



## ► Tool 1.1: Evaluability review during project start-up phase

► DATE: JANUARY 2021, V. 1

This tool is to be read in conjunction with ILO EVAL's ►  [Guidance note 1.3 on Evaluability](#)**INTRODUCTION**

Evaluability review (ER) serves the dual purposes of: i) revising the quality of the project's M&E plan and systems; and ii) building up on EVAL's M&E appraisal recommendations on the quality of the project design. The ER takes place within the first year of the project start-up.

**SCOPE AND CRITERIA FOR THE APPRAISAL**

The ER covers:

- The project's log frame approach to identify the logic between the activities, outputs, objectives and risks/assumptions. The quality of the risk analysis at project design and assessment of importance and likelihood sets the framework for subsequent monitoring during implementation.
- The causal logic and results-level linkages between the DWCP/ CPO and the project. Suggestions for improvements should be made as needed.

- The definitions, key questions, methodological approach, and initial preparations made, including baseline measures, by the project to assess the effectiveness and impact of the project.
- The monitoring and evaluation capacities of key partner organizations for each project, in addition to the resources and management arrangements for implementing the M&E plan.
- Good practices and also specific improvements that should be made to the M&E system, giving specifics for acting upon these recommendations.

Based on the following scale, project ER will be rated against each of the criteria listed in the enclosed tables. The ratings are intended to raise attention to potential problems. Comments indicate how improvements can be made.

- (1) Unsatisfactory quality
- (2) Satisfactory quality
- (3) High quality
- (4) Not relevant to project

*This tool is a living document and has not been professionally edited.*

*Right-click on hyperlinks and select 'Open in new tab' to access, if viewing in browser.*

► 1. INTERVENTION LOGIC, RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS

Question	Quality assessment criteria	Rating
1.1 Has the situation been properly analysed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A problem statement has been formulated through a situation analysis, baseline study or other evidence</li><li>• Stakeholders have been identified</li><li>• The target population has been differentiated</li></ul>	
Comments:		
1.2 Are the programmes/project's overall objective clearly defined?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The intervention specifies its contribution to the long-term ILO priorities and outcomes</li><li>• The intervention specifies its linkage with DWCP objectives, CPOs, national strategies and the international development frameworks, including SDG targets</li><li>• The intervention is linked to specific topics of the ILO's mandate (e.g. cross-cutting policy drivers) as well as pro-poor focus and inclusion of people with disabilities</li><li>• The proposal sets out a clear and holistic approach to capacity development based on a capacity assessment of key partners in the results strategy.</li></ul>	
Comments:		
1.3 Does the document contain a strategy or Theory of Change for dealing with the problem?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The project has a Theory of Change/intervention model that reflects the logical connection between the project's situation analysis and its objectives and outcomes</li><li>• The intervention explains the what, how and why of the intended change process, specifying causal links, mechanisms for change and assumptions.</li><li>• The intervention concentrates on dealing with root causes (causal logic established)</li><li>• The intervention is relevant to the needs of the target group(s)</li></ul>	
Comments:		
1.4 Does the document contain satisfactory immediate objectives / project outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Immediate objectives (IOs) clearly state the final situation to be achieved and the target groups that will benefit</li><li>• IOs describe the conditions under which the performance is to be observed</li><li>• IOs describe the standard which must be met in order for the performance to be considered acceptable (criteria)</li></ul>	
Comments:		



1.5 Are assumptions, risks and mitigations adequately identified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The principal restrictions to achieving outcomes have been identified</li><li>• The risks associated with each strategy for achieving project outcomes have been identified</li><li>• The risk mitigation measures are clearly defined, and are supported by theory, logic, empirical evidence and/or past ILO experience</li><li>• Assumptions have explicitly been presented for the project logic to hold true</li></ul>	
Comments:		
1.6 Are assumptions, risks and mitigations adequately identified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The project articulated an exit or transition strategy for its support</li><li>• Plans exist to gradually and effectively hand over the project to national partners</li><li>• The project established a knowledge management strategy with national partners and civil society, as appropriate</li></ul>	
Comments:		
Recommendation to CTA/project team:		
CTA response how recommendation is to be addressed (for validation at mid-term evaluation)		

► 2. QUALITY OF INDICATORS, BASELINES, TARGETS AND MILESTONES

Question	Quality assessment criteria	Rating
2.1 Are indicators appropriate proxies for the IOs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is a logical fit between indicators and outcomes, meaning the indicators measure the intended result</li><li>• IOs are enable reporting on progress under specific SDG targets and indicators</li></ul>	
Comments:		
2.2 Are indicators of quality?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Indicators include a clear definition of what is being measured</li><li>• Indicators measured intended results</li><li>• Indicators are SMART</li><li>• Indicators allow to capture gender equality, non-discrimination and people with disabilities concerns</li></ul>	
2.2 Is Baseline information collected for each indicator?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A baseline exists for each indicator</li><li>• Baselines are specific to the programme/project</li><li>• Baseline clearly describe the situation prior to the intervention</li><li>• Data is available to track the baseline</li><li>• Baselines permit comparison of results</li></ul>	
2.3 Are targets established for each indicator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Targets are specified for all indicators</li><li>• Targets were computed by adding amount of change desired to baselines</li></ul>	
Comments:		
2.4 Are milestones identified for each indicator?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Milestones provide a clear sense of the time frame for achieving results</li><li>• Milestones are identified for all indicators</li><li>• Milestones provide a clear sense of progress made for achieving goals</li></ul>	
Comments:		
2.5 Can data be disaggregated to support performance reporting on areas of special interest for the ILO?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Indicators, baselines, targets and milestones will permit gender disaggregation and disaggregated data on other relevant concerns for the project</li></ul>	
Comments:		
Recommendation to CTA/ project team:		
CTA response how recommendation is to be addressed (for validation at mid-term evaluation)		

► 3. MEANS OF VERIFICATION/MEASUREMENT AND METHODOLOGIES

Question	Quality assessment criteria	Rating
3.1 Does the document propose the appropriate combination of annual reviews, mid-term and final evaluations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The proposal conforms with ILO evaluation policy guidelines by including the appropriate amount of annual reviews, mid-term and final evaluations</li></ul>	
Comments:		
3.2 Does an M&E plan exist to conduct monitoring and evaluation in a systematic manner?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A monitoring and evaluation plan has been developed</li><li>The results framework includes actions to achieve appropriate M&amp;E results ((for example responsibilities and periodicity for data collection)</li><li>If applicable, comparison groups are included for impact evaluation purposes</li><li>Information needs for performance reporting is well identified</li><li>Roles and responsibilities for data collection, evaluation and reporting are specified</li><li>Risks for the monitoring and evaluation system have been defined with identified mitigation strategies</li></ul>	
Comments:		
3.3 Are the data collection and analyses methods in the M&E plan technically adequate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The methods proposed will lead to valid and reliable propositions</li><li>A data gathering system to generate information on all indicators has been defined</li><li>Methods are technically and operationally feasible with appropriate levels of efforts and cost for value added by the information</li><li>Sources of information are specified for all indicators</li></ul>	
Comments:		
Recommendation to project designers:		
CTA response how recommendation is to be addressed (for validation at mid-term evaluation)		

► 4. INFRASTRUCTURE, HUMAN AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Question	Quality assessment criteria	Rating
4.1 Is the budget for the evaluation properly expressed in the project budget?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The evaluation budget is on a separate line of the project budget</li></ul>	
Comments:		
4.2 Are there adequate financial resources in the evaluation budget?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The monitoring and evaluation budget is adequate for the size and duration of the project</li><li>Resources have been identified and committed to ensure that predefined data will be collected and analysed</li></ul>	
Comments:		
4.3 Are there adequate human resources?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A member of project management has been designated to be responsible for M&amp;E issues</li><li>Social partners and beneficiaries expected to participate in monitoring and evaluation</li><li>Reporting mechanisms and products identified with clear responsibilities</li></ul>	
Comments:		
4.4 Are organizational arrangements for M&E efficient?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>An M&amp;E system is used for work planning, implementation and reporting practices</li><li>Tripartite partners engage in M&amp;E and use information</li></ul>	
Comments:		
Recommendation to CTA/ project team:		
CTA response how recommendation is to be addressed (for validation at mid-term evaluation)		

► 5. PARTNERS’ PARTICIPATION AND USE OF INFORMATION

Question	Quality assessment criteria	Rating
5.1 Was the proposal designed in a participatory manner?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Constituents and other stakeholders were involved in establishing project priorities and outcomes</li><li>• The areas of agreement and disagreement among constituents priorities and outcomes are identified</li></ul>	
Comments:		
5.2 Was information from previous evaluations used to design the proposal?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lessons learned from past evaluations have been used to design the project</li></ul>	
Comments:		
5.3 Is there a plan for evaluation reporting and dissemination?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The project has a communication strategy for evaluation results</li><li>• Evaluation results will be communicated to constituents and stakeholders in a timely fashion</li></ul>	
Comments:		
Recommendation to CTA/ project team:		
CTA response how recommendation is to be addressed (for validation at mid-term evaluation)		