

## Call for Expressions of Interest

### INDEPENDENT MID-TERM EVALUATION

Title	Improving prospects for forcibly displaced persons and host communities (PROSPECTS)
Countries Covered	Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Sudan, Uganda
Application deadline	12 July 2022
Type of Contract	External Collaboration (individual consultancy contract) or Service Contract, dependent on successful candidate
Expected Duration	August to November 2022
Languages required	Proficiency in written and spoken English (knowledge of local language for National Consultants)

The ILO Evaluation Office is seeking Expressions of Interest from consultants (preferably a team composed of individual international consultants and national consultants who have previous experience working together<sup>1</sup>, or a company that puts the team together) to conduct an independent mid-term evaluation of the “ILO/PROSPECTS” programme, at the global and country level.

The following call is composed of three components:

1. Instructions for submission of EOI (Deadline: 12 July 2022)
2. Terms of Reference for the ILO/PROSPECTS mid-term independent evaluation
3. Questions and Answers: This component aims to address frequently asked questions from potential consultants. Interested candidates may send questions to the Evaluation Manager ([bonne-moreau@iloguest.org](mailto:bonne-moreau@iloguest.org)) until 27 June 2022, and answers will be provided on 30 June 2022. Please check [www.ilo.org/eval](http://www.ilo.org/eval) or follow ILO\_EVAL on Twitter for updates to the Q&A section.

## Required Information for Submission of an Expression of Interest (EOI)

### **Interested candidates intending to submit an EOI must provide the following information:**

- A 4-5 page proposal describing how the skills, qualifications and experience of the candidates/team are relevant to the required qualifications of this assignment, and the proposed approach/methodology to conduct this evaluation. Information on past experience conducting multi-country/complex evaluations is encouraged. The proposal should clearly identify the lead evaluator, roles and responsibilities of team members, as well as communication and reporting lines between them. It should include a tentative workplan with dates;
- A copy of the CVs of all the team members, highlighting previous assignments that are relevant to the context and topic of this assignment, as well as languages spoken;

---

<sup>1</sup> Please note that ILO will only sign a contract with the Evaluation Team Leader, who will be responsible for contractual arrangements with the other team members.

- A list of previous evaluations where the candidate or team leader was the lead author, that are relevant to the context and subject matter of this assignment (especially Forcibly Displaced Persons and socio-economic inclusion in protracted situations), including links (or attachments) to at least two full evaluation reports;
- A statement confirming their availability to conduct this assignment;
- A financial offer confirming the candidate's daily professional fee expressed in US dollars, and any additional expenses. In case of a team, the contribution and fees of each team member should be clearly presented;
- A statement confirming that none of the candidates/team members are engaged or have any previous involvement in the implementation of ILO/PROSPECTS or have a personal relationship with any of the ILO Officials who are engaged in this programme; *any links to ILO should clearly be highlighted and explained*;
- Names and contact details (including email) of two referees who can be contacted for reference.

For further details about the evaluation, please see the Terms of Reference on the following page.

The **deadline to submit an Expression of Interest for undertaking this evaluation is Tuesday 12 July 2022, by 17:00 hrs CET**. Applications should be sent by e-mail with the subject header "ILO/PROSPECTS Mid-term Evaluation" to the Evaluation Manager, Ms. Magali Bonne-Moreau ([bonne-moreau@iloguest.org](mailto:bonne-moreau@iloguest.org)) and copy to Ms. Naomi Asukai, [asukai@ilo.org](mailto:asukai@ilo.org).

## Terms of Reference

### INDEPENDENT MID-TERM EVALUATION

## Improving prospects for forcibly displaced persons and host communities (PROSPECTS)

### Key Facts

1	Title of project being evaluated	Improving prospects for forcibly displaced persons and host communities (PROSPECTS)
2	Project XB Symbol	GLO/19/18/NLD
	Countries	Global, Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Sudan, Uganda
	Start and End Date	1 July 2019 - 30 June 2024
3	Type of evaluation	Independent
4	Timing of evaluation	Mid Term
5	Donor	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Kingdom of the Netherlands
6	Administrative Unit in the ILO responsible for administrating the project	DDG/P
7	Technical Unit(s) in the ILO responsible for backstopping the project	ENTEPRISES (SME, COOP, SOC/FIN), EMPLOYMENT (SKILLS, DEV/INVEST, EMPLAB), FUNDAMENTALS, SOCIAL PROTECTION, GEDI, MIGRANT, INWORK, ACTRAV, ACTEMP
8	P&B outcome(s) under evaluation	Outcomes 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
9	SDG(s) under evaluation	1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 16 and 17
10	Budget	Multi Annual Country Programmes and Multi Annual Global and Regional Programme: US\$ 93,069,307 Opportunity Fund for Round 1 and 2: US\$ 31.021.682

## List of Abbreviations

CCRF - Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework  
DWCP - Decent Work Country Programme  
DWT - Decent Work Team  
EA - Evaluability Assessment  
EM - Evaluation Manager  
EVAL - ILO Evaluation Office  
FDP – Forcibly Displaced People  
FGD – Focus Group Discussions  
HC – Host communities  
HQ – Headquarters  
IDP – Internally Displaced Person  
IFC – International Finance Corporation  
ILO - International Labour Organization  
MACP – Multi-annual Country Programme  
MAGRP – Multi-annual Global and Regional Programme  
M&E - Monitoring and Evaluation  
MTE - Mid Term Evaluation  
P&B - Programme & Budget  
UNHCR - United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees  
UNICEF - United Nations Children's Fund

## Introduction to the programme

The forced displacement crisis has increased in scale and complexity in recent years. According to UNHCR, there were about 84 million forcibly displaced persons (FDP) in mid-2021, of whom about 34.9 million refugees and asylum-seekers. Overall men and women were almost equally represented in the population of concern. Forced displacement is increasingly protracted and disproportionately affects children: one in two refugees worldwide is a child. The overwhelming majority of the forcibly displaced are hosted in developing countries with limited resources and capacities to respond to the situations – with substantive socioeconomic impacts on both forcibly displaced persons (FDP) and host communities (HC).

A new consensus has emerged – especially around the need for displaced persons and host communities to access enhanced economic opportunities, and for children on the move to have effective and inclusive access to protection and education. Significant international support is needed to enhance the education, protection, and economic opportunities available in areas affected by forced displacement – in partnership with the private sector and other stakeholders.

The Partnership for improving prospects for forcibly displaced persons and host communities (PROSPECTS) is a unique four-year partnership (2019–2023), spearheaded by the Government of the Netherlands, that brings together the International Finance Corporation (IFC), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR), the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the World Bank (WB). Together, these partner organisations are developing a joint and fully integrated approach to respond to the forced displacement situation in the Middle East, North Africa and in the Greater Horn of Africa. The rationale for PROSPECTS is to overcome institutional silos, so that the different partner agencies can achieve more by working together than individually, thus leading to more coherent responses.

PROSPECTS aims to facilitate transitioning from humanitarian to development-centred assistance, by addressing long-term challenges and needs of FDPs and HCs and accelerate sustainable solutions to build a more inclusive, cohesive and productive society. This is to be done by aligning and leveraging partners' experience and expertise to develop a new paradigm in responding to forced displacement crises. Through their involvement, development actors can help transform the way governments and other stakeholders, including the private sector, respond to forced displacement crises for both FDPs and HCs through joint and concerted action in three thematic focus areas, referred to as pillars:

1. Education and Learning: Improving access to education and training for forcibly displaced persons and host community members (migrants, returnees, IDPs and refugees);
2. Employment with Dignity: Supporting the creation of decent employment and livelihoods opportunities;
3. Protection and Inclusion: Strengthening social protection for forcibly displaced persons and communities hosting them.

Work to achieve results under the three pillars is delivered by country teams in eight target countries (Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Sudan and Uganda). Common priorities are agreed under multi annual country programmes (MACPs) and an 'Opportunity Fund' provides an added incentive for collaboration: partner agencies can bid for additional funding once a year, provided they submit joint proposals building on existing programmatic success or responding to a newly available opportunity in a target country or at the global level.

A fourth pillar cuts across the other three areas of focus. It lays out the framework for partners' efforts to develop new ways of working, emphasizing results-oriented and learning-based collaborative and

complementary action that leverage each agency's expertise, mandate, and comparative advantage, to respond more forcefully to forced displacement crises.

Within PROSPECTS, the ILO plays a key role in the promotion of decent work and focuses on strengthening local economic development and improving employability by equipping refugees, IDPs and host communities with better and more relevant skills to enter local labour markets and to access enterprise development opportunities.

ILO brings significant expertise and experience in supporting enabling environments to underpin inclusive socio-economic growth and decent work, strengthen labour markets and promote access to improved working conditions and fundamental rights at work, including through the involvement of its tripartite national constituents.

The ILO stimulates labour market demand and immediate job creation through employment-intensive investment, employment service centres, local economic and business development and promotion of specific value chains and market systems. It provides targeted support to labour market institutions, services and compliance and monitoring mechanisms that facilitate the integration of forcibly displaced persons into the labour market in accordance with its strong normative foundation of international labour standards. The ILO also brings expertise on technical and vocational education and training and on the recognition of prior learning for certifying the skills of refugees to better ensure access to the labour market, and methods for assessing labour market demand to provide the right skills to refugees needed by employers. It equally works towards more inclusive social protection systems, focusing on national social security, including health insurance.

PROSPECTS provides a platform to demonstrate the benefits of innovative approaches that can enhance impact on the ground – including, but not limited to, by fostering synergies across the engagement of partnering organizations. Participating institutions are encouraged to create and test innovative approaches to forced displacement leveraging their respective comparative advantages, and to learn from each other, while collaborating in joint endeavours to maximize impact on the ground and to collectively stimulate dialogue with other stakeholders, including host governments. The partnership is expected to build on existing coordination arrangements between partnering organizations and leverage them as may be needed. Synergies are expected to strengthen strategic coordination, to ensure coherence in identifying priority activities and to seek opportunities for complementarity across individual programs.

## Management arrangements

ILO/PROSPECTS consists of a team based in Geneva, and country teams in the field, who are supported by international staff for specific technical areas (i.e. Enterprise, Skills and Employability, Social Protection and Employment Intensive Investment Programme).

From an internal management perspective, ILO/PROSPECTS reports to its Technical Core Advisory Group. The purpose of the Technical Core Advisory Group is to provide strategic and technical guidance to reinforce the ILO's added-value in the partnership programme. It also serves as a platform to ensure coherence, complementarity, collaboration and coordination within and between ILO technical departments involved in the PROSPECTS programme. It is expected that any technical approaches and tools funded and designed under PROSPECTS are adapted to serve the specific objectives of the PROSPECTS Programme and contribute to the ILO Programme and Budget. In this perspective, the Technical Core Advisory Group includes as members the focal points of key technical departments that are involved in the PROSPECTS programme or have a vested interest in the topic of forced displacement (i.e. EMPLOYMENT, SOCIAL PROTECTION, ENTERPRISES, GOVERNANCE,, WORKQUALITY, ACTRAV, ACT/EMP and PARDEV).

## Strategic Alignment

### ILO Programme and Budget (P&B)

ILO/PROSPECTS contributes to several outcomes in the ILO Programme and Budget 2020-21. The regional and global programme contributes to ILO P&B Enabling Outcome A: “Authoritative knowledge and high-impact partnerships for promoting decent work”, and Output A.4<sup>2</sup> in particular.

ILO/PROSPECTS country-level projects contribute to P&B Outcomes 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8.

### Sustainable Development Goals

PROSPECTS is aligned with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and is being implemented within the larger policy framework of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs<sup>3</sup>), as well as other global policy frameworks<sup>4</sup>. PROSPECTS’ Theory of Change actively supports these frameworks and related policies as part of its objectives, such as the ILO’s Guiding Principles on the Access of Refugees and other Forcibly Displaced Persons to the Labour Market, among others.

## Rationale for the evaluation

ILO considers evaluation as an integral part of the implementation of development cooperation activities. The ILO evaluation policy notes that evaluations are undertaken for organisational accountability and learning. Provisions are made in all programmes, in accordance with ILO Evaluation Policy and based on the nature of the programme and the specific requirements; projects with budgets over US\$5 million must undergo a mid-term and a final evaluation, both of which must be independent. This will be the programme’s independent mid-term evaluation (MTE), and a cluster approach will be taken.

The MTE will provide an opportunity to review the performance to-date of ILO/PROSPECTS and enhance organisational learning and accountability to ILO constituents, partners and donors. Findings from the MTE will allow to ascertain if the interventions are still coherent with the ILO’s strategic objectives, are relevant and useful to the key stakeholders and are being conducted in an efficient manner, according to ILO standards and the agreed programme documents.

## Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

### Purpose

The Evaluation will provide an independent assessment of progress on the achievement towards ILO/PROSPECTS’ development objective, assessing performance as per the established indicators vis-à-vis the strategies and implementation modalities chosen in the evolving national and regional contexts, and project management arrangements. The MTE will provide strategic and operational recommendations as well as highlight lessons and good practices to improve performance, delivery and sustainability of results across the programme for the remaining implementation period.

Considering that it is a mid-term evaluation, the approach will largely be learning-oriented and will gather evidence to inform the continuation of the project. It will thus:

---

<sup>2</sup> Output A.4: Strengthened ILO partnerships within the multilateral system for greater integration of the human-centred approach to the future of work into global debates and policies for achieving the SDGs.

<sup>3</sup> SDGs addressed include 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 16 and 17

<sup>4</sup> i.e. The 2016 New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants, the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) and the Global Compact on Refugees (GCR)

- Advise future project implementation;
- Contribute towards organizational learning;
- Help those responsible for managing the resources and activities of ILO/PROSPECTS to enhance development results from the short term to a sustainable long term;
- Assess the effectiveness of planning and management for future impacts; and
- Support accountability by incorporating lessons learned in the decision-making process of project stakeholders, including donors and partners.
- Provide recommendations to programme stakeholders to support the completion, expansion or further development of initiatives supported by the programme, especially if a Phase 2 of the programme is to be designed.

## Scope

The mid-term evaluation will cover the period from the launch of the project in July 2019 to July 2022, and will take a cluster approach.

Despite PROSPECTS being a Partnership across UNICEF, UNHCR, ILO, IFC and the World Bank, the main focus of the evaluation will be the work implemented under ILO/PROSPECTS. The evaluation will cover all outcomes and outputs that have resulted from the implementation of ILO/PROSPECTS. It will have full geographic coverage, assessing both the global component of the programme managed by ILO HQ, and the different country programmes, as well as projects funded through the Opportunity Fund.

As a cluster evaluation, it is expected that the linkages between the various ILO initiatives at global and country levels will be analysed. For each evaluation criterion, the MTE will examine both on the individual interventions and the interconnectedness of interventions within ILO's work in different countries.

The MTE will thus focus on ILO/PROSPECTS' achievements and its contribution to the overall socio-economic improvement of FDPs and HC members in the targeted countries, as well as to ILO and wider policy frameworks, and to SDG targets. The evaluation will also review and assess the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and ongoing socio-political crises on project implementation, and identify possible lessons learned in this context.

The evaluation should also provide early findings on the effectiveness of the Opportunity Fund projects in which ILO takes part, which includes other partners as well. In particular, the evaluation should assess the extent to which interventions jointly designed and implemented with other agencies add value to ILO's relevance in forced displacement contexts. The ILO's collaboration with other partners to leverage comparative advantages will be another element to examine.

The target groups of the evaluation are programme beneficiaries, especially working-age women and men, both from FDP and HC. Other indirect stakeholders are social partners and representatives of government institutions (i.e. policy and lawmakers, and those implementing policies, laws and programmes), as well as implementing partners. The evaluation should cover and reflect gender and disability inclusion-related issues, in the methodology, data collection as well in its analysis of findings, as well as ILO cross-cutting issues tripartism, social dialogue and the promotion of International Labour Standards.



## Clients of the evaluation

The primary clients of the evaluation will be the ILO/PROSPECTS team, as well as ILO Country Offices in targeted countries and other member agencies of the PROSPECTS partnership, ILO departments and the donor (both embassies, as well as the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands). The evaluation will also be useful to other groups, including national and regional governments, social partners, implementing partners of the PROSPECTS partnership at country level, other ILO projects in crisis contexts, UN and other organisations working on the forced displacement response, academics interested in furthering knowledge on forced displacement, and beneficiary groups.

## Evaluation Criteria and Questions

The mid-term evaluation will adhere to the [OECD Development Assistance Committee \(DAC\) evaluation criteria](#) and establish the relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and any evidence of impact to-date of ILO/PROSPECTS. The [ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation](#) and their technical and ethical standards and the Code of Conduct for Evaluation of the UN System<sup>5</sup> are established within these criteria, and the evaluation should therefore adhere to these to ensure an internationally credible evaluation.

The evaluation will examine:

- a) Relevance and strategic fit: the extent to which the objectives are in keeping with global, national and local priorities and needs, constituents' priorities and needs;
- b) Coherence: this includes internal coherence and external coherence, in particular, synergies and fit with other ILO projects working in situations of forced displacement, national initiatives, other PROSPECTS partners, and with other donor-supported projects;
- c) Validity of design: the extent to which the project design, logic, strategy and elements are/ remain valid vis-à-vis problems and needs, including the COVID-19 pandemic and socio-economic-political strife;
- d) Effectiveness: the extent to which ILO/PROSPECTS can be said to have contributed to the immediate objectives, achieved expected outcomes, and whether planned outputs were produced in a timely and satisfactory manner. Identification of supporting factors and constraints that have led to this achievement or lack of achievement; and unintended changes at the policy, institutional and beneficiaries' level, both positive and negative at outcome level, in addition to the expected results;
- e) Sustainability and impact: the adequacy of the sustainability strategy, its progress, and its potential for achievement, with identification of results that are likely to be maintained by stakeholders beyond project completion; evidence of progress towards impact
- f) Efficiency: the extent to which the programme has been implemented efficiently, how it may have achieved value for money, and the adequacy of financial and human resources;
- g) Cross-cutting policy drivers: the extent to which ILO/PROSPECTS contributed to promoting gender equality, inclusion of persons with disabilities, social dialogue and tripartism, international labour standards, as well as the just transition to environmentally sustainable economies;

It is expected that the evaluation addresses these criteria by answering the questions detailed below, as appropriate to each country context. These questions will be reviewed and refined during the inception phase, in consultation with the Evaluation Manager. They will be organised in the form of an Evaluation Question Matrix (EQM) and presented in the inception report.

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866>

OECD/DAC Criteria	Evaluation questions
<p><b>RELEVANCE: Are interventions doing the right things?</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Have PROSPECTS interventions at country and global levels been designed and implemented in a consultative process, in accordance to the needs and capacities of constituents, taking the different country contexts into account?</li> <li>2. Do the intervention objectives and design respond to the real and emerging needs of final beneficiaries? How were intersecting dimensions such as national status (refugees, IDPs, HC members), gender, religion, race and identity, and disability addressed?</li> <li>3. What are the components of PROSPECTS that have higher/lower relevance to different stakeholder groups (e.g. government representatives, social partners, FDPs and HCs)? What have been the most effective approaches to increase relevance for stakeholders?</li> <li>4. To what extent is the intervention design valid and realistic in each respective country/context to deliver planned results? Do activities and outputs causally link to the intended short-term and medium-term outcomes? Are the approaches taken appropriate to achieve immediate objectives, given the intervention logic, time and resources available? Were all relevant stakeholders engaged in the design phase, and if not, why? Were assumptions and risks properly identified and factored into the design? To what extent are PROSPECTS' theory of change, assumptions and risks still relevant at the global and country levels? Does the design need to be modified in the second half of the programme?</li> <li>5. Does the PROSPECTS strategy and intervention design remain valid in the context of COVID-19? To what extent have PROSPECTS interventions provided a timely and relevant response to constituents' needs and priorities in the COVID-19 context, especially for forcibly displaced and host community women, youth, and persons living with a disability?</li> <li>6. To what extent has the design adapted to changing contexts?</li> <li>7. Do the PROSPECTS theory of change and results framework, and overall design give adequate consideration to ILO cross-cutting policy issues related to gender equality and disability inclusion, as well as the promotion of relevant ILS, social dialogue, tripartism, and the just transition to environmentally sustainable economies?</li> </ol>
<p><b>COHERENCE: How well do interventions fit?</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are PROSPECTS interventions at the country level aligned with national priorities and policies? Do they respond to priorities identified by constituent groups?</li> <li>2. How well-aligned are the PROSPECTS strategy and country interventions with ILO Programme and Budget Outcomes? Are they aligned with Decent Work Country Programme Strategies and CPOs? To what extent have they contributed to these?</li> <li>3. To what extent has PROSPECTS built on the comparative advantage of the ILO? Is there evidence of mutual leveraging and complementarity? Are there any points which have not yet been pursued, but should be?</li> <li>4. How do ILO/PROSPECTS interventions fit in the wider UN Global and national frameworks and address SDGs?</li> </ol>

**EFFECTIVENESS: Are interventions achieving their objectives?**

5. To what extent is PROSPECTS on track to achieve expected results (outcomes and outputs) at global and country levels? What is the likelihood of countries achieving expected results by the end of the programme period? Are any components of the PROSPECTS performance framework particularly successful in making progress towards objectives?
6. To what extent has each individual country-level intervention contributed to the overall PROSPECTS objectives (keeping in mind the different scopes of country interventions)?
7. What general and/or country-specific factors can be identified as facilitating / hindering progress towards results? Are there specific areas that countries should address in their remaining project periods and/or upcoming strategies for a next phase?
8. To what extent have PROSPECTS strategies effectively adapted to unexpected changes at the global and country level e.g. the COVID-19 pandemic and/or socio-economic-political conflict? Is the programme agile enough to respond to emerging needs?
9. How and to what extent has ILO/PROSPECTS contributed to new or revised policy and legal initiatives to enhance the socio-economic integration of FDPs into HCs? Have advocacy efforts led to changes at the policy level? Has the programme increased the voice and representation of vulnerable groups (e.g. women, youth and persons with disabilities) in targeted communities?
10. How effective was the complementarity between ILO and the other PROSPECTS partner agencies, and how did they work together across the three core pillars?
11. To what extent and how have partnerships established at global, regional and country levels contributed to the achievement of the ILO/PROSPECTS objectives?
12. To what extent has ILO/PROSPECTS engaged with, and worked through social partners? Have there been any missed opportunities?
13. Was ILO/PROSPECTS able to maximize synergies and establish effective collaboration with new or external actors, while limiting duplication of efforts/resources? Should any other partnerships be considered to better deliver the programme, beyond the other PROSPECTS partners?

**ILO Cross-cutting policy issues:**

14. How were social dialogue and tripartism promoted and used to make progress towards PROSPECTS objectives at country and regional and global levels?
15. To what extent has PROSPECTS promoted awareness of, and compliance with International Labour Standards (ILS) at the country and global levels, and built on ILO's comparative advantage in normative work?
16. To what extent and how has PROSPECTS mainstreamed gender equality at country and global levels?
17. To what extent and how has PROSPECTS incorporated and encouraged disability inclusion at country and global levels?
18. To what extent has PROSPECTS supported greater understanding and buy-in of the fair transition to an environmentally sustainable economy at the country and global levels, and among key partners/collaborators?

**EFFICIENCY: How well are resources being used?**

19. To what extent have financial and human resources been allocated strategically to achieve expected results at global and country levels? Were they used efficiently? Were funds and activities delivered in a timely and cost-effective manner? Was staffing adequate to implement and monitor the programme? In general, do the results achieved justify the costs?
20. To what extent has ILO/PROSPECTS leveraged resources with other ILO projects/programmes, to enhance the programme's results and efficiency? How effective is the collaboration between ILO departments and ILO/PROSPECTS?
21. To what extent has ILO added value to the work of other PROSPECTS partner organisations?
22. Are management arrangements adequate at the different levels of implementation, with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and known among different actors/partners? Was technical backstopping sought and received from specialists when needed, and were arrangements effective? How effective is communication between the different actors involved?
23. Does the programme at global and country levels receive adequate administrative, technical, and political support from ILO?
24. To what extent are ILO/PROSPECTS country and global-level interventions learning from each other's experiences and creating synergies?
25. Were synergies created among the country interventions under review, and across pillars (education, employment, and social protection)? How did they mutually reinforce each other?
26. How were results achieved attributed to the New Ways of Working of the partnership vs. ILO standalone action?
27. To what extent did ILO's support in the targeted countries act as a catalyst for change? To what extent did ILO work help leverage additional resources in the country?
28. Is the ILO/PROSPECTS results framework used for strategic decision-making, implementation and to support responses to contextual changes? Do these link to each other with regards to an overall results framework? Are there SMART indicators linked outcomes, realistic performance targets, with milestones and baselines?
29. Have monitoring and reporting frameworks been established and used to measure and report progress at country levels? Were the recommendations of the 2020 (Jordan) and 2021 (Global) Evaluability Assessments addressed and followed-up? Are MACP updates responsive to changes in implementation contexts, and to what extent have ILO inputs been included?
30. Is there a strategy to document and disseminate knowledge from the PROSPECTS programme internally and externally? How effectively does PROSPECTS communicate its results and progress at country and global levels?

<p><b>SUSTAINABILITY and IMPACT: Will the benefits last?</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>31. To what extent are PROSPECTS results at global and country levels likely to be durable and maintained? Is there a sustainable exit strategy?</li> <li>32. What are the key factors that influence the ability of stakeholders to sustain ILO/PROSPECTS results? Is there evidence of ownership by constituents and target stakeholders, or changes in their behaviours and practices?</li> <li>33. What are the most critical factors influencing the success of sustainability strategies? What measures should be built into ILO/PROSPECTS interventions for increased sustainability of intervention results?</li> <li>34. Is there any visible progress towards impacts at this stage of implementation? To what extent has ILO/PROSPECTS contributed to this? What are the most significant elements to date that have influenced impacts?</li> <li>35. To what extent have country interventions been successful in reaching end-beneficiaries? Have all beneficiary groups benefited equally from ILO/PROSPECTS interventions? Have certain groups been left out, and why?</li> <li>36. What are the current and anticipated effects of COVID-19 on the sustainability and impact of ILO/PROSPECTS interventions, and how can this be addressed during the remaining project period?</li> </ol>
--	---

When and where relevant, evaluation questions will also be guided by the [ILO protocol on collecting evaluative evidence on the ILO’s COVID-19 response measure through project and programme evaluations](#). The independent evaluators, the evaluation manager, and the ILO/PROSPECTS team, under the guidance of EVAL, should propose alternative methodologies to address the data collection during the inception phase of the evaluation. These will be reflected in the Inception Report.

The different needs of women and men and of marginalized groups targeted by the programme should be considered throughout the evaluation process, and gender concerns should be addressed in accordance with [EVAL Guidance note 3.1: “Integrating Gender Equality in the Monitoring and Evaluation of Projects”](#) and [EVAL Guidance Note 4.5: “Stakeholder engagement”](#) should be taken into consideration to ensure stakeholder participation. The evaluation will also address disability inclusion as a cross-cutting concern throughout its deliverables and processes, including in the final report. All data should be sex, age and disability disaggregated whenever possible.

## Methodology

The evaluation will comply with evaluation norms and standards and follow ethical safeguards, all as specified in ILO’s evaluation procedures. The ILO adheres to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) evaluation norms and standards as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards. The evaluation is an independent evaluation and the final approach, methodology and evaluation questions will be determined by the lead consultant in consultation with the Evaluation Manager.

The evaluation will apply a **mixed methods approach**, collecting and analysing both quantitative and qualitative data. This should allow for triangulation of information to increase the validity and rigor of the evaluation findings, and the ability to capture the achievement of expected and unexpected outcomes. The methodology should clearly state the limitations of the chosen evaluation methods, including those related to representation of specific group of stakeholders.

The evaluation will comprise an **exhaustive desk review** of relevant project-related documentation including an examination of PROSPECTS’ theory of change and logical framework, to see if there is a logical connect between levels of results and alignment with ILO’s strategic objectives and outcomes and the global and national levels, as well as with relevant SDGs; **individual interviews and/or focus**

**group discussions** with, *inter alia*, staff in ILO Headquarters and field offices, technical backstopping officials, implementing partners, donors, PROSPECTS partners and other development partners, and direct and ultimate beneficiaries. The evaluation team may have to revise data and interview some stakeholders from the other partners specifically for the Opportunity Fund portfolio.

It is proposed that the evaluators consider doing several thematic case studies across different countries, to complete their analysis of the effectiveness ILO/PROSPECTS, possibly building on existing research and data. The topics will be proposed by the evaluation team during the inception phase, after initial briefings and the desk review. Online surveys may also be conducted, as deemed necessary. Involvement of key stakeholders at all levels in the evaluation design, data collection, reporting and dissemination stages should be ensured, in line with [Guidance Note 4.5](#).

The current COVID-19 pandemic severely restricts the mobility of staff and consultants. Based on the matrix developed by the ILO on the constraints and risks as measured against the criticality of the evaluation to the ILO, evaluation of the global component evaluation will be conducted remotely. It can be envisaged to have field visits for up to three project countries<sup>6</sup>, if the evaluation team includes national consultants, and depending on the COVID-19 pandemic evolution. A hybrid face-to-face/remote approach for collecting data will thus be taken. [ILO Evaluation Office guidance on the evaluation process during COVID-19](#) should serve as the main guidance on the subject.

The Evaluation Manager will facilitate the compilation of documentation and facilitate contacts to establish an interview schedule. Key questions to be asked during interviews will be prepared by the evaluation team. It may be relevant to circulate a questionnaire to key stakeholders ahead of time.

The evaluation should include the [gender dimension](#) and disability inclusion<sup>7</sup> as cross-cutting issues throughout the methodology and deliverables. The evaluators will ensure that the views and perceptions of both women and men and Persons with Disabilities are reflected in the interviews and that specific questions regarding these groups are included. The evaluation should also consider and integrate other core ILO cross-cutting priorities, including promotion of International Labour Standards and ILO's normative work; the fair transition to environmental sustainability; tripartism and social dialogue and constituent capacity development. To the extent possible, data collection and analysis should be disaggregated by sex as described in the [ILO Evaluation Policy Guidelines and relevant Guidance Notes](#).

## Main deliverables

The deliverables to be produced by the evaluation team are presented and detailed further below. All documents, including drafts and final outputs, supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data must be presented in English and submitted to the Evaluation Manager in electronic version compatible with Word for Windows:

1. **Inception report**
2. **Draft evaluation report**
3. **Stakeholder workshop(s)**
4. **Final evaluation report**
5. **Evaluation Summary and a fact sheet**
6. **Quantitative and qualitative data collected during the evaluation**

---

<sup>6</sup> Selection of field visit locations should be based on criteria defined and justified by the evaluation team. To the extent possible, selection of locations should also take into account the socio-political and cultural contexts as well as programme investment in a particular location.

<sup>7</sup> Guidance for disability inclusion is available here: <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/3050>

The following procedure will be followed in submitting the inception report, draft and final evaluation reports:

1. The Evaluation Team Leader will submit the report to the Evaluation Manager.
2. The Evaluation Manager will forward a copy to the ILO/PROSPECTS team, donor and other key stakeholders for comments, inputs and factual corrections.
3. The Evaluation Manager will consolidate all comments and send them to the Evaluation Team Leader.
4. The revised report will be submitted to the Evaluation Manager with any explanation why certain comments might not have been reflected in the report.
5. Once the report is approved, it will be forwarded to key stakeholders and disseminated by the Evaluation Manager. The evaluation report is considered final when it is approved by ILO Evaluation Office.

**Deliverable 1: Inception report** (cf. [Checklist 4.8 Writing the inception report](#))

The inception report should:

- Describe the conceptual framework that will be used to undertake the evaluation, notably justifying and explaining the approach to be taken;
- Elaborate the methodology proposed in the TOR, including the final evaluation questions (presented in a matrix), case studies, justification of countries for field visits if relevant, and justification of any changes as required;
- Set out in some detail the data required to answer the evaluation questions, data sources by specific evaluation questions; data collection instruments, triangulation and analysis methods; sampling and selection criteria of respondents for interviews, and identification of case study topics;
- Detail the work plan for the evaluation, indicating the phases in the evaluation, their key activities, deliverables and milestones;
- Identify key stakeholders to be interviewed and the tools to be used for interviews and discussions;
- Provide an outline for the final evaluation report.

The Evaluation Manager will review and sign off on the inception report.

**Deliverable 2: Draft evaluation report**

Suggested outline for the evaluation report:

- Title page with key project data
- An executive summary, with the project background, evaluation background, methodology, key findings, conclusions and recommendations, as well as any lessons learned or good practices
- Brief background on the project and its intervention logic
- Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation
- Evaluation criteria and evaluation question matrix
- Methodology applied, including limitations, and a short reflection on the process of the evaluation identifying the lessons learnt and suggestions for future PROSPECTS evaluations
- Presentation of findings addressing all evaluation questions, with a table presenting key results (i.e. figures and qualitative results) achieved per outcome and output (expected and unexpected)
- Conclusions
- Recommendations (specifying to whom they are addressed, timeframe and resource implications)
- Lessons learned and emerging good practices (detailed further in the ILO standard templates)

- Annexes (including case studies)

The evaluation will follow the ILO EVAL [Checklist 4.2 “Preparing the evaluation report”](#) and [Checklist 4.9 “Rating the quality of evaluation reports”](#). The Evaluation Manager will do a quality standard review of the draft report before circulating it for comments to all concerned stakeholders and project staff. The Evaluation Manager will collect all comments and forward the consolidated comments to the lead evaluator in a standard comments log table.

### **Deliverable 3: Stakeholder workshop(s)<sup>8</sup> and PPT presentation**

After the evaluation team has completed the data collection process and initial analysis, findings should be presented to all key stakeholders for validation in the form of an online workshop, once the draft report is available. Participants will be encouraged to give feedback and inputs on the preliminary findings and recommendations presented, and translation should be considered depending on the language of stakeholders. The PowerPoint presentation will be provided to the Evaluation Manager as one of the deliverables. The timing of the stakeholder workshop should be clearly specified in the inception report.

**Deliverable 4: Final evaluation report** (using the relevant templates for the Title Page, the Executive Summary and Annexes including lessons learned and emerging good practices in the ILO Templates).

The final report, excluding annexes but including an executive summary (as per template provided in ILO Policy Guidelines for Evaluation) should aim not to exceed 50 pages. The final report shall make all necessary adjustments to integrate comments received<sup>9</sup>, including feedback from stakeholders. When submitting the final report, the lead evaluator should also provide a completed comments log table to the Evaluation Manager, with observations on which comments were addressed, as well as those that were not.

The expected structure of the final report as per the proposed structure in the ILO evaluation guidelines is outlined below:

- Title page with key intervention and evaluation data
- Table of contents, including boxes, figures and tables
- List of acronyms
- Executive Summary using standard ILO template
- Programme background
- Evaluation background (purpose, scope and clients of evaluation)
- Evaluation criteria and questions (including ILO cross-cutting policy issues)
- Methodology
- Main findings (organized by evaluation criteria)
- Case studies (these may also go in an annex)
- Conclusions
- Lessons learned and emerging good practices
- Global and country-specific recommendations
- Annexes

---

<sup>8</sup> If field work can take place, in-country debriefing sessions with the Country Team and other key ILO staff could be considered, to present preliminary findings based on the evidence collected at the country. This will be determined by the Evaluation Team and the EM.

<sup>9</sup> There may be more than one round of comments.



The evaluators are required to append the following items:

- Lessons learned based on the ILO template
- Emerging good practices based on the ILO template
- Terms of Reference
- Evaluation Questions Matrix, including data collection instruments
- List of persons or organizations interviewed
- Bibliography
- Any further information the evaluator deems appropriate can also be added.

The Evaluation Manager will review the final version and submit it to ILO Evaluation Office (EVAL) for their final approval. The quality of the final report will be assessed against the standards set out in the ILO Policy Guidelines for Evaluation, and the lead evaluator is expected to familiarize themselves with these.

#### **Deliverable 5: Evaluation summary and Fact Sheet<sup>10</sup>**

This deliverable shall be prepared based on the template provided in [Checklist 4.4 Preparing the Evaluation Report Summary](#). The Evaluation Summary shall only be prepared once the final evaluation report has been approved. Contents for a short fact sheet and infographics could also be provided, upon discussion and agreement with the evaluation manager. The Evaluation summary should be translated into Arabic.

#### **Deliverable 6: Quantitative and qualitative data collected during the evaluation**

The evaluation team will share all qualitative and quantitative data collected during the evaluation process with the ILO. The modalities will be discussed and agreed upon with the Evaluation Manager and the individual country interventions.

#### **Completion criteria**

Deliverables will be regarded as delivered when they have been received electronically by the Evaluation Manager, and that a confirmation message has been sent by the Evaluation Manager.

Acceptance will be acknowledged only if the deliverables are judged to be in accordance with the requirements set out in the contract, to reflect agreements reached and plans submitted during the contract process, and incorporate or reflect consideration of amendments proposed by ILO. In particular, the evaluation report will be considered final only when it is approved by ILO Evaluation Office. Once approved, the evaluation report, good practices, and lessons learned will be uploaded and stored in the [ILO i-eval Discovery](#) database, to provide easy access to all development partners, to reach target audiences and to maximize the benefits of the evaluation.

## Management arrangements

The evaluation will be managed by an Evaluation Manager working for the ILO with no prior involvement in the project, with oversight provided by the ILO Evaluation Office (EVAL). For this assignment, the Evaluation Manager is Ms. Magali Bonne-Moreau ([bonne-moreau@iloguest.org](mailto:bonne-moreau@iloguest.org)).

**The Evaluation Manager** will undertake the following tasks:

- Serve as the first point of contact for the evaluators;
- Provide background documentation to the evaluators, in collaboration with the ILO/PROSPECTS team;
- Brief the evaluators on ILO evaluation procedures;

---

<sup>10</sup> For a sample fact-sheet, see <https://www.ilo.org/eval/comms-products/infographics/lang--en/index.htm>

- Ensure proper stakeholder involvement;
- Approve the inception report;
- Monitor the implementation of the evaluation methodology, as appropriate and in such a way as to minimize bias in the evaluation findings;
- Review and circulate draft and final reports to all concerned stakeholders for comments;
- Assist with the stakeholder workshop(s);
- Consolidate comments for the evaluators.

ILO/PROSPECTS teams at Global and country levels will be actively engaged in the evaluation process and provide relevant inputs required by the evaluators. The ILO/PROSPECTS M&E Officer will be the focal point within PROSPECTS for the evaluation. The PROSPECTS teams will provide administrative and logistical support during the evaluation process (in line with ILO rules and regulations):

- Provide programme background materials to the evaluation team through the Evaluation Manager;
- Provide a comprehensive overview of existing data to the Evaluation Team Leader;
- Prepare a comprehensive list of stakeholders to be interviewed, facilitate introductions, and assist in organizing stakeholder consultations;
- Provide assistance in the coordination of in-country logistical arrangements, including interview schedules, referrals to interpretation services, and in-country transportation<sup>11</sup>, as needed;
- Provide inputs as requested by the evaluators during the evaluation process;
- Review and provide comments on draft evaluation reports;
- Make recommendations for the organisation of validation workshops;
- Provide any other logistical and administrative support to the evaluation team, as may be required.

Given the large scope of work of the PROSPECTS programme, this independent MTE may be carried out by a team of evaluators or a company. The team composition should include sufficient team members to cover the required scope of work, with an international consultant (team leader) and national experts.

The Team Leader will report to the Evaluation Manager and be responsible for the timely submission of the deliverables detailed above, including the final evaluation report, which should comply with ILO's Evaluation Policy Guidelines and related checklists and templates. It is expected that the team leader will identify and collaborate with national consultants who will support the evaluation at country-level in Egypt, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Kenya, Lebanon, Sudan<sup>12</sup> and Uganda. The national consultants will report to the Team Leader. Under their guidance, national experts will be responsible for the implementation of data collection activities at country level. The Team Leader is responsible for coordinating with regional/national consultants and to ensure the evaluation meets the requirements specified in the TOR. The ILO/PROSPECTS programme team will provide administrative and logistical support during the evaluation process, including any field missions.

The evaluation will be funded from the ILO/PROSPECTS budget. The funds will cover the daily fees of the evaluation team, any evaluation missions (if relevant) and daily subsistence allowance (DSA) during field visits at the standard UN rate.

---

<sup>11</sup> While ILO/PROSPECTS may provide some assistance, the evaluation team will be primarily responsible for logistical and travel arrangements related to the MTE.

<sup>12</sup> Due to the current political situation in Sudan, evaluation of this country project will be done remotely, and may be very limited in scope.

## Profile of the evaluation team

The evaluation team should be composed of an international lead evaluator and national evaluators/team members, to divide the work and cover all countries listed in these TOR. It is possible for a national evaluator to cover more than one country, based on their experience and proven capacities. Gender balance of the evaluation team is expected, and the final composition of the team must be endorsed by the ILO before the signing of the contract.

Team members should have the following experience and qualifications:

- No previous involvement/engagement in the design and delivery of ILO/PROSPECTS programme;
- At least 8-10 years of experience evaluating policies, programmes, and projects at the international level (team leader) and 5 years for country level (national consultants), in particular with policy-level work, institutional building and local development programmes; proven experience using a systems approach to evaluation would be an advantage;
- Experience in conducting evaluations for the ILO, including multi-country programme evaluations (team leader);
- Relevant background in social and/or economic development with a specialization in forced displacement, socio-economic inclusion and decent work;
- Relevant sub-regional and/or country experience;
- Familiarity with the ILO's normative and social dialogue mandate, tripartite structure and cross-cutting issues of gender and inclusion, decent work, and the fair transition to environmentally sustainable economies, as well as the ILO's internal processes;
- Adequate contextual knowledge of UN programming, including SDGs, and of UN evaluation norms;
- Extensive knowledge of, and experience in applying participatory qualitative and quantitative evaluation methodologies, and an understanding of issues related to validity and reliability;
- Demonstrated ability to use on-line tools for data collection and analysis (surveys, interviews, stakeholder workshops);
- Strong capacity to analyse, triangulate, synthesise and present different types of data, both quantitatively, and qualitatively;
- Excellent consultative, communication and interviewing skills, with experience conducting key informant interviews and focus group discussions;
- Demonstrated ability to deliver quality results within strict deadlines;
- Fluency in written and spoken English and excellent report-writing skills in English for the team leader, and spoken Arabic would be an advantage; fluent English and relevant local language skills for the national consultants;
- Available for work between August and November 2022, including possible travel to field visit countries, should international health regulations allow.
- All team members should have proven ability to work with others in the development and timely delivery of high-quality deliverables.

## Tentative workplan and timeframe

It is anticipated that the evaluation will take place between August and November 2022, based on the proposed workplan below. Work days can be split among team members. This is a tentative allocation of work days per phase, and the evaluation team may wish to re-allocate days to different phases, as long as the level of effort remains unchanged. The level of effort expected by the evaluation team leader is about 60 days, plus 15-20 days per country for national/regional team members.

Table 1. Proposed work plan and tentative level of effort

Task/Deliverable	Responsible person	Work days	Tentative Deadlines
<b>Inception phase</b>			
Initial briefing with Evaluation Manager and PROSPECTS team(s)	Evaluation team	2 days	Week of 1 <sup>st</sup> August 2022
Desk review / drafting of inception report	Evaluation team	15 days	24 August 2022
Review and clearance of inception report	Evaluation Manager	---	
Circulation of draft inception report to PROSPECTS stakeholders, consolidation of comments to be sent to Lead Evaluator	Evaluation Manager	---	
<b>Final inception report (Deliverable 1)</b>	Evaluation team	2 days	7 September 2022
<b>Data collection</b>			
Data collection via interviews with key stakeholders	Evaluation team	25 days for lead evaluator, 10-15 days for each regional/national expert	September - October 2022
<b>Evaluation report and stakeholder workshop</b>			
<b>Draft evaluation report (Deliverable 2),</b> including case studies.	Evaluation team, including national experts	15 days for the main report, and 4 days/case study	Late October 2022
Draft agenda and draft presentation for the stakeholder workshop(s)	Evaluation team	2 days	Late October 2022
Restitution/validation workshops (online) with stakeholders <b>(Deliverable 3)</b>	Evaluation team	1 day	Early November 2022
Review and clearance of draft report	Evaluation Manager	---	
Circulation of draft evaluation report to PROSPECTS stakeholders, consolidation of comments	Evaluation Manager	---	
Finalize evaluation report, including annexes and a completed comments log table <b>(Deliverable 4)</b>	Evaluation team	5 days	Mid-November 2022
<b>Report approval and Evaluation Summary and Fact sheet</b>			
Review and clearance of final evaluation report	Evaluation Manager	---	
Approval of evaluation report	EVAL	---	
Drafting of evaluation summary and fact sheet, and sharing of data collected <b>(Deliverables 5 and 6)</b>	Evaluation team	1 day	End of November 2022

## Legal and Ethical Matters

The evaluation will strictly comply with UN standards for evaluations as specified in the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation and be guided by the ILO Evaluation

Policy. The evaluators are expected to familiarise themselves with, and adhere to the [UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system](#). The evaluators will also commit to adhere to the [ILO Code of Conduct for Evaluators](#). The evaluators should not have any links to the management of this project, or any other conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of the evaluation. They are expected to disclose any possible conflicts of interest that could interfere with the independence of the evaluation.

Evaluators must act with cultural sensitivity and pay particular attention to protocols, codes and recommendations that may be relevant to their interactions with refugees, persons living with a disability, women and minority groups.

The evaluation will observe confidentiality with regards to sensitive information and feedback obtained through individual and group interviews.

Ownership of data from the evaluation rests exclusively with the ILO. The copyright of the evaluation report will rest exclusively with the ILO. Use of the data for publication and other presentations can only be made with the written agreement of the ILO.

## **Annex A: Essential documents for conducting ILO evaluations**

Evaluators are expected to familiarize themselves and seek guidance from the following documentation:

- ILO Policy Guidelines for evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. [http://www.ilo.ch/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS\\_571339/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.ch/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS_571339/lang--en/index.htm)
- ILO Evaluation Policy (2017) [https://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationreports/WCMS\\_603265/lang--en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationreports/WCMS_603265/lang--en/index.htm)
- ILO Code of Conduct Agreement for Evaluators (To be signed by the evaluators): [wcms\\_746806.pdf](wcms_746806.pdf) (ilo.org)
- UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (2008): <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/548>
  
- Checklist 4.2 Preparing the evaluation report: [wcms\\_746808.pdf](wcms_746808.pdf) (ilo.org)
- Checklist 4.3 Filling in the Evaluation Title Page: [wcms\\_746810.pdf](wcms_746810.pdf) (ilo.org)
- Checklist 4.4 Preparing the Evaluation Report Summary: [wcms\\_746811.pdf](wcms_746811.pdf) (ilo.org)
- Checklist 4.5 Documents for project evaluators: [wcms\\_746812.pdf](wcms_746812.pdf) (ilo.org)
- Checklist 4.8 Writing the inception report: [wcms\\_746817.pdf](wcms_746817.pdf) (ilo.org)
- Checklist 4.9 Rating the quality of evaluation reports: [wcms\\_746818.pdf](wcms_746818.pdf) (ilo.org)
  
- Guidance note 3.1 Integrating Gender Equality in the Monitoring and Evaluation of Projects: [wcms\\_165986.pdf](wcms_165986.pdf) (ilo.org)
- Guidance Note 3.2 Adapting evaluation methods to the ILO's normative and tripartite mandate: [wcms\\_746717.pdf](wcms_746717.pdf) (ilo.org)
- Guidance Note 3.3 Strategic clustered evaluations: [wcms\\_746718.pdf](wcms_746718.pdf) (ilo.org)
- Guidance Note 4.3 Data collection methods (includes Checklist 4.1 Validating methodologies): [wcms\\_746722.pdf](wcms_746722.pdf) (ilo.org)
- Guidance note 4.5 Stakeholder engagement: [wcms\\_746724.pdf](wcms_746724.pdf) (ilo.org)
  
- Template 4.1: Lessons learned: [wcms\\_746820.pdf](wcms_746820.pdf) (ilo.org)
- Template 4.2: Emerging good practices: [wcms\\_746821.pdf](wcms_746821.pdf) (ilo.org)
  
- Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO – Practical tips on adapting to the situation [wcms\\_744068.pdf](wcms_744068.pdf) (ilo.org)
  
- Protocol on collecting evaluative evidence on the ILO's COVID-19 response measures through project and programme evaluations, effective on 9 Oct 2020 [https://www.ilo.org/eval/WCMS\\_757541/lang--en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/eval/WCMS_757541/lang--en/index.htm)

## Questions and Answers

In order to promote full transparency in the recruitment phase of this evaluation, the Evaluation Manager, in coordination with EVAL, will compile questions from interested evaluators until 27 June 2022, and answers will be provided by 30 June 2022. Please check the EVAL website ([www.ilo.org/eval](http://www.ilo.org/eval)) or follow ILO\_EVAL on twitter for updates to the Q&A section.