relevance, the validity of design, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

The evaluation will be carried out by an independent evaluator, and will be managed by an Evaluation Manager who is an ILO official and independent of the design and implementation of the project, with quality assurance provided by Regional Evaluation Officer, ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific. The final evaluation report will be approved by the ILO’s Evaluation Office (EVAL) at the ILO HQ in Geneva.

3. Background of the project

3.1. History and progress to date

Since August 2016, the ILO Country Office for China and Mongolia has implemented a project “Rights at Work: Promoting Harmonious Labour Relations through Collective Bargaining in China” (*Rights at Work project*). The project was originally costed at USD 1,455,518, with USD 1.2 million received from the US Department of State (USDOS) and the rest covered by ILO’s internal resources.

It was initially planned that the project would be completed in 36 months, to end in August 2019. However, the inception phase and the pre-training phase took longer than initially foreseen. The project spent substantial time to negotiate with the Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security (MoHRSS) to set up the collaboration modality. In April 2017 (eight months after the project commenced), the ILO and MoHRSS signed a [MOU](#) for implementing the project, which defines a collaboration framework and work plan.

The first component i.e. case studies documenting good practices and developing three training modules also required more time than anticipated. High demands for coordination to ensure a participatory learning process in the training module development with the aim of building national ownership of the products resulted in delays.

A no-cost extension was granted in August 2019 for an additional 6 months, giving the project a new end date of 29 February 2020. At the same time, ILO requested a reduction in funding from the US Department of State from USD 1,200,000 to USD 951,600. The total budget allocation for the product was therefore reduced to USD 1.26 million. Modifications were also made to the project outcomes and outputs, in particular for objective 2, to be achievable in the changing context. The extension enables the project to finalize on-going activities, validate the training modules through pilot training.

A mid-term evaluation was conducted between December 2018 and March 2019. Since the mid-term evaluation, the project has finalized training materials for workers, employers and government officials, and a handbook on prevention and resolution of collective negotiation disputes. One international conference was organized in May 2019. Three trainings were organized, one for employers' representatives in August 2019, one for government officials in November 2019 and a training of trainers for trade unions in December 2019.

3.2. Project background

Industrial relations in China have undergone remarkable changes since China's transition to market-based economy in the late 1970s, transforming from an administrative system of workforce allocation into a market-oriented system based on labour contracts. To institutionalize the market-oriented employment relations and practices en route to building a "socialist harmonious society", from the 2000s onwards, the Chinese government has promulgated a series of labour-related laws and regulations to enhance the legal basis of labour relations. The government, along with other tripartite constituents, especially the All-China Federation of Trade Unions (ACFTU), has highlighted and strengthened key mechanisms of collective contract and collective negotiation through a succession of policies, programmes, and plans on the national level, which have been complemented by and implemented through local level practices, experimentations and initiatives.

The efforts to promote collective contract and collective negotiation system since the CPC Central Committee issued the historical document "Opinion on Major Issues on Construction of Socialist Harmonious Society" in 2006 have brought about tremendous changes. There have been positive outcomes in terms of quantitative growth in union density and collective negotiation coverage. This was accompanied by gradual improvement in union representative capacity at various levels. On the other hand, given the volume and diversity of labour disputes, challenges remain in legal enforcement, and in terms of the quality of collective negotiations as a way of day-to-day communication, dispute prevention and resolution mechanism, as well as regular institution of governing and adjusting labour relations.

Since late 2014, China's economy has entered into a period of "new normal", characterized by lower GDP growth rate, and a transformation of the growth model from highly investment-driven to consumption-led. Collective negotiation is thus regarded by the Chinese government and CPC as a useful means for fostering greater capacity of people for consumption with increased incomes. Meanwhile, it is noteworthy that along with the "supply-side structural reform" initiated by the Chinese government to boost the quality of the Chinese economy, which includes cutting excessive production capacity of outdated industries such as steel, coal, cement, etc., challenges to harmonious labour relations have been on the rise and created substantial pressure on collective negotiation as relevant parties prefer quick actions that can immediately dissolve the "instable" factors.

In July 2019, the National Tripartite Meeting of Coordinating Labour Relations (MoHRSS, ACFTU, CEC and ACFIC) issued a three-year National Action Plan for Promoting Collective Negotiation - a renewed national action plan for continuous promotion of collective negotiation, with the goal of stabilizing employment, promoting development of enterprises and constructing harmony. It underlines the importance of collective negotiation in the context of increasing economic downturn pressure and of external environment. The overall objective is to improve effectiveness of collective negotiation, further develop the collective negotiation system with the Chinese characteristics, and make it play a greater role in building harmonious labour relations.

3.3. Project brief and rationale

The *Rights at Work* project aims to build the institutional capacity of Chinese workers, employers, and their respective organizations to carry out voluntary collective bargaining and to resolve collective bargaining disputes efficiently and effectively. It further aims to support the ILO's tripartite constituents in China to strengthen collective bargaining institutions and governance frameworks for the promotion and improved application of core labour standards, especially in relation to disadvantaged groups of workers such as women and rural migrants. A key contribution of the project is to enhance the collective bargaining strategies and agendas of workers' organizations to ensure the interests of these workers are better represented in collective contracts and to facilitate their meaningful participation in bargaining processes.

Early in 2019, the ILO reassessed the situation in preparation of submitting a project extension proposal. The two project objectives remained very relevant but the outcomes and outputs needed to be adjusted in order to be achievable in the current context. Compared with the time when the initial project was drafted, the level of priority the partners attach to collective negotiations and dispute resolution seemed diverted. In particular, initial discussions on a possible development of the collective negotiation legal and policy framework (outcome 2) were postponed and would not take place within the timeframe of the project. Therefore, the project adjusted the outcome and outputs for the second objective to shift the focus to the building of institutions and/or mechanisms at the workplace level. The output in relation to training of worker representatives was also replaced by training of trainers as proposed by ACFTU.

The main outputs of the project are a series of training modules and tailored training respectively for workers, employers and government officials. The training aimed at supporting the representatives develop their agenda and strategies for collective bargaining and dispute resolution.

The *Rights at Work* project has two objectives as follows, each with specific outcome:

Objective 1: To strengthen collective bargaining processes and institutional capacity for more inclusive & sound labour relations at various levels

Expected outcome 1: *Workers, employers and their respective organizations in the pilot programmes strengthen their institutional capacity to negotiate a range of issues in collective contracts and to extend the coverage of collective contracts that represents the rights and interests of vulnerable groups of workers.*

Objective 2: More effective institutions and governance frameworks for collective bargaining and labour dispute resolution

Expected Outcome 2: *Mechanisms for effective collective bargaining and dispute resolution promoted*

The project is part of the ILO's global and China-specific programme priority. The project achievements, particularly the experiences from the pilot programmes, will feed directly into — and provide China's home grown evidence for — ILO's dialogue with and technical assistance to the ILO constituents on issues related to collective bargaining and the policy goals of harmonious labour relations, a greater role of market forces and reduced labour disputes.

The project contributes to China Decent Work Country Programme 2016-2020, specifically Country Priority 3: strengthen the rule of law and the realization of fundamental principles and rights at work.

3.4. Innovation, sustainability and impact

The project's underlying theory of change is to promote rights at work and harmonious labour relations through strengthening the collective bargaining capacity of workers and employers and their organizations. The project also aims to improve government's role in promoting collective bargaining more effectively. It is unique in terms of an effort to train workers, employers and government officials within one collaborative framework and facilitate interactions among the tripartite parties.

The project's approach in providing training to social partners in developing their institutional and representative capacity in collective bargaining will be sustained well beyond the pilot programmes through the ILO's ongoing technical assistance activities and through the tripartite constituents' own initiatives. The tripartite constituents have acknowledged the need to improve the quality of current collective bargaining processes and the need for more effective institutions and governance frameworks to 'build harmonious labour relations'.

3.5. Management arrangements

The ILO Country Office for China and Mongolia is responsible for the overall implementation of the project. The project is managed by a National Project Coordinator (NPC) based in the ILO Beijing Office and reports to the director of the ILO Beijing. A project assistant in Beijing provides administrative and financial support.

The project works closely with the Inclusive Labour Markets, Labour Relations and Working Conditions Branch (INWORK) in Geneva and the ILO Decent Work Team for East and South-East Asia and the Pacific in Bangkok.

3.6. Implementation arrangements

The project implementation is carried out by the **ILO** in close collaboration with **the Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security (MoHRSS)**. The ILO is responsible for the managing the overall project delivery, overseeing the technical and administrative aspects of the project implementation; while MoHRSS is responsible for coordinating with social partners (detailed division of responsibility can be found in the ILO-MoHRSS MOU for implementing the project).

A **Project Steering Committee (PSC)** and a Project Office were established to promote successful implementation of the project. The major responsibilities of the PSC include: to approve annual workplan, make decisions on the scope of project implementation, activities and budget, and address major issues arising from project implementation. The PSC is constituted by the Project Directors (ILO and MoHRSS) and Project Executive Director (MoHRSS). The Project Office consists of members from MoHRSS, **All-China Federation of Trade Unions (ACFTU)**, and two national employers' organizations - **China Enterprise Confederation (CEC)**, and **All-China Federation of Industry and Commerce (ACFIC)**, jointly responsible for regular management of the project. In addition to joint work, the members were mainly responsible for developing training modules and organizing training respectively:

- MoHRSS: responsible for developing a training module and organizing a training for government officials
- ACFTU: developing a training module for worker representatives and organizing a training of trainers who will deliver training for worker representatives
- CEC and ACFIC: developing a training module and organizing a training for employers

The project contracted individual international and national consultants/institutions to conduct specific research products and to develop the training modules that will provide knowledge, good practices and practical tools and methodologies for target groups (government officials, employers and workers).

4. Purpose and scope of the evaluation

This Final Independent Evaluation has the following purpose: accountability, organizational learning, and improvement. The evaluation will seek to determine how well the project achieved the outcomes planned, how they were achieved and under what conditions. The evaluation will also attempt to contribute to organizational learning by identifying lessons that have been learned and emerging good practices. This information can work towards improving future strategies, particularly in designing any potential follow-up or similar interventions.

The principal client for the evaluation is the ILO constituents in China, US Department of State and ILO, and the evaluation will be used in the following ways.

- Findings and recommendations will be used to strengthen the achievement of the project's objectives and use lessons learned to improve the strategy and operational design of similar endeavours.
- Account for achievements to ILO management and the donor in terms of impact to date of donor's funds spent and measurable results against baseline.
- The evaluation report will be disseminated in the ILO for organization learning through EVAL's database.

4.1. Evaluation Scope

The scope of the evaluation will be to review and assess the implementation strategy and identify the achievements and any possible bottlenecks that impeded the achievement of the project's overarching objective, i.e. promote harmonious labour relations through strengthened collective

bargaining processes and more effective institutions for collective bargaining and dispute resolution.

The evaluation will cover the period from the inception of the project in August 2016 to the present. The evaluation will validate (and strengthen) the findings of the mid term evaluation with strong analysis.

The evaluation will collect data and information from all the partners of the project, including the MoHRSS, ACFTU, CEC and ACFIC.

In assessing the results of the activities funded under the project, the evaluation will, but will not be restricted to:

- Evaluate the outcomes and particularly high-level achievements of the projects and assess whether the project has achieved its immediate objectives as well as contribute to the broader context of the Decent Work Country Programme, for instance.
- Assess the progress against immediate objectives, expected outputs and outcome targets, as well as the delivery of quality outputs.
- Assess the appropriateness of the results framework and indicators, targets and overall monitoring and evaluation practices.
- Identify any factors that materially impacted on the project implementation and achievement of the objectives.
- How has the project engaged with the constituents and direct beneficiaries.
- Internal and external factors that contributed to the pace of the project implementation.
- Lessons learned identified.

Attention should also be placed on how the project's intervention is relevant to the ILO's programme and policy frameworks at the national and regional levels, UNDAF and national sustainable development strategy or other relevant national development frameworks, including relevant sectoral policies and programmes.

Based on the statistics of women, gender components are mainstreamed throughout the project; therefore, the evaluation will integrate not only gender equality but also non-discrimination and social inclusion.

4.2. Reference to Previous Evaluations and Reviews

The project undertook quarterly monitoring and reporting against the output and outcome indicators in the logic model. An internal mid-term evaluation was conducted between December 2018 and March 2019. Major findings of the mid-term evaluation include:

- **Relevance:** The project is highly in line with the national agenda that promotes harmonious labour relations, and has gained increasing relevance to the needs of its Chinese partners.
- **Effectiveness:** The project has experienced a very slow start at inception phase and as a result, no training activities were organized by the time of mid-term evaluation. However, the delays were not caused by the partners' disinterest, but rather by certain challenges inherent to the sensitive nature of the project itself as well as the complexity in engaging multiple stakeholders.
- **Efficiency:** The cost effectiveness of the project activities was sound. Some efficiency was lost in producing case studies and training modules, however this cost was necessary to correct the over-optimistic project design for these components. From a capacity building

and ownership development perspective, the time and resources spent on these activities were worthwhile.

- Sustainability: The project has built up ownership of the partners, broadened their conceptual understanding of collective negotiation and strengthened their capacity. The major factors influencing the achievements of potential sustainability of the project include the quality of training materials and training activities and the methods by which the collective negotiation is further implemented.

Progress to date after the mid-term evaluation:

- An international conference organized in Beijing in May 2019
- Three training modules finalized and tested through training
- Training organized respectively for employers (August), government officials (November) and collective negotiation instructors (December)
- A handbook on prevention and resolution of collective negotiation disputes finalized
- A tripartite project closure meeting organized in December 2019

The quarterly reports and the mid-term evaluation report will be provided to the evaluator electronically or consolidated in google drive for access.

5. Evaluation Criteria and Questions and Cross Cutting Issues/Issues of Special Interest to the ILO

Referring to the ILO evaluation policy and guidelines¹, the evaluation will assess the contributions based on the criteria including the relevance of the project to beneficiary needs, the coherence of the project design, the project's efficiency and effectiveness, the impact of the results and the potential for sustainability. For each criterion, evaluation questions are suggested below (Annex D for more suggested questions). The questions seek to address priority issues and concerns of the constituents and other stakeholders.

- Relevance
 - To what extent is the design of the project relevant to the strategy, in meeting the Programme & Budget outcomes in the ILO Strategic Framework, Country Priority Outcomes (CPO) and SDG it aims to support?
 - Is it relevant to national, regional and international development frameworks?
 - To what extent the project objectives/outcomes are relevant to the needs of the beneficiaries? Specifically: national and local tripartite constituents (workers, employers, government officials); disadvantaged vulnerable groups of workers (e.g. women workers, migrant workers, non-unionized workers, workers in non-traditional forms of work)
 - Were project methodologies and approaches in line with the project partners' capacities and expectations?
 - To what extent have the project's interventions so far contributed to promoting inclusiveness in collective bargaining and fundamental rights including the principles of relevant ILO instruments?
 - What effect, if any, does not having this project have on relevance?
- Coherence
 - To what extent are the various activities the project's implementation strategy coherent, logical and complementary (in it design and implementation) with

¹ https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_571339.pdf

regards to the vertical and horizontal elements within the ILO's Strategic Framework.

- Was the project evaluable?
- Were principles of Results Based Management applied?

- Effectiveness
 - The extent to which the activities, including training efforts, assist in achieving the project goals/objectives? To what degree was the institutional capacity of the target beneficiaries improved?
 - What are the observed changes (both expected and unexpected) with regard to collective negotiations and collective contracts? What was changed within the institutional, government, and legal contexts?
 - To what extent has the project ensured that the interests of workers in particular disadvantaged groups of workers are fully taken into account in developing project outputs and project implementation?
 - What were the key factors of success or challenges for attaining or not attaining the expected results.

- Efficiency
 - To what extent have the project's resources been used efficiently.
 - How well did the project management coordinate with partners to support the implementation of the project.

- Impact
 - To what extent have the project's actions produce impacts towards achieving the objectives.
 - How was the knowledge generated from the project shared?

- Sustainability
 - Does the project have an implementation strategy that involves tripartite constituents and development partners, to establish synergies that could enhance impact and promote sustainability.
 - How effectively has the project built necessary capacity of people and institutions (of national partners and implementing partners)? How effectively has the project built national ownership and capacity?
 - What positive and negative recommendations and lessons could be offered to improve sustainability.
 - What recommendations can be offered on the way forward.

The evaluator may adapt criteria and question, but any fundamental changes should be agreed between the project manager, the project officer and the evaluator, and reflected in the report.

The evaluation will address ILO's cross-cutting policy drivers – international labour standards, social dialogue, environmental sustainability, and, especially, gender equality and non-discrimination. Cross-cutting issues on how and extent to which the project has mainstream gender, labour standard, tripartism and social dialogue into the implementation should be considered. Involve both men and women in the consultation, evaluation analysis and evaluation team. The evaluation should review data and information that is disaggregated by sex and assess the relevant and effectiveness of gender-related strategies and outcomes to improve lives of women and men. All information should be accurately included in the inception report and final evaluation report.

This evaluation will comply with the 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/document/detail/102>

6. Methodology

The evaluation will be carried out in accordance with ILO standard policies and procedures, comply with evaluation norms and follow ethical safeguards. The evaluation will address the overall ILO evaluation criteria as defined in the ILO Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation: principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations (3rd ed. 2017)². The evaluation will also take into account the gender issues into the evaluation process as guided by the ILO guidelines on Integrating gender equality in monitoring and evaluation of projects (2014). The ILO adheres to the United Nations system evaluation norms and standards as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.

The evaluation will use mix of approaches and ensure triangulation of information. It will, in part, use a goal-based approach to examine the achievements. In will, in part, use a case study approach to examine the provinces under review. It will also use a mixed methods approach (e.g. document analysis, interviews, direct observation and surveys) to ensure validity and reliability of the findings.

Open and transparent consultation will underpin this evaluation. The evaluation will be carried out in a participatory manner to ensure the involvement of key stakeholders in particular national project partners and the donor, in all phases of the evaluation, including preparation, field visits, report preparation and dissemination. The donor and other stakeholders will be given the opportunity to comment on the draft report.

The evaluation will be carried out from January to April 2020

The following methods will be used as a minimum to collect information:

Desk review: Review and analysis of documents related to the project (see Annex A). The desk review will suggest a number of initial findings that in turn may point to additional or fine-tuned evaluation questions.

Field visits and interviews

The evaluator will undertake group/individual discussions with the ILO project staff, supporting staff and management in Beijing. The evaluator will also have teleconference with the ILO specialists in Geneva.

The evaluator will have group/separate meetings with project partners and national experts that have been actively engaged in the project activities. The evaluator may visit one or more pilot provinces (Inner Mongolia, Hubei, Jiangsu) to be decided in consultation with the ILO.

At the end of the field work, the evaluation team will present preliminary findings to the project key stakeholders in a workshop to discuss and refine the findings and fill information gaps.. The donor and other stakeholders will be given the opportunity to comment on the draft report. The final report will be made available to the ILO and relevant stakeholders. (See Annex B for preliminary list).

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

Methodology should include examining the intervention's Theory of Change (if not available that the evaluator reconstructs one), specifically in the light of the logical connect between levels of results and their alignment with ILO's strategic objectives and outcomes at the regional and national levels, as well as with the relevant SDGs and related targets.

The evaluation will use a combination of methods and the final methodology will be determined in consultation with the ILO. The detailed methodology will be elaborated by the evaluator on the basis of this terms of reference and document in the report. It is expected that the evaluation will apply mixed methods that draw on both quantitative and qualitative evidence and involve multiple means of analysis.

The data collection, analysis and presentation should be responsive to and includes issues relating to diversity and non-discrimination. All data should be sex disaggregated and different needs of women and men and the marginalized groups should be considered throughout the process.

Refer to Annex C-1 on sample questions for examining project's responsiveness to issues relating to gender equality and inclusion. Refer to Annex C-2 on sample questions for examining project's responsiveness to SDG.

7. Main Deliverables

The evaluation process will yield the following outputs.

1. Brief inception report (maximum 5 pages, excluding Annexes if any), including the following elements.
 - Refined evaluation questions
 - Describe the conceptual framework that will be used to undertake the evaluation.
 - Sets out in some detail the approach for data collection, the evaluation methodology; i.e. how evaluation questions will be answered by way of data collection methods, data sources, sampling and selection criteria, and indicators.
 - Sets out the work plan for the evaluation, which indicates the phases in the evaluation.
 - Sets out a plan for data collection, interviews or discussions.
 - Sets out the list of key stakeholders to be interviewed.
2. Stakeholders workshop. The evaluator will conduct a stakeholders' workshop. The stakeholders' workshop will be organized to validate information and data collected through various methods and share the preliminary findings with the ILO and local stakeholders at the end of evaluation mission. The stakeholders' workshops will be organized by the project team with assistance from the ILO Office for China. Powerpoint presentation should be prepared and presented at the workshop and shared with EM
3. Draft evaluation report and its timing.
 - Evaluator to submit a complete and readable draft report to the evaluation manager.
 - Draft report should reflect the evaluative reasoning and critical thinking that were used to draw values-based conclusions following the evidence. Evaluation report should include action-oriented, practical and specific recommendations assigning or designating audiences /implementers /users. The draft evaluation report should be prepared as per the ILO Checklist 5: Preparing the Evaluation Report (see Annex D). The first draft evaluation report will be improved by the evaluation

- manager who is responsible for checking the quality of the draft report in terms of adequacy and readability.
- The evaluation manager circulates the report among the stakeholders.
4. Final Independent Evaluation report (with Title Page, Executive Summary and Annexes, including lesson learned and emerging good practices in the ILO Template). The report should not be longer than 30 pages, excluding annexes.
 - Evaluation manager will compile the comments received and forwards them in a single communication to the evaluator. The evaluator incorporates them as appropriate and submits the final report to the evaluation manager. The quality of the report will be assessed against the EVAL checklist 5, 6 and 7 (see Annex D).
 - The final version is subjected to final approval by EVAL (after initial approval by the Evaluation manager/Regional evaluation officer)
 5. Evaluation Summary (EVAL checklist 8 see Annex D), lessons learnt and good practices must be developed using ILO standard format.

All draft and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided in electronic version compatible with MS WORD for Windows. Ownership of the data from the evaluation rests jointly with the U.S. Government, ILO and the consultant. The copyright of the report from the evaluation rests exclusively with the ILO. Use of the data for publication and other presentation can only be made with the agreement of the ILO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgment.

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

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

8. Management Arrangements and Work Plan

An evaluator (independent consultant) will be hired to undertake the evaluation and will be responsible for the task and outputs set out in this TOR.

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

In the region, the overall coordination, administrative and logistics support will be provided by the ILO project staff in based in ILO CO China and Mongolia. The project staff consult with a wide range of stakeholders, collect and analyse information, and convene national and regional meetings. The project team will ensure close links with the MoHRSS and social partners.

Evaluator or an external consultant who has experience in evaluating development projects and programmes will be hired to undertake the evaluation and will be responsible for the task and outputs set out in this TOR. The choice of the external collaborator will be approved by the ILO's Evaluation Unit along with the Terms of Reference for the evaluation. Responsibilities and profile of evaluation consultant is provided in the table below.

Responsibility	Profile
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Drafting the inception report, producing the draft reports and drafting/presenting a final report. ○ Providing any technical and methodological advice necessary for this evaluation. ○ Ensuring the quality of data (validity, reliability, consistency and accuracy) throughout the analytical and reporting phases. ○ Ensuring the evaluation is conducted per TORs, including following the ILO EVAL guidelines methodology and formatting requirements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adequate contextual knowledge of the UN, ILO and China, especially on topics relevant to industrial relations and collective bargaining. ○ Adequate technical specialization, demonstrated knowledge and expertise on industrial relations and collective bargaining. ○ At least 10 years' experience in evaluation policies, strategies and organizational effectiveness. ○ Experience in conducting evaluations for ILO projects. ○ Expertise in qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and an understanding of issues related to validity and reliability. ○ Fluency in spoken and written English and an understanding of the ILO cross-cutting issues. ○ Working knowledge of Chinese (Putonghua) is an advantage.

It is estimated that the scope of effort required by the evaluation will be approximately 22 days. The successful evaluation consultant will be remunerated on an output based total fee. Travel and DSA at the prevailing UN Common Systems rate will be provided. The evaluator will be required to book his/her own travel, in consultation with the ILO.

The suggested timeline and workplan is provided in the table below.

Task	Responsible person	Time frame
Preparing and drafting TOR Evaluation Manager	Evaluation Manager	By 6 January 2020
Sharing the TOR with all stakeholders for comments/inputs	Evaluation Manager	By 7 January 2020

Finalization of the TOR and Expression of Interest	Evaluation Manager	By 9 January 2020
Approval of the TOR EVAL	EVAL	By 10 January 2020
Selection of consultant	Evaluation Manager/ROAP/EVAL	By 21 January 2020
Draft mission itinerary for the evaluator and the list of key stakeholders to be interviewed	CTA	By 21 January 2020
Ex-col contract based on the TOR prepared/signed	CTA	By 7 Feb 2020
Brief evaluators on ILO evaluation policy	Evaluation Manager	By 10 Feb 2020
Desk review, and audio/skype/video conference with project, and inception report	Project and evaluator (at home based)	By 14 Feb 2020
Evaluation Mission	Evaluator	By 20 – 28 Feb 2020
Stakeholder consultation workshop (included in the evaluation mission)	Evaluator/CTA	By 28 Feb 2020
Drafting of evaluation report and submitting to the Evaluation Manager	Evaluator	By 10 March 2020
Sharing the draft report to all concerned for comments	Evaluation Manager	By 11 March, 2020
Consolidated comments on the draft report, send to the evaluator	Evaluation Manager	By 25 March 2020
Finalisation of the report	Evaluator	By 31 March 2020
Review of the final report	Evaluation Manager	By 7 April 2020
Submission of the final evaluation report	Evaluation Manager	By 8 April 2020
Approval of the final evaluation report	EVAL	By 15 April 2020

Proposed workdays (payable days)

Phase	Responsible Person	Tasks	No. of days
I	Evaluator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Briefing with the evaluation manager, the project team and the donor - Initial discussion with the project team - Desk Review of programme related documents - Inception report 	5
II	Evaluator with organisational support from ILO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In-country consultations with programme staff - Field visits - Interviews with projects staff, partners, beneficiaries - Stakeholders workshop for sharing findings - Debriefing with the CO – Beijing 	7
III	Evaluator	- Draft report based on consultations from field visits and desk review and the stakeholders' validation workshop	8
IV		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quality check and initial review by Evaluation Manager - Circulate revised draft report to stakeholders - Consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to team leader 	0
V	Evaluator	- Finalize the report including explanations on	2

		why comments were not include	
TOTAL			22

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

Interested parties are requested to submit a proposal including: cover letter that explains how the candidate meet the desired profile, a technical section and financial section, CV, fee structure and availability. Proposals should be sent to Ms. Rattaporn Pongpattana (poungpattana@ilo.org) with copy to Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka (pamornrat@ilo.org) indicating the title of the evaluation **by COB January 20, 2020**.

Proposal will be judged based on the following criteria: contextual knowledge, technical specialization, prior experience, clarity and soundness of proposed methodology, language and understanding of the ILO's cross-cutting policy drivers and financial competitiveness.

Annex

Annex A: List of Documents to Review

To be finalized with the selected evaluator

- Project Documents: initial Project Document, revised Statement of Work after extension , ILO-MoHRSS MOU, and work plans
- Periodic Progress Reports submitted to the donor by ILO as per PARDEV reporting guidelines
- Project outputs: national and international case studies, training modules, and other relevant studies
- Project documentation: workshop reports, PSC meeting reports, consultation meeting reports, concept notes, minutes of monthly calls/meetings with the Donor, and relevant correspondence
- Mid-term evaluation report
- Other relevant documents such as the China DWCP 2016-2020, UNDAF China.-

Annex B: List of stakeholders/interviews

To be finalized with the selected evaluator

Name	Title, Institution	Location
Zhou Jie	National Project Coordination, ILO CO for China and Mongolia	Beijing
Youngmo Yoon	Senior Specialist on Social Dialogue and Labour Administration, ILO	Beijing
Claire Courteille-Mulder	Director, ILO CO for China and Mongolia	Beijing
Verena Schmidt	ILO INWORK	Geneva
	Ministry of Human Resources and Social Security (MoHRSS)	Beijing
	All-China Federation of Trade Unions (ACFTU)	Beijing
	China Enterprise Confederation (CEC)	Beijing
	All-China Federation of Industry and Commerce (ACFIC)	Beijing
	Chinese Academy of Labour and Social Security and selected national experts	Beijing
	Selected trainees (through phone call interview)	Focus Areas

Annex C-1: Sample questions for examining project's responsiveness to issues relating to gender equality and inclusion.

Relevance and validity of design
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Within the context of the ILO goal of gender quality, 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; and concerns relating to inclusion. 2. To what extent did the problem analysis identify its differential impact on men and women and on other vulnerable groups? 3. To what extent did the project design identify and integrate specific targets and indicators. 4. To what extent did the project strategies, within the overall scope, remain flexible and responsive to emerging concerns.

Effectiveness
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Within its overall objectives and strategies, what specific measure were taken by the project to address issues relating to gender equality, non-discrimination and inclusion. 2. How effective were these measures in advancing gender equality and inclusion within the context of the project's objectives. 3. To what extent were the intervention results defined, monitored and achieved, and what was their contribution. 4. Within the project's thematic area, what were the facilitating limiting factors in project's contribution.
Efficiency
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what extent did project budget factor in the cost of specific activities, outputs and outcomes to address gender equality, non-discrimination and inclusion. 2. To what extent did the project leverage resources (i.e. financial, partnerships, expertise to promote gender equality, non-discrimination and inclusion.
Impact
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What were the intervention's long-term effects in terms of reducing/exacerbating gender equality, non-discrimination and inclusion. 2. To what extent did the project bring lasting changes in norms and policies that favour/promote gender equality, non-discrimination and inclusion.
Sustainability
To what extent did the intervention advance strategic gender-related needs that can have a long term positive bearing on the gender parity and inclusion within the world of work.

Annex C-2: Sample questions for examining project's responsiveness to SDG.

Relevance and validity of design
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what extent the project considered relevant SDG targets and indicator(ies)? 2. How responsive was the programme design to national sustainable development plans for SDGs? 3. Were the indicators designed and used in a manner that they enabled reporting on progress under specific SDG targets and indicators?
Effectiveness
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To what extent the project results contribute (or not) to the identified SDGs and related targets? Even if the relevant SDGs had not been identified in design, can a plausible contribution to the relevant SDGs and related targets be established. 2. To what extent have intervention results been monitored and reported in terms of their contribution to specific SDGs and targets (explicitly or implicitly) 3. To what extent did the project increased stakeholders' awareness on SDG targets and indicators relevant to Decent Work Agenda? (explicitly or implicitly)
Efficiency
1. To what extent did the project leverage partnerships (with constituents, national institutions and other UN/development agencies) that enhanced projects relevance and contribution to priority SDG targets and indicators? (explicitly or implicitly)
Impact
1. Has the intervention made a difference to specific SDGs the project is linked to? If so, how has the intervention made a difference? (explicitly or implicitly)
Sustainability.
1. To which extent the results of the intervention likely to have a long term, sustainable positive contribution to the SDG and relevant targets? (explicitly or implicitly)

Annex C-3: List of sample questions to stimulate discussion and identify appropriate evaluation questions.

Criteria	Questions
Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent to which the Project continued its relevance and responsive to address the issues and needs of beneficiaries. • To what extent has the Project made strategic use of coordination and collaboration with other projects/agencies an on-going initiatives to increase effectiveness and impacts. • To what extent is the Project perceived as an effort by the ILO to support.
Validity of design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project design (i.e. priorities, outcomes, outputs and activities) address the stakeholder needs that were identified and realistic to the situation on the ground? • Did the design identify risks and key assumption and whether the Project has mitigation strategy. Which strategies has the Project undertaken to address challenges? • How relevant and useful are the indicators and means of verification described in the Project Document and the monitoring and evaluation matrix for assessing the Project's progress, results and impact? Are the means of verification appropriate. • To what extent was the ILO's gender mainstreamed strategy adequately and appropriately included. • Was the capacity of Project partners taken into account in the strategy and means of action? • Did the Project design adequately plan for an effective participation of governments and social partners.
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the Project achieved the immediate objectives per relevant indicators? • To what extent has the Project contributed to achieving relevant outcomes in DWCP. • How effective has the project been in establishing national ownership? Is the project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards achievement of the project objectives? Has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities? • Have the quantity and quality of the outputs produced satisfactory? • What were the main challenges, constraints, problems and areas in achieving the results? • Assess how gender considerations have been mainstreamed through the Project cycle. • To what extent has the Project managed the practice of knowledge management and lessons dissemination and visibility effort on Project and donor branding. • How has the Project been responding to the changing situation of the country and/or of the constituents and partners' priorities? Has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional etc. changes in the project environment?

Efficiency of resource use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes? • Have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective? In general, do the results achieved justify the costs? Could the same results be attained with fewer resources? • Have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? • The extent to which the Project has leveraged resources/ collaborated with other projects.
Effectiveness of management arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the size of the Project, were the existing management structure, staffing and technical capacity sufficient and adequate? • Did the Project receive adequate political, technical and administrative support from the ILO and its implementing partners. If not why? How could it be improved. • How effective is the steering committee and the donor management mechanism? • Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes? • Have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective? In general, do the results achieved justify the costs? Could the same results be attained with fewer resources? • Have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
Impact and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What has been the overview of the impact. • Has the Project developed a feasible strategy for sustainability of those interventions. To what extent has this been implemented? And to what extent has it succeeded? • What has been the impact. • Is the Project's knowledge and experience effectively transferred to national partners?

Annex D: Relevant ILO evaluation guidelines and standard templates.

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

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

Guidance note 4 Integrating gender equality in M&E of projects

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm

Checklist No. 5 Preparing the evaluation report

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

Checklist No. 6 Rating the quality of evaluation report

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

Guidance note 7 Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165982/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

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>

SDG related reference materials

<http://www.ilo.ch/eval/eval-and-sdgs/lang--en/index.htm>