



**DRAFT
TERMS OF REFERENCE**

Final Independent Evaluation of “Indicator and methodologies for wage setting” Project

| | |
|--|--|
| Overview | |
| ILO Project Code | GLO/18/23/NLD |
| Project Title | Indicator and methodologies for wage setting |
| Contracting Organization | International Labour Organization (ILO) |
| ILO Responsible Chief | Philippe MARCADENT, Chief of INWORK |
| Administrative Unit in charge of the project | INWORK |
| Technical Unit | INWORK |
| Funding source/donor | Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands |
| Project Budget | 1,125,000 USD |
| Project Location | Global with operations in India, Indonesia, Vietnam, Costa Rica and Ethiopia |
| Project Duration | October 2018 – December 2021 |
| Outcome(s) and CPO | Outcome 7, CPOs for India, Indonesia, Vietnam, Costa Rica and Ethiopia |
| Evaluation Manager | Özge Berber Agtaş, ILO Office for Turkey |
| Type of Evaluation | Final Independent Evaluation |
| Expected Starting and End Date of Evaluation | September-December 2021 |

I. INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

As per ILO evaluation policy, this project is subject to a final independent evaluation. In that regard, the final independent evaluation, as projected in the work plan of the project, will be undertaken by an external consultant(s) and/or service providers.

ILO Evaluation Policy adopted by the Governing Body in October 2017 provides for systematic evaluation of programmes and projects in order to improve quality, accountability, learning, transparency of the ILO’s work, strengthen the decision-making process and support constituents in promoting decent work and social justice. It is planned that the final independent evaluation will be carried out under the overall supervision of the ILO Evaluation Manager, with the support of the Departmental Evaluation Focal Point for the WORKQUALITY Department and ILO Evaluation Office.

a. Project description

The project Indicator and methodologies for wage setting is a DC project with a total budget of 1,125,000 USD funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, implemented by a technical team in INWORK based in Geneva and pilot-tested in 5 countries, namely, India, Indonesia, Vietnam, Costa Rica and Ethiopia. The project implementation period is 39 months (October 2018 to December 2021).

The overall objective of the project is to develop indicators and methodologies that strengthen the capacity of governments and social partners to negotiate and set appropriate wage levels, taking into account both the

needs of workers and their families and economic factors. In particular, the project seeks to fill a knowledge gap and focuses on indicators and methodologies to estimate the needs of workers and their families. The methodologies and tools developed at the global level under this project will be tested in selected pilot countries that have requested technical assistance from the ILO on wage policies. The indicators developed and tested in this project will subsequently be incorporated into the ILO toolkit (the minimum wage policy guide) for future ILO wage-setting support to member States.

The project has two immediate objectives:

Objective 1:

By the end of the project, the evidence base for better-taking workers' needs alongside economic factors into account in wage-fixing in the formal and informal economy, as well as in global supply chains, will have been strengthened and disseminated in the project countries.

Objective 2:

By the end of the project, stakeholders and ILO member states will have access to better indicators and methods for adequate wage fixing, enabling them to negotiate and/or set wages adapted to the national context.

The project is aligned with the ILO Strategic Plan (2019-21) and primarily fits into the ILO P&B (2020-21). The project outcomes also contribute to Outcome 7 (Adequate and effective protection at work for all), with a specific link to Output 7.3 (Increased capacity of member states to set adequate wages and promote decent working time. In addition, its results are linked to Sustainable Development Goals – SDG 8 (promote inclusive and sustainable economic growth, employment and decent work for all) with particular reference to 8 and 8.5, and SDG 10 (reduce inequality within and among countries) with particular reference to 10.4.

b. Management Arrangements

The ILO Senior Economist based in Geneva leads the implementation of ILO activities and outputs under the programme in collaboration with the Technical Officer assigned to this project and the ILO regional wage specialists covering the piloting countries in New Delhi, Bangkok, Cairo and Santiago de Chile. In addition, administrative assistance for the project was provided by INWORK.

The ILO Coordination team in Geneva, led by the Senior Economist at the ILO INWORK (Inclusive Labour Markets, Labour Relations and Working Conditions Branch) and the Technical Specialist in the same unit acted as the management team of the project. The project team in Geneva provides consistent and timely support and coordination to the project activities. The ILO regional wage specialists covering the pilot countries and based in New Delhi, Bangkok, Cairo and Santiago de Chile also plays a key role in liaising with ILO Constituents and key counterparts in concerned countries.

II. PURPOSE, SCOPE AND CLIENTS OF THE EVALUATION

Independent final project evaluations assess DC projects and programmes as a means to deliver services to constituents with a view to contributing to the achievement of results at both the national and global levels, in line with ILO outcomes as outlined in the P&B and DWCPs. They assess the projects in terms of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coherence, impact and sustainability of outcomes and test underlying assumptions about contributions to broader developmental impacts. Project evaluations have the potential to:

- improve future project performance and contribute towards organizational learning;
- help those responsible for managing the resources and activities of a project to enhance development results from the short term to a sustainable long term;
- assess the effectiveness of planning and management for future impacts;

- support accountability aims by incorporating lessons learned in the decision-making process of project stakeholders, including donors and partners;
- support conceptualization of the next phases, steps, strategies and approaches. The evaluation results would contribute to further project development and help define what and how the ILO contributed to strengthening the capacity of governments and social partners to negotiate and set appropriate wage levels, taking into account both the needs of workers and their families and economic factors.

The scope of the evaluation will encompass all activities and components of the project under the direct responsibility of the ILO throughout the lifetime of the project. The main recipients of the evaluation are:

- ILO Project Management Unit
- ILO Offices and/or focal points in India, Indonesia, Vietnam, Costa Rica and Ethiopia
- Relevant ILO departments and technical units
- ILO ACTRAV and ACT/EMP (as also being the member of Project Steering Committee)
- ILO Constituents (at the global and national levels in the pilot countries)
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands
- Project partners and stakeholders

In line with ILO evaluation policy, the evaluation will address gender equality and non-discrimination as a cross-cutting concern throughout its methodology and deliverables. Furthermore, tripartism and social dialogue and international labour standards will be placed at the heart of the evaluation. It will also give specific attention to how the project is relevant to the ILO's programming framework, including the P&B for 2018-19 and 2020-21 and DWCPs, where available, of India, Indonesia and Viet Nam, contribution of the project to SDGs and UN country frameworks, and COVID-19 response. To that end, the evaluation is expected to follow the guidance documents included in Annex 1.

III. CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The evaluation will apply the key criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact potential and apply international approaches for international development assistance established by OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard and in line with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). In particular,

- The evaluation should address the evaluation criteria related to relevance, coherence, project progress/ achievements and effectiveness, efficiency in the use of resources, impact and sustainability of the project interventions as defined in the [4th edition of the ILO Policy Guidelines](#) for results-based evaluation (2020).
- The evaluation adheres to confidentiality and other ethical considerations throughout, following the [United Nations Evaluation Group \(UNEG\) Ethical Guidelines and Norms and Standards in the UN System](#). The evaluation process will observe confidentiality related to sensitive information and feedback elicited during the individual and group interviews. To mitigate bias during the data collection process and ensure maximum freedom of expression of the implementing partners, beneficiaries and other stakeholders, project staff will not be present during interviews.
- The core ILO cross-cutting priorities, such as gender equality and non-discrimination, promotion of international labour standards, tripartism and social dialogue, and constituents' capacity development, will be considered in this evaluation. In particular and in line with ILO evaluation policy, the gender dimension will be considered throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation.
- The evaluation will also focus on the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on the project, assessing whether, how and to what extent unexpected factors have affected project implementation and

whether the project has effectively addressed these unexpected factors, including those linked to the Covid-19 pandemic.

- It is expected that the evaluation will address all of the questions detailed below to the extent possible. The evaluator may adapt and propose reformulations of the suggested questions, but any changes should be agreed upon between the ILO evaluation manager and the evaluator. Upon completion of the desk review and initial interviews conducted as part of the inception phase, the inception report to be prepared by the evaluator will indicate and/or modify (in consultation with the evaluation manager) the selected specific aspects to be addressed in this evaluation.

The suggested evaluation criteria and indicative questions are given below:

Relevance

- Project's fit with the context:
 - To what extent is the project addressing key relevant components of and is contributing to:
 - ILO results framework (including P&B for 2018-19 and 2020-21), the ILO mandate and relevant policies, including gender equality and non-discrimination, international labour standards, social dialogue and disability inclusion?
 - DWCPs, where they exist, in the countries targeted by the project
 - National development strategies and UN Country programme frameworks (UNDAFs/UNSDCFs) in piloting countries
 - Constituents' organization's mission, mandate, strategic/organizational plans?
 - The achievement of the relevant Sustainable Development Goals – especially SDG 1, SDG 8 and SDG 10, with particular focus on 8, 8.5 and 10.4 in piloting countries?
 - To what extent has the project been repurposed to provide a timely and relevant response to constituents' needs and priorities in the Covid-19 context?
 - Is intervention logic coherent and realistic to achieve the planned outcomes? Are the activities supporting the achievement of the set project objectives (strategies)?
 - To what extent is the project aligned to international resolutions (e.g. ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization, ILC 2015 resolution on labour protection, ILC 2016 resolution on decent work in global supply chains) and relevant labour standards (e.g. Convention No. 26, Convention No. 131, Convention No. 154)?
- Appropriateness of the project design:
 - To what extent was the project designed based on ILO constituents' needs at the global and national levels and grounded on consultation with target beneficiaries?
 - To what extent does the project embed institutional capacity development of social partner organizations into the implementation?
- Did the project design consider the gender dimension of the planned interventions through objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities that aim to promote gender equality?

Coherence

- How well did the project fit and work with other relevant ILO interventions at the global and country levels? What synergies have been created with other partners?
- Has the project established partnerships with relevant organizations/institutions at the global and country-level throughout its implementation? What were their roles? And what were their expectations? To what extent have these partnerships been useful in the achievement of the intended results?
- To what extent have country-based interventions informed global outputs and vice versa?
- What has been the added value of the ILO work in terms of comparative advantage?
- To which extent other activities of the ILO support or undermine the project activities, and vice versa?
- To which extent other interventions of the partners (particularly policy-related interventions) support or undermine the project activities?

Effectiveness

- To what extent have the project objectives been achieved? What are the results noted, particularly in terms of notable successes or innovations? What are the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
- What have been the implications of the COVID-19 pandemic on the nature and degree of achievement of the project?
- Has the project fostered ILO constituents' active involvement through social dialogue through this project in articulating a response to the immediate effects of the pandemic?
- Has the project yielded desired results through its contributions to the ILO's core principles (gender equality, ILS, tripartism and social dialogue)?
- To what extent have the project activities, products and tools benefited from the participation of constituents and have been disseminated to them for utilization, policy advocacy or service delivery?
- How effective is the monitoring mechanism set up, including the regular/periodic meetings among project staff and direct beneficiaries, donors and key partners? Was a monitoring and evaluation system developed at the outset of the project and updated regularly?

Efficiency

- How efficiently have the project resources (time, expertise, funds, knowledge and know-how) been used to produce outputs and results?
- Given the size of the project, its complexity and challenges under the Covid-19 environment, has the existing management structure and technical capacity been sufficient and adequate?
- Has the project been receiving adequate political, technical and administrative support from the ILO and its partners? If not, why? How could that be improved?
- Were resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise etc.) allocated strategically to achieve the project objectives? Did the project benefit from complementary resources at the global and country levels that supported the achievement of its intended objectives?

Sustainability and impact potential

- To what extent is the achieved progress likely to be long lasting in terms of longer-term effects? If not, what action might be needed to form a basis for longer-term effects?
- How likely will the ILO project lead to results that will be sustained or integrated in other post-pandemic responses over time?
- To what extent have results contributed to advance sustainable development objectives (as per UNSDCFs, similar UN programming frameworks, national sustainable development plans, and SDGs)?
- To what extent has the project contributed to advance the ILO's core principles (ILS, tripartism and social dialogue, gender equality)?
- How much has the project facilitated and enhanced partnership with the Government of Netherlands and the joint promotion in the respective countries of wage setting?
- How is the sustainability of the project affected by the Covid19 situation and in the context of the national and global response?

Lessons learned and good practices for future

- What are the to-date lessons learned, and how these lessons could be made use of for the formulation of a new project?
- Are there good practices to be replicated both nationally and globally?
- Is the project successful in terms of advocating and promoting good practices through innovative communication tools?
- What lessons and good practices from the project are relevant for the COVID-19 response?

Gender equality and non-discrimination issues

- Does the project align with ILO's mainstreaming strategy on gender equality?
- To what extent did the project mainstream gender in its approach and activities?
- To what extent did the project use gender-responsive/women specific tools and products?

The list of questions can be adjusted by the evaluator in consultation with the ILO evaluation manager during the inception phase. The evaluator may adapt the evaluation criteria and questions, but any changes should be agreed upon between the evaluation manager and the evaluator and reflected in the inception report. Based on the analysis of the findings, the evaluation will provide practical recommendations that could be incorporated into the design of potential future initiatives.

IV. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will comply with UNEG evaluation norms, standards and follow ethical safeguards, as specified in the ILO's evaluation guidelines and procedures. The evaluation will apply multiple methods; both qualitative and quantitative evaluation approaches should be considered for this evaluation.

The evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner by engaging the stakeholders at different levels and ensuring that they have a say about the implementation of the project, can share their views and contribute to the evaluation and participate in dissemination processes. The methodology will include examining the project's **Theory of Change** in the light of logical connect between the levels of results, their alignment with the ILO's strategic objectives. Particular attention will be given to the identification of assumptions, risk and mitigation strategies, and the logical connect between levels of results and their alignment with ILO's strategic objectives and outcomes at the global and national levels, as well as with the relevant SDGs and related targets.

The methodology for the collection of evidence should be implemented in three phases (1) an inception phase based on a review of existing documents to produce an inception report; (2) a fieldwork phase to collect and analyse primary data; and (3) a data analysis and reporting phase to produce the final evaluation report.

The evaluation will be carried out in the middle of a pandemic caused by the COVID-19 virus. The pandemic is likely to have serious implications for data collection for this independent final evaluation. In principle, domestic travel by the evaluator may not be possible due to COVID-19 related travel restrictions. Therefore, alternative methodologies for the data collection will be considered. This could include extensive use of video-conferencing technology, and other forms of online and virtual approaches building on EVAL's guidance notes "[COVID-19: Conducting evaluations under challenging conditions](#)" and [Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO \(Practical tips on adapting to the situation\)](#). Should country-based field work be necessary, a team of national consultants could make part of the evaluation team.

Multiple data collection techniques are expected to be used by the evaluation. First of all, the evaluator will conduct a **desk review** of appropriate materials, including the project document, Logical Framework, progress reports, mission reports, news on activities and other outputs of the project and relevant materials from secondary sources (e.g., national research and publications). Secondly, the evaluator is also expected to use **interviews (telephone or computer-based)** as a means to collect relevant data for the evaluation. Finally, individual or group interviews will be conducted with the main clients defined on page 7.

The evaluator would be given a list of recommended/potential persons/institutions to interview that will be prepared by the Project Team in consultation with the evaluation manager. Thirdly, the evaluator may use **surveys** to collect data for the evaluation from the target groups, if applicable.

Opinions revealed by the stakeholders will improve and clarify the quantitative data obtained from project documents. In addition, the participatory nature of the evaluation will contribute to the sense of ownership among stakeholders. Quantitative data will be drawn from project documents, including the Progress Reports.

Sound and appropriate data analysis methods should be developed for each evaluation question. Different evaluation questions may be combined in one tool/method for specific targeted groups as appropriate. Attempts should be made to collect data from different sources by different methods for each evaluation question, and findings be triangulated to draw valid and reliable conclusions.

The evaluator will be expected to follow EVAL's Guidance material on appropriate methodologies to measure key cross-cutting issues, namely the ILO EVAL [Guidance Note 3.1 on integrating gender equality and non-discrimination](#); and the ILO EVAL [Guidance Note 3.2 on Integrating social dialogue and ILS in monitoring and evaluation of projects](#).

More specifically, in accordance with ILO Guidance note 3.1: "Considering gender in the monitoring and evaluation of projects", the gender dimension should be considered throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation. The evaluator should assess the relevance and effectiveness of gender-related strategies and outcomes to improve the lives of women and men. Data shall be disaggregated by sex where possible and appropriate during the collection, presentation and analysis of data. To the extent possible, data should be responsive to and include issues relating to diversity and non-discrimination.

All this information should be accurately reflected in the inception report and final evaluation report.

The methodology and techniques to be used in the evaluation should be described in detail in the **inception report**. **The final evaluation report should contain, at minimum, information on the instruments used for data collection and analysis, whether these be documents, interviews, or interviews surveys.** The limitations of the chosen evaluation methods should also be clearly stated.

Planning Consultations: The evaluator will have a consultation meeting (via skype/zoom/teams or telephone) with the Evaluation Manager and project team in ILO HQ, Geneva. The objective of the meeting is to reach a common understanding regarding the status of the project, the priority assessment questions, the available data sources and data collection instruments and an outline of the final assessment report. The following topics will be covered: status of logistical arrangements, project background and materials, key evaluation questions and priorities, data sources and data collection methods, roles and responsibilities of the assessment team, the outline of the final report.

Debriefing/Presentation: Upon completing the report, the evaluator will provide a debriefing to the ILO Team on the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations. The final draft of the report will be shared by the evaluator with the Evaluation Manager, who will circulate it to the stakeholders and the project team for their comments and inputs, and the evaluator will be responsible for considering the feedback provided and reflecting relevant inputs to the final report.

1. Main Outputs (Deliverables)

A. Inception report in English, including an outline of the report (to be submitted electronically to the evaluation manager within **five days of the submission of all program documentation** to the evaluator).

This report will be up to 20 pages in length and will propose the methods, sources, and procedures to be used for data collection. It will also include a proposed timeline of activities and submission of deliverables. The evaluator will share the initial draft inception report with the Evaluation Manager to seek her/his comments and suggestions. The inception report should be in line with [ILO EVAL Office Checklist](#).

B. Draft Final Report in English that should include (initial draft to be submitted electronically to the evaluation manager within **15 days of completion of the interviews**):

- ✓ Executive Summary with key findings, conclusions and recommendations¹

¹ The executive summary should address the project purpose, project logic, project management structure, present situation/status of project, evaluation purpose, evaluation scope, evaluation clients/users, evaluation methodology, main findings, conclusions, recommendations, important lessons learned, and good practices. It will need to use EVAL's template, as per Annex 2.

- ✓ Project background²
- ✓ Evaluation background (purpose, scope, clients, methodology)
- ✓ Findings
- ✓ Conclusions and recommendations (identifying which stakeholders are responsible)
- ✓ Lessons learnt & good practices, using separate templates provided by ILO EVAL
- ✓ Appendices including the TORs, inception report, a list of those consulted

The evaluation consultant shall submit to the evaluation manager the initial draft of the final report. This draft will be app. 40-50 pages plus executive summary and appendices. It shall also contain an executive summary of max. five pages, the body of the draft report shall include a brief description of the project, its context and current situation, the purpose of the evaluation, its methodology and its major findings, conclusions and recommendations. The draft final report will be disseminated to all key project stakeholders as well as concerned ILO officials by the Evaluation Manager for inputs and comments.

C. Debriefing/Presentation of preliminary findings:

The evaluator will take part in a debriefing meeting to present the preliminary findings of the evaluation report.

D. Final Report in English incorporating feedback from stakeholders on the draft and a table of the comments and how the evaluator has responded to each of the comments or why not.

Final Evaluation Report (to be submitted electronically to the evaluation manager within ten days of receipt of the draft final report with comments). The ILO Evaluation Office will approve the final report. Upon approval, it will be disseminated to all key project stakeholders as well as concerned ILO officials by ILO EVAL.

E. An evaluation summary using the ILO Summary template.

2. Suggested Report Format

The final version of the report shall follow the below format in accordance with the ILO Evaluation Office guidelines (see Checklist 6 on Rating the quality of evaluation reports):

1. Title page
2. Table of Contents
3. Acronyms
4. Executive Summary
5. Project Background
6. Evaluation Background
7. Evaluation Methodology
8. Main Findings
9. Conclusions
10. Lessons learned and Emerging Good Practices
11. Recommendations
12. Annexes (TOR, inception report, lessons learned template, list of interviews, meeting notes, relevant country information and documents)

The process of the finalization of the Evaluation reports:

- The evaluation manager will provide inputs/comments to the draft final report,
- After reflection of the inputs/comments of the evaluation manager into the draft report, the draft report will be shared with the ILO project team and stakeholders to receive their comments.

² The project background should address the project context, project purpose, project objectives, project logic, funding arrangements, organizational arrangements for implementation, and project major events and milestones.

- After consideration of comments of stakeholders to the report, the draft final report will be subject to approval by the ILO Evaluation Department Focal Point for consequent submission to the ILO Evaluation Office for final clearance. The final report shall be delivered not later than **two weeks** after receiving the comments to the draft report.

3. Management Arrangements

The evaluation team will be comprised of an independent consultant (s) working under the supervision of the ILO Evaluation Manager. The evaluation will be managed by Özge Berber-Agtaş, Senior Programme Officer of the ILO Office for Turkey, under the coordination of Ms Rasha Tabbara, Evaluation Focal Point for the WORKQUALITY Department and Ms Naomi Asukai from ILO Evaluation Office.

4. Qualifications of the Evaluator(s)

- Advanced degree in social sciences, preferably economics, evaluation, and any related field
- A minimum of 5 years of experience in complex, outcome-level evaluations
- Previous experience in conducting programme evaluations as well as multi-stakeholder evaluations
- Knowledge of wage policies and experience in collaboration with the constituents and the private sector
- Excellent analytical, facilitation, writing and communications skills; ability to understand and engage with a wide range of stakeholders
- Expertise on the ILO’s mandate, Decent Work agenda and international labour standards
- Adherence to high professional standards and principles of integrity in accordance with the guiding principles of evaluation professionals associations
- Qualitative and quantitative research skills
- Full command of English is required
- *(Desirable):* Certificate indicating completion of the ILO EVAL’s online *Self-induction programme*. The programme takes one hour, and a certificate is provided upon completion of the programme. The programme is available at http://training.itcilo.org/delta/ILO-EVAL/ILO_Self-induction_Module_for_Evaluation_Consultants-Part-I/story_html5.html.

For this assignment, a pool of CVs from Consultants who demonstrated satisfactory performance in delivering similar assignments with the ILO and other UN agencies will be considered. The final selection of the evaluator will be done by the ILO selection panel based on a short list of candidates with an approval from the Evaluation Focal Point for the WORKQUALITY Department and a final approval by EVAL.

V. TIME FRAME

The following is a tentative schedule of tasks and the anticipated duration of each:

| Responsible Person | Tasks | Proposed Timeline | Number of Days |
|--------------------|---|-------------------|----------------|
| Evaluator | Desk review of project-related documents; Skype briefing with evaluation manager, project manager and UN Women project staff. Prepare inception report including interview questions and questionnaires for project stakeholders | | 10 |

| | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|-----------|
| Evaluator | Interviews and surveys with relevant project staff, stakeholders, and beneficiaries | | 10 |
| Evaluator | Draft report based on desk review, interviews /questionnaires with stakeholders Debriefing/Presentation of preliminary findings | | 10 |
| Evaluation Manager | Circulate draft report to key stakeholders and project team Stakeholders and project team provide comments Consolidate comments of stakeholders and project team and send them to the evaluator | | 10 |
| Evaluator | Finalize the report, including explanations on why comments were not included | | 5 |
| Evaluation Manager | Review the revised report and submit it to Evaluation Department Focal Point for WORKQUALITY and EVAL for final approval | | 5 |
| | Total number of working days for the evaluator | | 35 |

VI. LEGAL AND AETHICAL MATTERS, NORMS AND STANDARDS

The evaluation will be carried out in adherence with the ILO evaluation policy guidelines, UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards and OECD/DAC criteria for evaluating development assistance.

Ethical considerations will be taken into account in the evaluation process. As requested by the UNEG Norms and Standards, the evaluator will be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs, act with integrity and honesty in the relationships with all stakeholders.

The evaluator shall respect people's right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality while ensuring that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source.

Deliverables:

All deliverables and outputs will be in English.

| Deliverable | Deadline for Deliverable Submission |
|---|--|
| Submission of Inception Report | 5 days following the signature of the Contract |
| Conducting interviews with relevant project staff, stakeholders and beneficiaries | 15-25 October 2021 |
| Submission of a Draft Final Report | 15 November 2021 |

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Submission of a Final Report and evaluation summary | 1 December 2021 |
|---|-----------------|

Annex-I: All relevant ILO evaluation guidelines and standard templates

- ILO Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation, 4th Edition, 2020
https://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS_571339/lang-en/index.htm
- Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO: Practical tips on adapting to the situation https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_744068.pdf
Protocol to collect evidence on ILO response to COVID-19
https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_757541.pdf
- 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
- Checklist 5 preparing the evaluation report
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165967/lang-en/index.htm
- Checklist 6 rating the quality of evaluation report
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165968/lang-en/index.htm
- Template for lessons learnt and Emerging Good Practices
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206158/lang-en/index.htm
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206159/lang-en/index.htm
- Guidance note 7 Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang-en/index.htm
- ILO EVAL [Guidance Note 3.1 on integrating gender equality and non-discrimination](#)
- ILO EVAL [Guidance Note 3.2 on Integrating social dialogue and ILS in monitoring and evaluation of projects](#)
- 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>