



## Call for Expression of Interest (EoI)

### What works and does not and why in Decent Work Country Programmes 2020 - 2024? A synthesis-review of DWCPs Country Programme Reviews and High-level Evaluations -March-May 2025-

The Evaluation Office of the International Labour Organisation (ILO/ ILO-EVAL) is seeking expressions of interest from a qualified consultant to conduct a synthesis-review of Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) Reviews and High-level Evaluations (2020-2024).

**Type of contract:** External Collaboration Contract.

**Expected duration of assignment:** 25 working days for a consultant over an overall period of 3 months (March-May 2025).

For further details about the evaluation, see the ToRs below.

#### Profile of Evaluator (s)

1. A description of how the candidate skills, qualifications and experience are relevant to this assignment (maximum 2 pages).
2. The candidate curriculum vitae (CV) highlighting the candidate skills, qualifications and experience that are relevant to the assignment.
3. A list of previous reports that are relevant to the context and subject matter of this assignment, highlighted in the CV.
4. A statement confirming the availability to conduct this assignment, and the professional daily fee expressed in US dollars (no travel is planned).
5. A statement confirming that the candidate has no previous involvement in the planning or implementation of DWCPs.
6. The names of two referees (including phone and email) who can be contacted.

**The deadline to submit expression of interest for undertaking the assignment is no later than 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2025.**

Please send an e-mail with the subject header "DWCP Synthesis review" to EVAL, SECRETARIAT [EVAL@ilo.org](mailto:EVAL@ilo.org), copying Ricardo Furman ([furman@ilo.org](mailto:furman@ilo.org)).

Women are encouraged to apply.

*NOTE: Expressions of interest submitted without an indicative fee/rate in US\$ will not be considered for this assignment.*

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

### **What works and does not and why in Decent Work Country Programmes 2020 - 2024? A synthesis-review of DWCPs Country Programme Reviews and High-level Evaluations -March-May 2025-**

#### **I. Introduction**

##### **1.1. Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP)**

The Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) are the ILO's programming instrument at the country level. They provide a framework that identifies the priorities of ILO constituents in a country and specifies the planned support of the Office to the achievement of results under those priorities. They are developed with full participation of national governments and employers' and workers' organizations and are implemented with their active engagement. Country ownership and results orientation are key aspects of DWCPs.

DWCPs are aligned with national development priorities and henceforth with the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF). They constitute the ILO's contribution to the wider UN effort in a country towards the achievement of the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

In supporting country priorities identified in DWCPs, ILO programmes build on synergies and complementarity of operations, bringing together diverse sources of funding for the achievement of common outcomes, greater scale and impact.

##### **1.2. Country Programme Reviews (CPRs)**

The ILO Regional Offices, in coordination, with Country Offices, conduct Country Programme Reviews (CPRs) of DWCPs as required for management and learning purposes.

To facilitate a consistent methodological approaches, based on evaluation standards, EVAL has developed [CPR guidance notes](#) to conduct these reviews. There are two modalities of CPRs: a) Internal CPRs conducted by an ILO staff, or a consultant, as facilitator; with the process organized as a less formal management tool to gauge progress, correct implementation issues and improve performance and inform future strategies; b) CPRs managed jointly by ILO

Regional Program Unit (RPU) and Country Office (CO) and conducted by a consultant. In both cases the CPRs reports become a public document uploaded at EVAL [i-eval-Discovery](#) platform. Moreover, the Asia-Pacific Regional Office develops synthesis review/meta-analysis of DC evaluation reports in a country as a proxy CPR.

The CPRs are funded by ILO and can be implemented at mid-point and/or at end of the DWCP cycle towards gauging lessons for the current and/or forthcoming DWCP. The CPR ToRs are developed jointly by RPU, CO and constituents (represented by the National Steering Committee head). The draft ToRs is shared with the government representative (i.e. Ministry of Labour) and social partners (employers' and workers organizations). The CPR follows a similar process to project evaluations in terms of enhancing participation of the stakeholders (i.e. constituents and partners) at the ToRs formulation stage, data collection, discussing the preliminary findings and recommendations, and reviewing of the draft report.

### 1.3. DWCP High-level evaluations (HLEs)

The current [ILO Evaluation Policy](#) indicates that every year EVAL will conduct at least one DWCP evaluation based on an established [DWCP HLE Protocol](#). This evaluation covers a cluster of countries or a subregion in a region (covering the 5 ILO regions<sup>1</sup> in a 5 year-cycle). This type of evaluations is managed directly by EVAL, conducted with support of a team of independent evaluators, and presented to the Governing body, along with the management response by the Regional Office.

The purpose of the evaluation is to examine the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the ILO's programme of work, how well they achieved them and under what conditions. It also seeks to contribute to organizational learning by identifying lessons learned and emerging good practices.

### 1.4. Synthesis review relevance

The relevance of synthesis reviews (SR) for ILO work, as highlighted in the ILO Results-Based Evaluation Strategy 2023-2025, offers an opportunity for the continuous expansion of the knowledge base through evaluation findings and recommendations. By analyzing large amounts of evaluative evidence, SRs contribute effectively to organizational learning and enhance overall organizational effectiveness. Since 2012, EVAL has regularly conducted synthesis reviews for this purpose. The reports systematically synthesize information on results, lessons learned, and good practices. This can take various forms. Examples can be consulted [here](#). This SR is expected to follow, as much as possible, a similar methodological approach.

Regarding DWCPs the last global similar exercise that ILO conducted took place in 2011: [Meta analysis of lessons learned and good practices arising](#) from nine DWCPs evaluations. The study combined an analysis of learning to conduct further CPRs/ evaluations of DWCPs and to inform programme policy and formulation. It is expected that this synthesis-review will refer to this

---

<sup>1</sup> Africa, Arab States, Asia-Pacific, Europe and Central Asia, and Latin America and the Caribbean.

study to identify trends of items repeated or revised at CPRs methodology and programmatic issues.

## II. Purpose of the Synthesis Review

### 2.1. Purpose

The purpose of this SR is to contribute to organizational learning, especially in terms of cross-fertilization among ILO staff (i.e. Regional Offices/RPUs, DWT, Country Offices and all departments at HQ) as well as ILO constituents towards improved DWCP design, implementation, and evaluation to advance the DW agenda.

This assignment will build up on the results of the “Inter-regional workshop Country Programming in the ILO: Stock-taking of recent DWCP experiences in the context of the UN reform” held in Dakar (14-17 May 2024)<sup>2</sup>.

It should provide guidance to ILO constituents and the ILO Office following an evidence-based manner on:

1. What works and why considering CPRs findings, recommendations, lessons learned and good practices.
2. What works and why regarding the implementation of a CPR (i.e. approach and methodology).
3. Recommendations of ways to move forward on DWCPs design, implementation and evaluation to advance DW.

### 2.2. Scope of the Synthesis Review

The SR will cover all countries in which a CPR or a DWCP HLE took place between 2020 and 2024 (i.e. about 27 CPRs and 5 DWCP HLEs). The timeframe considers the adjustments in the DWCP outline that took place in 2020.

The exact scope and research questions will be defined during the inception phase in close consultation with EVAL. It will take into account the purposes of the exercise, the research questions presented below, and the outcomes of exploratory interviews with the RPUs and PROGRAM representatives. For more details see below the methodology section.

## III. Suggested Synthesis-review questions

### 3.1. DWCP formulation process and document

- Are DWCP aligned with UNDAF/UNSDCFs, SDGs targets and national strategic frameworks?
- Are DWCP programmes designed in a results-based and oriented manner?
- Are all constituents involved in the same degree or to what extent?

<sup>2</sup> The report will be made available to the consultant.

**Commented [JM1]:** Two points on the proposed questions:

- 1.1 counted 24 questions. Want to check if this exercise could realistically answer them all. Perhaps best to streamline.
2. Maybe this has already been discussed, but would be beneficial for Program to review these TORs

- What has been the value added/usefulness of the DWCP document to advance the DW agenda?

### 3.2. DWCP implementation process

- What is the level of ownership of the DWCP by constituents and other stakeholders that participate in the DWCP (i.e., DWCP s on the modality of Tripartite +), or is it assumed as an ILO programme/project?
- Is programming of work, including XB-funded DC, informed by or guided by the DWCP?
- What are the lessons learned for a more effective participation of constituents and other stakeholders in the implementation of the DWCP? How can their engagement be stronger?
- Has the DWCP ToC contributed to achieve the DWCP results? What are the gaps for this purpose?
- Has the DWCP promoted joint work with UN agencies and other international and national organizations beyond the constituents, and/or vice-versa, has work with UN agencies contributed to promote the DW agenda?
- What are the external/contextual factors that have contributed significantly positively, or affected negatively, the advancement of the DW agenda through the DWCP implementation? How have ILO and the constituents faced these factors at different levels or aspects such as outputs, outcomes, timeframe, etc?
- Are DWCPs implemented with regular monitoring conducted to track progress towards their achievements?

### 3.3. Results: outcomes, impact and suitability

- What are the areas of achievement in terms of DWCP outcomes and impacts? Do we have differences among regions, subregions, and countries?
- Do the DWCP identifies results at level of SDGs targets, if so which ones are covered?
- Have there been any unexpected results identified that could be integrated in further DWCPs?

### 3.4. DWCP M&E

- Does the DWCP have an M&E framework designed and operating beyond separate projects and programmes M&E frameworks?
- Under which conditions the constituents play an active role on DWCP M&E? Have the DWCP Steering Committees and similar bodies used M&E data to manage the DWCP? If so, has this data been taken from the DWCP document and its annexes (i.e., indicators, targets, baselines, etc.)?
- Can we identify good practices and lessons learned regarding DWCP M&E? What can we learn towards improving M&E of DWCP?

### 3.5. Resource mobilization, advocacy and communication

- When and how have resources mobilization activities contributed effectively to achieve the DWCP outcomes? Which actors, beyond ILO, were involved? Which type of resources were mobilized (national international, government, social partners, civil society, private sector, etc.)?
- When have these resources contributed to expand the DW results beyond the DWCP: unexpected positive results?
- Has alignment to UNDAF/UNSDCF contributed to mobilize partnerships and to align the DWCP outcomes to SDGs?
- Has the DWCP included an advocacy and communication plan? To what extent have such plans, if any, been successful?

### 3.6. Cross cutting themes

- How has the DWCP contributed to develop constituents' capacities to advance DW, RBM and M&E with special reference to International Labour Standards (ILS), social dialogue, gender and non-discrimination, and just transition to environmental issues? What are the lessons learned and good practices in areas /themes to be strengthened, differences by constituent, etc?
- What are lessons learned and good practices on integrating/prioritizing vulnerable groups (such as women, people with disabilities, youth, indigenous groups, and labour migrants) at the DW Agenda, at operational and strategic levels?

### 3.7. CPRs approach and methodology

- What are the pros and cons of applying CPRs as a consultant review versus a more participatory process facilitated by a consultant?
- How can the CPRs address the need of the constituents and the COs to make it a useful exercise?
- What are the lessons learned and good practices to consider in future DWCP CPRs and DWCP HLEs?

## IV. Methodology and Process

The work will mainly consist of a desk-based review of CPRs and relevant documents (both published and unpublished) in order to consolidate and synthesise key results, lessons learned, and good practices to make these findings accessible and useful to ILO officials and constituents. The evaluation database shows: about [27 CPRs for 2020-2024](#) and 5 [DWCP High level evaluations for years 2020-24](#).

The synthesis review will take into account [ILO DWCPs documents](#) and [UNSDCF policy documents](#) and ILO internal ones to be provided by EVAL (e.g. current DWCP guidance notes, forms and templates developed in 2020) and UNSDCF evaluations as required. Moreover, the

SR will also consider the 2011 [Meta analysis of lessons learned and good practices arising from nine DWCPs](#) as a reference.

The analysis to be conducted should consider the findings by country and a comparative analysis towards learning. This implies that trends and gaps identified can be considered in further CPRs.

While this synthesis review is not an evaluation, a discussion with key ILO officials (i.e. RPU and PROGRAM) will be organized at the inception phase and follow-up meetings may take place upon request by the consultant.

The final methodology will be based on two levels:

1. Inception phase: data screening and selection of CPRs and HLEs to be analysed from a universe of about 30 CPRs and 5 HLEs
2. Detailed analysis of a sample of about 25 reports, interviews findings and related documents review

The general sequence is as follows:

- a. The consultant will, in consultation with EVAL, define the universe of studies with explicit inclusion and exclusion criteria, and the approach to analysing data. ILO EVAL will provide the list CPRs and HLE reports (in English, French and Spanish).
- b. In consultation with ILO, the consultant will select the reports to be analysed in depth by: (i) assessing the quality and comprehensiveness of the reports data; and (ii) a stratified purposive sample based on the evaluation questions, with presence of the 5 ILO regions.
- c. In consultation with EVAL, code the selected reports using an iterative thematic qualitative synthesis approach and an evidence gap map (for this last one using as a reference the [3ie evidence gap maps methodology](#))
- d. Undertake a descriptive analysis of the full universe.
- e. Report writing.

#### **4.1. Key Dates and Deliverables**

The consultant(s) will be expected to deliver in English the following:

- [An inception report](#) including a draft report outline; a detailed work plan, a list of possible additional data/information sources to be consulted; and a detailed methodology and work plan. This should include, among others, a description of the key questions to be addressed; the analytical approach to be taken (with details regarding the aspects and topics that will be addressed); the search strategy and a protocol for the review; possible inclusion/exclusion criteria for the selection of CPRs and HLE reports, and other documents; the coding strategy; the means to address risk of bias and quality control. Any additional information need should be identified and proposed at this stage. The approach should take into account the specificities of [synthesis reviews developed by EVAL](#). EVAL will review and comment on the inception

report, and the consultant will respond in writing to all received comments. The inception report must be approved by EVAL before work can proceed.

- A draft report based on the approved inception report that will include an outline of the SR report. The draft report will present the analysis of the selected documents and key findings and will include an executive summary. It will be written in English and be no longer than 50 pages, including the executive summary, but excluding the annexes. The draft report will be presented to EVAL and key stakeholders for comments, and the consultant will respond in writing to all comments received. EVAL will conduct quality assurance/peer review of the draft version of the report.
- A final report which will present the completed analysis and must respond appropriately to comments and feedback from key ILO officials that will be provided in a consolidated manner by EVAL. The final report must have a high-quality executive summary no longer than 10 pages and use of visuals to present or synthesize key findings will be required.
- A webinar to ILO staff will be conducted to present the key findings and conclusions of the SR.

The following is the proposed schedule by deliverable:

<b>Dates</b>	<b>Tasks</b>	<b>Responsible</b>	<b>Outputs/ Deliverable</b>	<b>Number of working days</b>
<b><i>Inception Phase (March 2025) 15 working days</i></b>				
	Initial briefing with EVAL to discuss the scope of the assignment-e.g. methodology, documents and format of inception report	EVAL - Consultant	Briefing and agreed format for inception report	1
	Interviews with 5 RPU/ROs and PROGRAM/HQ	Consultant	n.a.	2
	Refinement of the methodology (research questions, synthesis review protocol)	Consultant	n.a.	2
	Data screening and selection of CPRs and HLE reports to be analysed and draft inception report	Consultant	Draft Inception Report	9
	Integration of feedback from EVAL on final inception report	EVAL- Consultant	Final Inception report	1
<b><i>Analysis and report development (April-May 2025) 9 working days</i></b>				



	Draft report development	Consultant	Draft report	7
	Comments on report by EVAL and ILO stakeholders	EVAL	Consolidated comments by EVAL	n.a.
	Final report Quick fact	Consultant(s)	Final Report with a concise executive summary	2
<b>Dissemination (May-June 2025) 1 working day</b>				
	Minimum editing and posting on the web	EVAL	Report posted on web	n.a.
	Webinar	EVAL-Consultant	Online presentation	1
	<b>Total number of consultants' working days</b>			25

The inception report should be submitted to EVAL within four weeks after signing of the contract. The consultant will have four weeks to submit the draft report, and the final report should be submitted within one week of receiving comments.

#### V. Management and Coordination

The Consultant will report to EVAL on all aspects of consultancy deliverables and day-to-day work schedules. EVAL will provide support in accessing key internal documents and reviewing protocols and will facilitate meetings with key stakeholders, if necessary, monitoring of progress will be ensured through weekly exchanges between EVAL and the consultant.

EVAL will issue the Excol contract to the selected consultant for which a separate budget is available.

#### VI. Quality assurance

The consultant will be required to ensure the quality of data (validity, reliability, consistency and accuracy) throughout the analytical and reporting phases. It is expected that the report shall be written in an evidence-based manner such that all observations, conclusions, recommendations, etc. are supported by evidence and analysis.

#### VII. Profile and Qualifications of the Synthesis Review Consultant

The review will be carried out by a consultant with the following qualifications and profile combined:

- Knowledge and understanding of UN and ILO and related labour issues.
- Demonstrated familiarity and knowledge of the methodology relevant for this assignment, with demonstrated understanding of issues of validity, reliability and feasibility of methodology.

- Strong evaluation and related applied research background.
- Appropriate balance of contextual knowledge, technical understanding, relevant prior experience and language abilities. Fluency in English (spoken and written) as the report will be in English is essential. Ability to work in French and Spanish would be needed.
- Prior knowledge of the ILO's roles and activities and understanding of DW approach, including tripartism and social dialogue and gender and non-discrimination.
- Demonstrated analytical skills are essential.
- Prior experience on synthesis reviews (or similar assignment) and/or on the synthesis of large volumes of quantitative and qualitative information is preferable.
- Proven ability to work with others in the development and timely delivery of high-quality deliverables.

The consultant can indicate support of an assistant that will be budgeted under the contract of the sole evaluator.

#### **VIII. Terms of Payment**

It is expected that the consulting work will be carried out over a period of three months. The assignment will take 25 working days for one consultant.

Inception report approved:	20%
Draft SR report approved	30%
Final report approved and Webinar	50%