

Draft Terms of Reference
Final Independent Evaluation

“Develop inclusive insurance market and stimulate innovation in Asia and Latin America”

Title of Project	Develop inclusive insurance market and stimulate innovation in Asia and Latin America
Project DC Code	GLO/17/36/PRU (106596)
Administrative Unit	Department of Enterprises
Technical Unit	Impact Insurance Facility/Social Finance
Type of evaluation	Final Independent
Project Period	1 June 2018 to 31 December 2021
Timing of evaluation	December 2021 to March 2022
Budget of project	US\$ 2,200,000
Funding Agency	The Prudential foundation

1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Despite global progress in reducing poverty, an estimated 1.3 billion people still lived below \$1.25 a day in 2008, and 2.5 billion lived on \$2 dollars per day (World Bank, 2012). Progress is patchy, with conditions worsening in some countries; plus, the looming crises of climate change and food insecurity threaten to reverse progress that is being achieved. Vulnerability remains prevalent.

Low-income households, often working in the informal economy, are more vulnerable to risks than the rest of the population, and yet they are the least able to cope when crises occur. Many shocks – such as the illness or death of breadwinners, the theft or breakdown of productive assets, and the destruction wrought by disasters – can negatively impact income while creating the additional challenge of increasing expenses. Under these circumstances, low-income people take a range of undesirable actions, such as eating less or putting children to work. These coping strategies often have long-term implications, such as malnutrition and an uneducated work force.

While vulnerability and poverty go hand in hand, insurance holds the promise of breaking a part of the perpetuating cycle. Yet, to be most effective, insurance should be part of a broader menu of financial services that includes savings, credit and money transfers, which can collectively enable the working poor to manage a diversity of risks.

ILO/ Prudential Foundation Cooperation

The ILO’s Impact Insurance Facility (the “facility”) designs and delivers insurance innovations to benefit low-income workers, promote market development in select countries, and build capacity at the regional and local levels.

Since June 2018, the Facility proposes a 3-year, \$2.2 million collaboration with the Prudential Foundation to design and deliver insurance innovations to benefit low-income workers, promote market development in select countries, and build capacity at the regional and local levels. Lessons learned through this collaboration have been widely disseminated to highlight approaches in which insurance products and insurance companies make meaningful contributions to the Sustainable Development Goals.

Through this collaboration, the Prudential Foundation could enable more than one million people to benefit from insurance, while indirectly strengthening the capacity of scores of insurance

professionals. Indirect benefits will accrue also to Prudential, the parent company, through learnings on innovation and change management, building greater agility to respond to the needs of financially excluded and low income households.

The ILO is keen to collaborate with Prudential Foundation as it believes that the private sector should play an important role to drive the change needed to extend valuable protection to millions of small enterprises and low-income households. Prudential is a like-minded organization focused on providing quality solutions to the excluded populations – beginning in the 19th century as a friendly society to help widows and orphans. As an advocate of social change, the ILO's Facility acts as a champion for the low income and financially excluded households by building trust among consumers and governments in the potential of the insurance industry to help critical objectives including risk management, resilience, and supporting economic development.

Project development objectives and its logical framework

Enterprises are the main engine of job creation and the source of almost 9 of every 10 formal jobs in the world. Therefore, nearly all ILO Decent Work Country Work Programs (DWCP) refer to sustainable enterprise development including all three dimensions of sustainability (financial, social, and environmental). There is a high demand from member countries for support in this area, as evidenced by the many countries that identify “sustainable enterprise development” as one of their top three priorities.

The project therefore impacts ILO Outcome 4: Promoting sustainable enterprises, and it is linked to global product, GLO206 Promoting sustainable enterprises and development through global policy measures. These measures may impact both a) the upstream policies respectively regulators and policy makers that are part of the project's Communities of Practice; and b) micro and small enterprises through access to better risk management tools.

In addition, this partnership also contributes towards SDG 8, Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all. In particular the project contributes to: target 8.3, which aims to promote development-oriented policies that support productive activities, decent job creation, entrepreneurship, creativity and innovation, and encourage the formalization and growth of micro-, small- and medium-sized enterprises, including through access to financial services; and target 8.10, which strengthens the capacity of domestic financial institutions to encourage and expand access to banking, insurance and financial services for all.

Project overview

According to the project design, under the partnership, the following activities are carried out:

- Supporting the development of integrated risk-management solutions for low-income households and small enterprises at five financial institutions in the Philippines, Indonesia and India.
- Facilitating the development of inclusive insurance markets in Brazil and Mexico, where the Facility builds the capacity of the local insurance industry.
- Setting up of a knowledge platform in Spanish and Portuguese, in partnership with the Microinsurance Network and FIDES (Inter-American Federation of Insurance Companies). This platform facilitates exchanges among key stakeholders to overcome barriers to serving emerging consumers.

- Documenting and sharing of lessons learned from the innovation and market development component, using the Facility’s knowledge tools, which includes publications, case briefs, trainings, emerging insights and webinars

The project has two components: 1) **Innovation and change management for holistic risk management solutions** for low-income households and micro and small enterprises (MSEs); and 2) **systematic insurance market development** in two countries by working with stakeholders at all levels to build their capacity, facilitate knowledge exchange and accelerate the evolution of the markets. The first component engages with specific companies and is intended to push the frontier by testing, and scaling up, new products; while the second component works at a country level to expand and improve the insurance market.

The main costs under component 1 relate to hosting fellows, mentorship for the fellows, technical support to the partners, conducting research, and the knowledge outputs. Under component 2, the costs include the time and travel of the technical team, cost of workshop/training venues, and some costs associated with the consumer education campaigns.

Institutional Framework and Management Arrangements

This project is implemented primarily by the ILO’s Impact Insurance Facility in coordination with the Prudential Foundation. The Foundation’s role is to ensure that the project activities are in line with the Prudential Foundation’s overall strategies and plans and to orient their partners about the project and the activities that the ILO undertakes. The ILO is primarily responsible in executing the project activities.

The responsible office within the ILO is the Social Finance Unit in the Enterprises Department. This unit provides administrative and technical backstopping required for the project. Work in the countries is coordinated with local ILO offices, and will be performed by either the local staff members or Impact Insurance Fellows.

2. RATIONAL FOR EVALUATION AND PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

In line with the ILO’s Evaluation Policy (2017), projects with budgets between one and five million US\$ must undergo a mid-term (self or internal evaluation) and final independent evaluation. However due to the COVID-19 outbreak, no mid-term evaluation has been conducted for this project.

In May 2021, a progress review was completed by the project team, which is a self-evaluation and covers the time scope between June 2020 and May 2021. The goal of the progress report was to review the project implementation rather than providing strategic and operational recommendations as well as lessons to improve performance and delivery of result.

The Final evaluation will focus on the outcome of the project and the likelihood that the results will be able to achieve a sustainable impact. This final evaluation provides an opportunity for in-depth reflections on the strategy and assumptions guiding the intervention. It will assess the extent to which the intervention achieved its objectives; it will document lessons learnt from implementation, and may make recommendations for the sustainability of the outcomes. This evaluation is also a mean to assess how well interventions supported higher level ILO strategies and objectives, as articulated in national strategies and policies on sustainable development and social finance, Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) and the ILO’s Programme and Budget (P&B), as well as SDG.4 and 8.

Since 2020, the world of work is being profoundly affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. ILO projects, programmes and their beneficiaries are responding and adapting to the COVID-19 pandemic. The evaluation will also review and assess the impact of the crisis on the implementation of the project and lessons learnt from the response of the interventions.

The evaluation will be conducted as an independent evaluation by an evaluation team led by an independent evaluator. ILO independent project evaluation serves accountability purposes by reporting to donors and national partners on the extent to which the intended outcomes are achieved. It also offers evidence of whether or not the activities and outputs described in the project document are actually undertaken and/or produced. The ILO Constituents, project teams and the donor as the key stakeholders will be consulted throughout the evaluation process.

This Final evaluation of the project is going to start in December 2021, with the final report expected to be completed by March 2022.

The Evaluation serves the following main purposes:

- Provides an independent assessment of progress on the achievement towards the Project's development objective, assessing performance as per the established indicators vis-à-vis the strategies and implementation modalities chosen and project management arrangements;
- Provides strategic recommendations, highlights good practices and lessons learnt

Moreover it:

- Advises future project development;
- Contributes towards organizational learning;
- Helps those responsible for managing the resources and activities of a project to enhance development results from the short term to a sustainable long term;
- Assesses the effectiveness of planning and management for future impacts;
- Supports accountability aims by incorporating lessons learned in the decision-making process of project stakeholders, including donors and national partners.

3. EVALUATION SCOPE

The evaluation will cover the duration of 1 June 2018 to 31 March 2022 and its full geographic coverage at both Headquarters and Country level, including the components managed by Implementing Partners. The evaluation will cover all outcomes of the project, with particular attention to coherence and synergies across components, and across countries.

All Project Countries will be assessed as part of the desk review (including sample-based review of all the video-reels produced for different training/ round tables/ workshops, if applicable and available), in-depth analysis, interviews and e-meetings with the Project stakeholders and beneficiaries.

The Final Evaluation will serve the following clients' groups: Tripartite constituents, Project Partners, Project National Team, ILO ENTERPRISES, Social Finance Programme, ILO Country Offices (the Philippines, Indonesia) as well as ILO overall as part of organisational learning.

4. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The evaluation will follow the [UN Evaluation Standards and Norms](#), [the Glossary of key terms in evaluation and Results-Based Management](#) and utilise the [Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Assistance Committee \(OECD DAC\)](#) evaluation criteria as outlined below:

- Relevance and strategic fit – the extent to which the objectives are in keeping with Sub-Regional, national and local priorities and needs, Constituents’ priorities and needs, and the donor’s priorities for the Project countries;
- Coherence: the extent to which other interventions support or undermine the intervention, and vice versa. This includes internal coherence and external coherence, in particular, synergies and fit with national initiatives and with other donor-supported projects and project visibility;
- Validity of design – the extent to which the project design, logic, strategy and elements are/ remain valid vis-à-vis problems and needs;
- Effectiveness - the extent to which the project can be said to have contributed to the development objectives and the immediate objectives and more concretely whether the stated outputs have been produced satisfactorily;
- Efficiency - the productivity of the project implementation process taken as a measure of the extent to which the outputs achieved are derived from an efficient use of financial, material and human resources;
- Progress towards impact - positive and negative changes and effects caused by the Project at the Sub-Regional and National levels, i.e. the impact with Social Partners and various implementing partner organisations;
- Sustainability – the extent to which adequate capacity building of Project stakeholders has taken place to ensure mechanisms are in place to sustain activities and whether the existing results are likely to be maintained beyond project completion.

Suggested Key Evaluation Questions:

The evaluation will examine the project on the basis of the questions listed below and against the standard evaluation criteria mentioned above. The independent evaluator will start from these proposed set of questions and develop a more detailed analytical structure of questions and sub-questions as part of inception phase. If applicable, evaluations findings and lessons learned from the previous phase of the project should also be taken into account when finalising the analytical framework.

Suggested evaluation criteria and evaluation questions are summarized below:

Relevance and strategic fit

- How did the project align with and support national development plans and priorities of the ILO constituents?
- Is the project relevant to the UNSDFs, DWCPs of the project countries, and other national frameworks (for refugee response for instance in Jordan) and to relevant Programme and Budget Outcomes of the ILO? How did the Project objectives and interventions consider relevant SDG targets and indicators?
- Are the needs addressed by the project in the various countries and at global level still relevant considering the COVID-19 pandemic? How has the Project adapted its activities to the changing priorities of the Project beneficiary countries? Has the programme provided a timely and relevant response?

Coherence

- How does the project relate to other similar interventions around inclusive insurance implemented in the Project beneficiary countries over the project implementation period?
- Are the project's objectives aligned to other ILO and UN inclusive insurance initiatives? What are the coordination mechanisms and interlinkages with the project?

Validity of design

- To what extent are the project design (objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities) and its underlining theory of change logical and coherent, given the needs of the beneficiary countries, the expectations of the ILO and the Donor? How was the project design adapted following the COVID19 crisis?
- Did the project strategies, within their overall scope, remain flexible and responsive to emerging concerns with regards to (i) promotion of international labour standards and social dialogue (ii) gender equality and non-discrimination, notably inclusion of people with disabilities? (iii) just transition to environmental sustainability?
- Are the indicators described in the project document appropriate and measurable in assessing the project's progress?
- How realistic were the risks and assumptions upon which the project logic was based?
- What feedback loops have been established within the project activities to ensure it remains relevant to the evolving needs of its recipients and beneficiaries?

Effectiveness

- Has the project made sufficient progress towards its planned results? Has the project achieved its planned long-term and medium-term outcomes? What have been unintended results of the project – positive and negative? To what extent are the project interventions contributing (or not) to the relevant SDGs and related targets?
- To what extent did the project address the impact of the COVID-19 crisis and contributed to the ILO policy response? To what extent has the project adapted its approach to specific country contexts, and to local political economies? Has it been responsive to political, legal, and institutional challenges where it operates?
- To what extent has the project contributed to advance in areas of emerging concerns regarding, (i) promotion of international labour standards and social dialogue (ii) gender equality and non-discrimination, notably inclusion of people with disabilities? (iii) just transition to environmental sustainability?
- Has the project managed to play a useful role of facilitator of wider positive change, rather than delivering by itself?
- How effectively did the project monitor performance and results? What were the systems put in place at national level to track progress and risks in a quickly evolving environment?

Efficiency

- Are the available technical and financial resources adequate to fulfil the project plans?
- Are resources (human resources, time, expertise, funds etc.) allocated strategically to provide the necessary support and to achieve the broader project objectives? (specific sub-questions can be: (i) To what extent do the project management capacities and arrangements put in place, support the achievement of the expected results? (ii) Are the project's activities/operations in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the work

- plans; (iii) Are the disbursements and project expenditures in line with expected budgetary plans? If not, what were the bottlenecks encountered? Are they being used efficiently?)
- To what extent did the project budget factor-in the cost of specific activities, outputs and outcomes to address:
 - Gender equality and non-discrimination? (Gender parity in inclusive insurance?)
 - Inclusion of women and men with disabilities in inclusive insurance?)
 - Inclusion of people with disabilities?
 - just transition to environmental sustainability?
 - Has cooperation among project partners been efficient? What is the value addition of the cooperation/ collaboration of the project? Was there a mechanism to facilitate coherence and synergy by the partners? How effective was it?
 - How has the project leveraged new or repurposed existing financial resources to mitigate COVID-19 effects in a balanced manner?

Progress towards impact

- Has the project built the capacity of people and national institutions, including social partner organizations, or strengthened an enabling environment (laws, policies, people's skills, attitudes etc.)?
- To what extent did the intervention advance strategic gender-related needs, which can have a long term positive bearing on:

Sustainability

- Once external funding ends, will national institutions and key implementing partners be likely to continue the project or carry forward its results? Does the project have a strategy in place to sustain these elements?
- What were the major factors which have/will influence the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project?

5. METHODOLOGY

The Evaluation will be carried out in accordance with [the ILO evaluation policy](#) based on the [United Nations Evaluation Norms and Standards](#), following [the Policy guidelines for results-based evaluation, 4th edition \(2020\)](#). It fully adheres to ILO evaluation norms, standards and ethical safeguards as well as to the [OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards](#).

The evaluation methodology is expected to use a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods, to be defined and approved as part of the evaluation inception report. The methods are expected to create a space for a sample of all stakeholders and beneficiaries to voice their opinions and analysis, that will be compared and consolidated into the evaluation document. To the extent possible, all categories of project participants should be represented.

The evaluation methodology should include examining the interventions' Theory of Change, specifically in the light of logical connect between levels of results, its coherence with external factors, and their alignment with the ILO's strategic objectives, SDGs and related targets, national and ILO country level outcomes. A special focus will also be on the response of the project to evolving project context. The methodology should clearly state the limitations of the chosen evaluation methods, including those related to representation of specific group of stakeholders.

Envisaged steps include the following:

- 1) Desk Review: Review of programmes and its components materials, publications, data, among others;
- 2) Inception meeting with the project team and technical backstopping unit in ILO HQ. The objective of the consultation is to reach a common understanding regarding the status of the project, the priority assessment questions, available data sources and data collection instruments and an outline of the final evaluation report. The following topics will be covered: project background and materials, key evaluation questions and priorities, list of stakeholders, criteria for country selection, outline of the inception and final report.
- 3) Initial interviews through conference calls or surveys with key stakeholders including (but not limited to) representatives from partners and entities who have participated in project activities;
- 4) Submission of an Inception Report with the final methodology and Work Plan. The Inception Report and the Work Plan will be subject to approval by the Evaluation Manager, and it will indicate the steps/phases and dates of the process in which the evaluation will take place;
- 5) Additional documents review and analysis, data collection prior or in parallel to the evaluation interviews as required by the proposed methodology;
- 6) Evaluation interviews (individual or collective) with stakeholders;
- 7) Drafting evaluation reports;
- 8) Presentations to the ILO project team and the key stakeholders on the draft report
- 9) Finalization of the evaluation report.

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, the global component evaluation will be conducted in a totally remote way, relying on e-surveys. For some country components it might be feasible to use a hybrid face to face/remote approach for collecting data by a national consultant if possible – depending on the COVID19 pandemic evolution. [ILO Evaluation Office guidance on the evaluation process during COVID-19](#) should serve as the main guidance on the subject.

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 evaluator, the project team and the evaluation manager, under the guidance of EVAL, should propose alternative methodologies to address the data collection that will be reflected in the inception phase of the evaluation developed by the evaluation team. These will be reflected in the Inception Report.

6. MAIN DELIVERABLES

- Deliverable 1: Inception report.
The inception report will include among other elements the evaluation questions and data collection methodologies and techniques, proposed data presentation techniques for cross over analysis of the level of satisfactions for the interventions of the project, and the evaluation tools (interview, guides, self-administered questionnaires, etc.). The independent evaluator will prepare an inception report within one week after the contract signed.
- Deliverable 2: Stakeholder workshop.
The independent evaluator will conduct remote workshop for the project countries to validate information and data collected through various methods and to share the preliminary findings with the key local stakeholders at the end of each field mission, or,

remote interviews if travel restrictions are applied in project countries, lock down applied and stakeholders are unwilling to meet in person at the COVID-19 situation. The relevant ILO officials in the project countries will help organize the stakeholder workshops or remote interviews. Evaluation findings should be based on facts, evidence and data.

In addition, the independent evaluator should conduct individual remote meeting if the evaluation team considers it necessary for the detailed and/or if a key stakeholder request a more detailed interview.

- Deliverable 3: Draft evaluation report.
Evaluation report should include action-oriented, practical and specific recommendations assigning or designating audiences/implementers/users.
The draft evaluation report should be prepared as per the ILO Checklist 5 (Annex 1): Preparing the Evaluation Report, which will be provided to the independent evaluators. It should address all the evaluation questions and present explicit comparative and crossover analysis, in table format, of level of satisfaction towards the projects using appropriate data presentation techniques.
- Deliverable 4: Presentations of draft report. Presentations should be prepared and conducted by the evaluation team for the ILO project team and the key stakeholders on the draft report.
- Final evaluation report, including the templates for lessons learned and good practices, and the executive summary: The evaluation team will incorporate comments received from ILO and other key stakeholders into the final report. The report should be finalized as per the ILO Checklist 5: Preparing the Evaluation Report. The quality of the report and evaluation summary will be assessed against the ILO Checklists 5, 6, 7, and 8 (Annex1).

The reports and all other outputs of the evaluation must be produced in English. All draft and final reports including other supporting documents, analytical reports, and raw data should be provided in electronic version compatible with WORD for windows. Ownership of the data from the evaluation rests jointly between ILO and ILO consultants. The copy rights of the evaluation report rests exclusively with the ILO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

7. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS AND WORK PLAN

A designated ILO staff who has no prior involvement in the project will manage this independent evaluation with oversight provided by the ILO Evaluation Office. The independent evaluator, together with an evaluation team and/or national consultants, will be commissioned to conduct this evaluation. The evaluation will be funded from the budget of the project.

The tasks of the evaluation manager are as follows:

- Draft and finalize the evaluation TOR upon receiving inputs from key stakeholders;
- Reviewing CV and proposals of the proposed independent evaluator;
- Guides the independent evaluator during the evaluation process;
- Providing project background documents to the independent evaluator;
- Coordinate with the project team on the remote interview agenda of the independent evaluator;
- Briefing the independent evaluator on ILO evaluation procedures, together with EVAL specialist;
- Circulating the report to the stakeholders concerned for their comments;

- Reviewing and providing comments of the draft evaluation report;
- Consolidate comments and send them back to the independent evaluator;
- Review and approve the evaluation report and submit to EVAL for final approval.

The ILO HQ project team will handle administrative contractual arrangements with the independent evaluator and provide any financial, logistical and other assistance as required.

The project teams of HQ and the countries concerned will be responsible for the following tasks:

- Provide project background materials to the independent evaluator;
- Prepare a list of recommended interviewees;
- Schedule remote meetings for the independent evaluator with the project team at both global and country level;
- Participate meetings, workshops or interview and provide inputs as requested by the independent evaluator during the evaluation process;
- Review and provide comments on TOR and the draft evaluation reports.

Work plan and tentative timeframe:

	Task	Responsible person	Tentative time
1	Preparation, sharing and finalization of the TOR	Evaluation Manager	15-19 Nov. 2021
2	Approval of the TOR	EVAL	22-24 Nov. 2021
3	TOR to Stakeholders for comments	Evaluation Manager	23 Nov. – 3 Dec. 2021
4.	To finalize TOR	Evaluation Manager	6-7 Dec. 2021
5	Issuance of EOI, advertisement and selection of independent evaluator	Evaluation manager and EVAL	24 Nov -14 Dec. 2021
6	Preparation and Issuance of contracts	ILO Technical team	3-7 Jan. 2022
7	Brief independent evaluator on ILO evaluation policy and the project	Evaluation manager and EVAL	10-11 Jan. 2022
8	Document review and development of the inception report submitted to Evaluation Manager	Independent evaluator	12 - 21 Jan. 2022
9	Circulate IR to stakeholders for comments	Evaluation manager	24-28 Jan 2022
10	Inception report approved	Evaluation manager and EVAL	31 Jan. - 2 Feb. 2022
11	Interviews with main stakeholders. Since the COVID 19 situation continue to persist in project countries and official travel is restricted to the project countries, the field visit plan of independent evaluator should be subject to change to remote interviews, supplemented by assistance of national consultants	Independent evaluator, under logistical and administrative support of ILO technical team and country teams	3 – 18 Feb. 2022
12	Draft report submitted to Evaluation Manager	Independent Evaluator	21-25 Feb. 2022

13	Presentations to ILO project team and key stakeholders	Independent evaluator	28 Feb. – 1 March 2022
14	Sharing the draft report with all concerned stakeholders for comments	Evaluation manager	3 -18 March 2022
15	Consolidated comments on the draft report and send to the independent evaluator	Evaluation manager	21 -22 March 2022
16	Finalization of the report and submission to Evaluation Manager	Independent evaluator	23 -25 March 2022
17	Review and approval of the final report and submit to EVAL for final approval	Evaluation manager	28 -29 March 2022
18	Final review and approval evaluation report	EVAL	30 -31 March 2022
19	Evaluation report will be sent to PARDEV	EVAL	
20	Evaluation report will be sent to Donor	PARDEV	

8. INDEPENDENT EVALUATOR QUALIFICATION

The independent final evaluation will be conducted by an evaluation team consisting of a lead international evaluator, who will work with the support of national consultants and.

The independent lead evaluator will have the following profile:

- Advanced university degree in social sciences or related graduate qualifications;
- A minimum of 10 years of professional experience specifically in evaluating international development initiatives, experience in the area of s will be an added advantage;
- Minimum five years of experience in conducting programme or project evaluations;
- Experience in managing teams of national consultants
- Proven experience with logical framework approaches and other strategic planning approaches, M&E methods and approaches (including quantitative, qualitative and participatory), information analysis and report writing;
- Fluency in written and spoken English is required. Knowledge of one or more languages spoken in the project countries would be an asset;
- Knowledge of ILO's roles and mandate and its tripartite structure as well as UN evaluation norms and its programming is desirable;
- Understanding of the development context of the Project Countries is an advantage;
- Excellent consultative, communication and interview skills; Demonstrated excellent report writing skills in English; and Demonstrated ability to deliver quality results within strict deadlines.
- No previous involvement with the project under evaluation.

Annex 1: Relevant ILO policies and guidelines

- [ILO Policy Guidelines for evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 4th edition \(2020\).](#)
- Code of conduct form (To be signed by the evaluators)

- http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206205/lang--en/index.htm
- [Checklist No. 4.8: Writing the inception report](#)
- [Checklist 4.2: preparing the evaluation report](#)
- [Checklist 4.9: rating the quality of evaluation report](#)
- [Checklist 4.4: Preparing the evaluation summary](#)
- Checklist 10: Documents for project evaluators
https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_208284.pdf
- Template for lessons learnt and Emerging Good Practices
https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746820.pdf

https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746821.pdf
- [Guidance note 4.5: Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation](#)
- [Guidance note 3.1: Integrating gender equality in the monitoring and evaluation of projects](#)
- [Guidance 3.2 Adapting evaluation methods to the ILO's normative and tripartite mandate](#)
- Template for evaluation title page
- [Template for evaluation summary](#)
- UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation
<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/548>

DRAFT