



International
Labour
Organization

**Call for Expressions of Interest
Independent Final Evaluation of Myanmar COVID-19 Response Programme by the ILO**

Title	Myanmar COVID-19 Response: Livelihoods support to remittance dependent communities
Countries covered	Myanmar
Application deadline	15 December 2022
Type of contract	External Collaboration (individual consultancy contract)
Expected duration	January to March 2023
Languages required	Proficiency in written and spoken English

The International Labour Organisation (ILO) is seeking expressions of interest (EOI) from an international evaluator – IE (home-based) to conduct the independent final evaluation of the project '[Myanmar COVID-19 Response: Livelihoods support to remittance dependent communities](#).' The project is implemented by the ILO Liaison Office in Yangon.

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

Interested candidate intending to submit an EOI must provide the following information:

- (1) A **Letter of Intent** expressing willingness and availability to take on the assignment
- (2) A **'financial offer'** confirming –
 - the daily professional fee of the evaluator expressed in US dollars
 - any additional expenses with rationale
- (3) A copy of the evaluators' **Curriculum Vitae** highlighting a list of previous evaluations relevant to the context and topic of this assignment, as well as languages spoken
- (4) A **statement** confirming that the candidate had no previous involvement in the design and implementation of the project 'Myanmar COVID-19 Response: Livelihoods support to remittance dependent communities' or have a personal relationship with any of the ILO Officials who are engaged in the project subject to evaluation.
- (5) At least **two examples** in the form of evaluation products for projects/programmes related to livelihood support, skills development and/or infrastructure support to conflict affected population, or any other relevant field (full document should be annexed or webpages for published reports should be hyperlinked)
- (6) A list of **two referees** (including name, affiliation, phone number and email address). These referees must be the evaluation manager of the relevant evaluations undertaken by the applicant.

The deadline to submit an Expression of Interest for undertaking this evaluation is **Thursday, 15 December 2022, by 17:00 hrs (Bangkok time)**. Applications should be sent by e-mail with the subject header **"ILO/Myanmar COVID-19 Response Programme Final Evaluation"** to the Evaluation Manager, Ms Sohana Samrin Chowdhury (chowdhuryso@ilo.org), copied to Ms Pamornrat Pringsulaka (pamornrat@ilo.org).

Please see the Terms of Reference (ToR) attached for further details about the evaluation.

Terms of Reference
Independent Final Evaluation of Myanmar COVID-19 Response Programme by the ILO

KEY FACTS

Title of project being evaluated	Myanmar COVID-19 Response: Livelihoods support to remittance dependent communities
Country	Myanmar
Project DC Code	MMR/20/02/NZL
Type of Evaluation	Independent
Timing of evaluation	Final
Donor	New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT)
Administrative Unit in the ILO responsible for administrating the project	ILO-Yangon
Technical Unit(s) in the ILO responsible for backstopping the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employment-Intensive Investment • DWT-Bangkok
P&B outcome (s) under evaluation	Outcome 3: Economic, social and environmental transitions for full, productive and freely chosen employment and decent work for all
SDG(s) under evaluation	SDG 8: Decent work and economic growth
Total project budget	NZD 3,000,000 ¹
Project start date	23 September 2020
Project end date	31 March 2023
National implementing partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rahmonnya Peace Foundation (RPF) • Covenant Development Institute (CDI)
Duration of final evaluation	January – March 2023
Evaluation Manager	Sohana Samrin Chowdhury, Technical Officer, ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific

¹ Equivalent to USD 1,976,284 during project initiation. Total project cost estimated in 2022 is USD 2,013,604.

Contents

Background information	1
Project context.....	1
Description of the project and critical events.....	2
Project duration	2
Geographical coverage	2
Expected results.....	3
Management set-up	4
Internal institutional arrangement	4
Activity Steering Group	5
Operational Project Steering Committee (PSC)	5
Exit strategy	5
Strategic alignment.....	5
Project achievements to date.....	6
Purpose and objectives of the evaluation	6
Evaluation scope	7
Users of the final evaluation	7
Evaluation criteria and questions	7
Cross cutting issues	10
Methodology	10
Main deliverables	12
Management arrangements	14
Responsibilities of the evaluation manager.....	14
Responsibilities of the project team	14
Responsibilities of the independent international evaluator	15
Desired competencies of the IE	15
Evaluation work plan with indicative timeline	16
Legal and ethical matters	17
Application	17
All relevant ILO evaluation guidance notes, checklists and standard templates	17

Abbreviations and acronyms

CBO	Community Based Organization
CDI	Covenant Development Institute
CERP	COVID-19 Economic Relief Plan
CfW	Cash-for-Work
CPO	Country Programme Outcome
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CV	Curriculum vitae
DWCP	Decent Work Country Program
DWT	Decent Work Team
EAO	Ethnic Armed Organization
EIIP	Employment-intensive investment Programme
EM	Evaluation Manager
ESP	Ethnic Service Provider
EVAL	Evaluation office of the ILO
FGD	Focused Group Discussion
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
HQ	Headquarter
IE	International Evaluator
ILO	International Labour Organization
KNU	Karen National Union
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MFAT	Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NMSP	New Mon State Party
NZD	New Zealand Dollar
NZL	New Zealand
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
OECD/DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee
P&B	Programme and budget of the ILO for a biennium
PIT	Project Implementation Team
PSC	Project Steering Committee
REO	Regional Evaluation Officer
RPF	Rahmonnya Peace Foundation
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
ToR	Terms of Reference
TVET	Technical and Vocational Education and Training
UN	United Nations
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UN-SERF	United Nations Framework for the immediate socio-economic response to COVID-19
VDC	Village Development Committee
VIOMCs	Village Infrastructure Operation and Maintenance Committees
WASH	Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene

Background information

The International Labour Organisation (ILO) calls for Expressions of Interest (EOI) from a home-based International Evaluator (IE) to conduct an independent final evaluation of the ILO project *Myanmar COVID-19 Response: Livelihoods support to remittance dependent communities* (hereafter denoted as the ‘Project’), implemented by the ILO and funded by the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT). The intended evaluation will be undertaken in line with the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the donor and the ILO, and as outlined in the [ILO Evaluation Policy 2017](#). It will be conducted in compliance with the principles, norms, and standards for project evaluations as outlined in the [ILO policy for evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 4th edition \(2020\)](#).

The overall objective of the final evaluation is to gather an assessment of the project’s performance regarding the foreseen objectives (outcomes and outputs), targets and indicators of achievement, and to provide strategic and operational recommendations.

Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic situation, it is planned that a home-based International Evaluator (IE) will conduct data collection remotely, with the research methodology largely based on desk review, online interviews (including online surveys, where possible) and stakeholder validation workshop. S/he will be assisted by two national consultants², in conducting the online interviews, data collection from beneficiaries and stakeholder validation workshop. The data collection period for this evaluation is tentatively scheduled from end of January to mid-February 2023, with the stakeholder workshop taking place in the third week of February 2023.

The IE will report to the Evaluation Manager (EM) based in the ILO’s regional office in Bangkok. The EM for this evaluation has no prior involvement with the Project at any level and will manage the overall evaluation process with oversight provided by the ILO evaluation office (EVAL), and local context by the ILO Yangon Liaison Office.

Project context

Myanmar, a least developed country, made significant achievements in economic development and poverty reduction over the last decade. Decades of military rule left Myanmar poor with major economic disparity, and social, religious, and ethnic divisions until 2008 when a new Constitution paved the way for a partial and military – controlled political and economic reform. A gradual liberalization was allowed to begin in 2011, under a transitional military government, setting in motion an outlook of “triple transition”: from military to partial civilian rule, from a planned to a more market-based economy, and from widespread internal conflict to military – driven peace process. The first democratic elections, in 2015, resulted in rapid economic growth (above 7 percent per year) owing to more political stabilization, unification of exchange rates, initial liberalization of product and factor markets, integration into regional markets, and modernization of economic and financial institutions and systems.

Despite such positive socio-economic performance, data prior to the COVID-19 pandemic shows that millions of people in Myanmar had remained vulnerable and at risk of falling into poverty in the face of a negative shock. In the years 2020 and 2021 the situation deteriorated immensely when Myanmar economy was hard hit by four substantial shocks since the beginning of 2020 – the three waves of COVID-19 and the February 2021 coup. In 2021, Myanmar experienced more conflict events than any other countries in the world. Following the military takeover on 1 February 2021, conflict in Myanmar quickly increased, and by the end of the year it had overtaken Syria as the most conflict-affected country³. This dual shock brought massive job losses, stumbling wage increases and weakened the already frail social protection coverage. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) estimates that Myanmar’s GDP shrank by 18% in 2021, while the Kyat exchange rate is in free fall. The relatively

² Two national consultants will be hired by the ILO to provide interpretation and translation service to the IE. One with proficiency in Kayin language and the other in Mon language.

³ Myanmar Food Security Cluster. (2022, June). *Understanding Conflict Dynamics in Myanmar through Conflict and Incident Data: A Food Security Perspective*. <https://food-security-cluster-myanmar.github.io/exploratory-data-analysis-acled-fsc/>

high inflation, rising food prices, and an acute cash shortage have plunged the population into economic desperation. The ILO estimates that 2.2 million jobs have been lost in the two first quarters of 2021. With a low vaccination rate, inadequate health services, and recent trends of escalating conflict, Myanmar continues to be highly vulnerable to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic as well as the political crisis.

Conflict-affected communities across southeast Myanmar are among the most vulnerable where households are struggling to meet their needs after losing regular sources of income from jobs and remittances, giving rise to increasing levels of debt and use of negative coping mechanisms. Despite the ceasefire agreements, these conflict-affected communities continue to face widespread poverty and vulnerability – especially in areas controlled by the Ethnic Armed Organizations (EAOs). Ongoing economic pressures are having a substantial effect on vulnerability and food security, water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH), livelihoods and protection, particularly for the large number of households in the states of Karen and Mon who depend on remittances from their migrant household members. Official statistics published by the Immigration Bureau of Thailand indicate that 183,375 Myanmar nationals departed Thailand between March 2020 and April 2021⁴ through official border crossings in Karen and Mon states as a result of unemployment and a severe COVID-19 lockdown in Thailand. However, given the prevalence of irregular migration channels, the number was presumably much higher for migrant workers returning through irregular border crossings.

Description of the project and critical events

The [Myanmar COVID-19 Response: Livelihoods support to remittance dependent communities](#) is a 27-months ILO project, funded by the New Zealand MFAT, with a budget of NZD 3 million. The Project was initiated by the ILO on 23 September 2020 with an aim to provide safety net for those most vulnerable and affected within the remittance-dependent villages of Karen and Mon States of Myanmar in the wake of COVID-19 pandemic. Longer-term recovery support was another key objective of the Project, to be ensured through increasing employability and creating key rural infrastructure for the targeted beneficiaries. Lessons from previously implemented employment-intensive investments in rural infrastructure (EIIIP) projects of the ILO in Myanmar indicated an acute need in incorporating more skills development activities, with a focus on livelihood skills and TVET courses on subjects that are relevant in the local context, and that improve the employability of the population of the communities. The Project, therefore, also builds on the lessons and good practices established by the three EIIIP projects previously implemented by the ILO in Myanmar, and leverages the critical mass developed through those previous cycles of engagement and capacity development.

Project duration

The Project was initially designed for an implementation period of 18 months (from October 2020 to March 2022). Owing to the political crisis and over four-months of complete suspension of field activities (February to May 2021), combined with the rapidly spreading third wave of COVID-19 transmission in mid-2021, the Project received a total twelve-months extension for implementation. As per the agreed new timeline, the project will close on 31 March 2023.

Geographical coverage

Originally the Project interventions were expected to cover areas under the sole administration of Ethnic Armed Organizations (EAO) as well as areas under mixed administration with the government in the two states namely [Karen](#) and [Mon](#). However, due to rising conflicts which constrained ILO's engagement with the pre-identified Ethnic Service Provider (ESP)⁵ to carry out project interventions in Karen state, the Project ceased any intervention in the mixed administrative areas and expanded its coverage (for TEVT training courses under Output 2) for Karen ethnic remittance-dependent communities in Bago and [Tanintharyi Regions](#) in June 2021.

⁴ International Organization for Migration (IOM), 2021. Socioeconomic Impact of COVID-19 on Migrant Workers in Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar and Thailand. IOM, Thailand

⁵ The Project could not sign Implementation Agreement with the identified ESP as its registration certificate was expired in December 2020 and the organization was unable to renew its registration certificate till date due to the 2021 Myanmar coup d'état.

Within these areas, the Project selected isolated clusters of villages that are deprived of government support and have large numbers of highly affected, vulnerable, and poor population.

Expected results

The development objective of the Project is that ***the remittance-dependent communities in EAO areas of Karen State, Mon State and Tanintharyi Region will have better withstood the loss of remittances and be better equipped for future livelihood opportunities***⁶. The Project set out to provide employment opportunities to the remittance-dependent communities through improving community-demanded rural infrastructures, primarily focusing on WASH facilities, renovation of schools & clinics, and implementing upskills TVET training for the poor and vulnerable ethnic remittance dependent communities that are home to the pandemic affected migrant workers.

The table below illustrates the outcome and outputs that the Project seeks to achieve through its interventions. The table also includes 16 performance indicators which are being measured to demonstrate the achievements by the Project. Note that the original targets for the **Output Indicators** were revised during the second reporting cycle (April–September 2021) as a result of the delay in project implementation caused by the political unrest and inflation as well as lockdown due to COVID-19 transmission:

Table 1 Project outcome, output and targets

Project Outcome: Selected remittance-dependent communities in Karen State, Mon State and Tanintharyi Region better overcome the immediate economic shocks of COVID-19 through improved small-scale community infrastructure and increased options for employment or self-employment		
Outcome Indicators		
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 75% of households in the over 30 project villages who consider the project’s interventions useful for the community as a whole and are satisfied with the process of the selection of individual beneficiaries and the infrastructure 2. Extent to which the wage transfers through the Cash-for-Work activities have compensated for the loss of remittances 3. Time and cost savings related to the improved or constructed infrastructure 4. Extent to which the increased employability (through skills training) has contributed to (or is expected to contribute to) the loss of remittances caused by the coronavirus pandemic 5. 100% of constructed or improved infrastructure for which a self-sustainable village-level operation & maintenance (O&M) system has been established and operationalized 		
OUTPUT 1: Short-term employment provided through cash for work programmes in the construction or improvement of WASH facilities and other essential small-scale public infrastructure in poor, remittance dependent, communities in EAO and mixed administration areas		
Output 1 indicators	Original target	Revised target
Number of infrastructure assets constructed or improved on time, within budget and as per design specifications	Not less than 70 infrastructure assets	Not less than 55 infrastructure assets
Number of workdays of short-term employment provided across the targeted villages	About 56,000 workdays	About 47,000 workdays

⁶ As per the Project’s Logical Diagram

Number of poor vulnerable households benefit from the short-term employment	At least 1,100 poor vulnerable households	At least 1,000 poor vulnerable households
Amount of cash injections in the villages through cash-for-work activities	Not less than NZD 1,470,000	Not less than NZD 1,200,000
Established and operational Village Infrastructure Operation and Maintenance Committees (VIOMCs) in each targeted village	N/A	Unchanged
Output 2: Short certified TVET courses and non-certified livelihoods and construction training delivered that increase skills and employability of people in remittance dependent communities for domestic and migrant work		
Output 2 indicators	Original target	Revised target
Number of beneficiaries from among the most affected poor and vulnerable households in participating villagers have successfully completed certified short TVET courses	180 beneficiaries	325 beneficiaries
% of trainees who completed the TVET courses, will receive on-the-job training in the project's infrastructure construction	At least 50%	Unchanged
% of beneficiaries who have successfully completed the certified TVET courses, have secured or have been assured job placement	Not less than 50%	Unchanged
Number of community contractors from participating villages have received training on construction and contract management aspects and have all completed the works in time, in budget and as per specification.	Not less than 70 community contractors	Not less than 55 community contractors
Amount of profit each community contractors have earned	Profit in the range of NZD 2,000 to NZD 3,000 each	Unchanged
All VDCs have received training required to exercise their roles and responsibilities.	N/A	Unchanged

Source: *Project Results Framework and Second Progress Report of the Project*

Management set-up

Internal institutional arrangement

The ILO Liaison Office in Yangon is responsible for overall management and coordination of the Project. The ILO team for this Project includes an Infrastructure Specialist/Project Manager, a National Project Engineer, an Assistance Finance & Admin Officer and a Driver.

The project is implemented by the ILO, in partnership and close coordination with two national implementing partners who has a long presence and trusted relationships with both local Karen and Mon Service Providers in the proposed project areas in assisting conflict-affect communities. The partners are (i) Covenant Development Institute (CDI), (i) Rahmonnya Peace Foundation (RPF), an ESP. The project intervention takes place within the scope of those Implementation Agreements signed between the ILO and the national partners. According to the Project design, a third implementation agreement was supposed to be signed with another ESP to implement activities in Karen state. This had to be postponed as the ESP was unable to renew their registration certificate to operate because of the difficulties posed by 2021 Myanmar coup d'état.

The Project is technically backstopped by the Employment-Intensive Investment Programme of the ILO and the ILO Decent Work Team in Bangkok (DWT-Bangkok).

The pandemic restrictions prevented onboarding of the Project team in the field due to full teleworking modality adopted by the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) in Myanmar from 28 March 2020. The ILO, including the Project team, was prepared to return to work with a phased approach from 1 February 2021. However, the plan had to be abandoned due to a state of emergency declared by the military Junta following the coup d'état on that very day. At the time of writing this ToR, the Project team was still working remotely.

Activity Steering Group

The implementation of the Project is overseen by an Activity Steering Group, comprising of representatives from the ILO and MFAT. The group provides active direction, periodically reviews interim results and reports, and identifies & executes adjustments to ensure achievement of the Project's results. The group meets on a quarterly basis (post-coup, frequency of meeting increased from the original six-monthly) to monitor and make decisions in handling delivery, political, organisational, technical, cost, management, cultural, and sustainability issues of the Project.

Operational Project Steering Committee (PSC)

An operational Project Steering Committee (PSC) provides policy guidelines and directives for project implementation, and ensures the Project is implemented in accordance with its principles, safeguards, standards, approved work plan, budget, and timeline. The operational PSC comprises of members from the local departments and ethnic CSOs/CBOs, working in the targeted areas and it meets every month to perform following functions: (a) overseeing the work of the PIT including staffing, work plan, budget, financial and progress reports; (b) providing policy direction and guidance to the Project; (c) reviewing the project progress and approval ahead of project disbursement of grants.

In addition to the operational PSC, there are two other institutional bodies that support the Project implementation – the Project Implementation Team (PIT) and the Village Development Committees (VDCs). On one hand the PIT supports the works of the PSC and consists of ESPs and its partner organizations to implement the project, the role of VDCs, on the other hand, is to facilitate the complete process of the selection of subprojects, supporting their implementation, selecting community contractors among others. Detail ToRs of all the operational committees will be made available to the IE during the evaluation.

Exit strategy

The exit strategy of the Project builds on ILO's experiences over the past years of working in conflicts affected areas of Myanmar. To ensure the sustainability of the interventions under output 1, the Project adopted the model for community-based operation & maintenance (O&M) of the infrastructure. The said O&M model has proved to be successful in previously implemented ILO-EIIP projects. The Project ensures active involvement of the communities in the development of the system and enhances their capacities for O&M at the community level. The Project also established Village Infrastructure Operation and Maintenance Committees (VIOMCs) for this purpose and is building their capacities to sustain the project results.

Furthermore, the Project follows-up outcomes of the vocational skills training through on-the-job mentoring/training and provides support in job placement in an attempt to sustain the contributions under output 2.

Lastly, capacity building activities are undertaken for the EAOs line departments and ESPs/ethnic CSOs to ensure that they assume the responsibility of after-project support to the local communities.

Strategic alignment

ILO Program & Budget (P&B): The Project contributes to ILO P&B Outcome 3: Economic, social and environmental transitions for full, productive and freely chosen employment and decent work for all under programme and budget for the biennium [2020-2021](#) and [2022-2023](#).

Decent Work Country Program (DWCP) and Country Programme Outcome (CPO): This Project contributes towards the [Myanmar DWCP 2018-22](#): Employment and decent work and sustainable entrepreneurship

opportunities are available and accessible to all, including for vulnerable populations affected by conflict and disasters. The specific country programme outcome (CPO) that the proposal contributes to is outcome 1.1 – more women and men of working age have decent jobs or are engaged in entrepreneurship especially those in vulnerable employment conditions.

Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): The Project is also aligned with the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and contributes towards the realisation of the targets set under SDG 8: Promote sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all.

Myanmar Government's and UNCT priorities: The Project contributes to the priorities of the Government's COVID-19 Economic Relief Plan (CERP) that was in effect prior to the military takeover, and the UN Framework for the immediate socio-economic response to COVID-19 (UN-SERF). CERP is understood to no longer in effect, and the UNCT principle of engagement requires a re-programming on works that require engagement with the de facto authorities.

ILO cross cutting policy drivers: The Project also supports the Gender Equality and mainstreaming of a gender equality approach, a cross cutting theme of the ILO. The Project is designed to address pressing needs to create jobs, improve livelihoods and build resilience for remittance dependent communities – in particular women & youth – to mitigate the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. The Project strategy includes increasing decision-making and employment opportunities for women in rural infrastructure works, promoting the development of gender-responsive infrastructure that meets the needs of all end users – women and men. The Project targets at least 40% men or women participation in the construction works and equal participation of women and men in training/skills development activities. A Gender Framework is developed by the Project that sets out the rationale for integrating gender equality into the project activities and provides practical direction for doing so across sectors.

Project achievements to date

During its first 24 months of operations, until 30 Sept 2022, the Project achieved the following:

- 28 infrastructure assets constructed or improved
- More than 38,800 workdays of short-term employment provided across 48 number of villages
- At least 1,200 poor vulnerable households' benefit from the short-term employment
- At least MMK 830 million cash injected through CfW activities
- 15 VIOMCs established
- 200 direct beneficiaries successfully completed short TVET courses
- 236 certified beneficiaries received on-the-job training in the project's infrastructure construction
- 56 number of community contractors from 48 number of villages received training on construction and contract management aspects
- 48 VDCs established by the Project in Karen State, Mon State and Tanintharyi Region
- 48 VDCs have received training required to exercise their roles and responsibilities.
- Surveys conducted by the PITs in 48 villages of Karen State, Mon State and Tanintharyi Region to identify priority needs and opportunities.

Purpose and objectives of the evaluation

In the ILO, final evaluations of Development Cooperation (DC) projects focus on the outcomes of project and the likelihood that the projects will achieve impact⁷. The evaluation provides an opportunity for in-depth reflection on the strategy and assumptions guiding the intervention. It assesses the extent to which an intervention achieved its objectives and may recommend adjustments to its strategy. It is also a means to assess how well intervention-level actions support higher level ILO strategies and objectives, as articulated in DWCPs and the ILO's P&B.

⁷ ILO policy guidelines for evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 4th edition

The purpose of the final evaluation of this Project is two-fold. The first purpose is summative. As the programme nears to its end date, the final evaluation will assess the performance of the project during its implementation period, as well as its success in achieving its planned results and objectives. This assessment will take into account relevance and validity of design, coherence, effectiveness including effectiveness of management arrangement, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the ILO's strategy, project approach and interventions. The effect of ongoing pandemic and continued political turmoil in the country will be at the heart of the assessment.

The evaluation is also intended to be forward looking and provide findings and lessons learned and emerging good practices for improved decision-making. Thus, the second purpose of the evaluation is to draw lessons and good practices from the project implementation so that the ILO, project donor and stakeholders can improve future projects and programmes of similar nature, within and outside Myanmar and the targeted Project areas, as well as to consider potential follow-up support after the end of the Project.

Evaluation scope

The scope of the final independent evaluation covers the entire Project period i.e., it will encompass all activities and components of the Project under the direct responsibility of the ILO from its start in October 2020 and up to the actual time of the final evaluation. It will focus on the Project's achievements and its contribution to the overall socioeconomic improvement of the targeted communities and beneficiaries in southeast Myanmar. In particular, the evaluation will analyse on what worked, what did not work, and why this is the case through measurement of progress towards all Project outcomes, *intended and unintended*, produced since the start of the Project. It will further assess the overall level of achievement of the two outputs to understand how and why these have been achieved and to what extent. Recommendations, emerging from the evaluation, should be strongly linked to the findings of the evaluation and should provide clear guidance to the ILO and its stakeholders on how they can address them.

The evaluation will integrate gender equality, disability inclusion & non-discrimination, and impact of the COVID-19 throughout its deliverables and process. It should be addressed in line with [ILO/EVAL Guidance Note no. 3.1](#), and [Guidance Note no. 4.5](#) to ensure stakeholder participation. Due to escalated armed conflicts, reaching adequate stakeholder participation might be challenging. The IE, however, will make the best effort to engage the key national stakeholders in coordination with the Project team and implementing partners. The evaluation report should elucidate the factors leading to reduced level of stakeholder engagement and utilize the analysis to complement the findings of different evaluation criteria (coherence, effectiveness in particular) and infer further lessons for the ILO.

In addition, the evaluation should seek to integrate sensitive and timely conflict analysis throughout the process into its design, approach, reporting and validation.

The evaluation should also pay a specific attention to how the project is relevant to the ILO's global programme framework including P&B, contribution of the project to SDGs ([Myanmar sustainable development plan 2018-30](#)) and UN country frameworks, and COVID-19 response.

Users of the final evaluation

The main users of this independent final evaluation will include the ILO management in Myanmar, regional and headquarters level, the ILO's tripartite constituents, the partners and donor of the programme.

Evaluation criteria and questions

The independent final evaluation will adhere to the six OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) evaluation criteria that serve as the basis upon which evaluative judgements are made. More specifically, the Project will be assessed against the following evaluation criteria:

- **Relevance**, the extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries', global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change

- **Coherence**, the compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution
- **Effectiveness**, the extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups
- **Efficiency**, the extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way
- **Impact**, the extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects, and
- **Sustainability**, the extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue

[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 are established within those criteria, and the evaluation should therefore adhere to these to ensure an internationally credible evaluation.

Below is a draft list of the *Evaluation Questions*. The IE is encouraged to adapt the evaluation questions. If the IE wishes to propose any fundamental changes to the evaluation questions, s/he should do so after consulting the EM and shall reflect the changes in the *Inception Report*. The evaluation questions should consider how data collection can avoid fuelling further tensions and putting affected people/communities at risk.

Evaluation criteria	Evaluation questions
Relevance and validity of design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the project still relevant to beneficiaries', global, country, ILO and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, considering the changes in circumstances (the 2021 coup d'état)? What is the relevance of the Project as perceived by the local population and beneficiaries? • How has the Project responded flexibly to changing circumstances over time? Did the Project address the major causes of vulnerability and respond to livelihood & employment issues among remittance-dependent communities, including women and youth? • Are the stated goals, objectives and outputs relevant to issues (and their effects) that are central to the situation of pandemic and ongoing conflict and fragility? Was there a measurable relationship between project outputs e.g. cash into communities, and project outcomes?
Coherence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent other interventions and policies support or undermine the Project interventions, and vice versa? • Was the Project consistent with or influential to ILO national, regional and global strategic priorities and programming on labour migration, social protection and skills development, and make effective use of its comparative advantages? • To what extent there is synergies and interlinkages between the Project interventions and other interventions carried out by the ILO-Yangon office, the government, EAOs, ESPs, CSOs and social partners? • How the Project adds value in relation to others and how duplication of effort is avoided?
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the size of the project, its complexity and challenges under Covid-19 as well as the political instability in Myanmar, have the existing management structure and technical capacity been sufficient and adequate? To what extent the Project received political support to navigate local political and security challenges? • Has the project been receiving adequate political, technical and administrative support from the ILO and its partners? If not, why? How did the Project address this? • Was the Project's use of resources optimal for achieving its intended results (financial, human, institutional and technical, etc.)? Were activities completed on-time/according

Evaluation criteria	Evaluation questions
	<p>to work plans? Was the funding and timeframe sufficient to achieve the intended outcomes?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which project activities represented the greatest value for money in terms of achieving objectives and outputs of the project? • Were cost-sharing arrangements or in-kind contributions sought from partners to complement the project’s resources (from other ILO projects, inter-agency initiatives, cooperation with tripartite constituents and CSO partners, etc.)? Which were the most effective for leveraging project resources? • What was the impact of the major challenges/risks that affected programme efficiency and performance (incl. those related to COVID-19 and the February ’21 coup)? How did the Project manage those challenges/risks to continue delivering impact?
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent did the Project achieve the targets set forth in its logical diagram and results framework? What were the internal and external factors that influenced achievements or non-achievements of results (including but not limited to management, human resources, financial aspects, regulatory aspects, implementation modifications or deviation from plans)? How did the Project respond to changing context, particularly the political upheaval, and conflict, and how effective were the responses in maintaining safety and delivering results? • Has an effective Risk Analysis and a Monitoring, Evaluation (M&E) and Reporting system been established and implemented, including the regular/periodic meetings among project staff and with the beneficiary, donor and key partners? Are those systems effective to aid result-based management and to ensure expected results of the Project? To what extent the M&E and reporting system is able to collect and use disaggregated data by sex, by age (youth), people with disabilities, and age (and other categories that the Project has identified)? • Were management and governance structures effective – from implementation to donor/ILO meetings? Was technical backstopping sought and received from specialists when needed, and were arrangements effective? How effective is communication between the different actors involved, including between the ILO and EAOs, Village development committees, civil society partners etc? • Were local communities or affected populations involved in monitoring activities, including marginalised groups such as women, youth, people with disabilities (PWDs)? • Were the monitoring tools and resources adapted to meet real-time needs on the ground, if needed?
Impact orientation and sustainability of project benefits ⁸	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What were the most significant negative or positive, intended or unintended, effects on the life of the ultimate project beneficiaries so far? How did the Project interventions address the immediate economic shocks of COVID-19 among selected remittance-dependent communities in Karen and Mon State? • Was there any evidence that the results of the intervention may have a positive contribution to the relevant SDGs and targets (explicitly or implicitly)? • Was there a sustainability strategy/plan for the Project? Is the strategy effective and realistic taking into consideration potential changes in the country due to the COVID 19 pandemic? Were there any gaps in the sustainability strategy/plan and how these could be addressed by the stakeholders, including other ILO-Yangon office and other ILO projects?

⁸ it may be difficult to attribute impact to the Project given the current context in Myanmar. Therefore, the evaluation focus in this regard could relate to the Project’s intended or unintended longer-term results. The same reasoning applies in measuring sustainability.

Evaluation criteria	Evaluation questions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Which project benefits show evidence that they will likely continue after external funding is discontinued? • Did the trainings conducted in areas where trainees are/will be later able to generate increased income? • Any evidence that operational maintenance committees tasked with infrastructure maintenance are completing this work as required?
Gender and other Cross Cutting issues including COVID 19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the Gender Framework of the Project relevant and effective? Which factors influenced its implementation and achievement or non-achievements of gender related targets? • To what extent was the Project successful in increasing decision-making and employment opportunities for women in rural infrastructure works? • To what extent was the Project successful in promoting the development of gender-responsive infrastructure that meets the needs of all end users – women and men, and people with disabilities? • To what extent has the Project promoted the relevant international standards and good practices, or ratification and application of the ILS, inclusion of people with disability, social dialogue and tripartism? • How well has the programme integrated environmental concerns and disaster risk reduction into its initiatives?

Cross cutting issues

The IE must explicitly refer to gender and disability issues throughout the evaluation activities within the his/her responsibilities and any outputs, including the Final Evaluation Report which shall mainstream gender and disability issues. The evaluation shall apply gender and disability analysis by involving women, men and PWDs in the data collection, meetings and data analysis; justification of programme documents; reviewing of programme’s objectives and indicators in line with its sensitivity towards gender and disability; and assessing outcomes in terms of its role in improving lives of women, men and PWDs.

The analysis of gender-related concerns will be based on the ILO/EVAL Guidance Note 3.1 (June 2020). The evaluation will be conducted following UN evaluation standards and norms and the glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management developed by the OECD/DAC.

Methodology

[The ILO’s policy guidelines for evaluation \(4th edition, 2020\)](#) provides the basic framework for conducting independent final evaluation of DC projects. The evaluation will be carried out according to the ILO’s standard policies and procedures and comply with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms and standards and the OECD/DAC evaluation quality standards.

As the COVID 19 pandemic continues to persist, this evaluation will be also guided by [ILO/EVAL Operating procedures No. 1, Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO, Practical tips on adapting to the situation, 24 April 2020 \(v.3\)](#).

The evaluation will draw on both subjective (interviews, focus group discussions, stakeholder workshop) as well as objective sources (development documents, donor reports, M&E reports, statistics etc.). The proposed methodology for the current evaluation includes:

- **Stakeholder analysis.** Since the Project operates in a political environment under conditions of considerable tension, it also covers a full spectrum of people from the powerful to the powerless, and the evaluation should consider the views and interests of all stakeholders, as much as possible. The IE

should conduct a preliminary background analysis to determine who the stakeholders are and how they are affecting or are affected by the Project.

- **Desk review** of relevant documents, including:
 - The project document (ProDoc) with all annexes
 - Relevant national plans
 - Myanmar sustainable development plan 2018-30
 - Myanmar DWCP 2018-22
 - MoU Agreement between the ILO and MFAT, and subsequent amendments
 - Logical diagram and results framework
 - Project Operational Procedure Manual, 2020
 - Original and revised work plan
 - Original and revised financial documentation
 - Research materials/publications/knowledge products produced through the Project or by relevant stakeholders
 - Policy documents reviewed/revised by the programme
 - The skills development courses and related materials
 - The project's M&E framework and plans
 - The biannual project progress reports to the donor
 - Partner reports including progress reports, needs assessments reports, impact assessment reports
 - ASG and PSC meeting minutes
 - The ILO's Evaluation guidance documents
 - ILO P&B 2020-21 and 2022-23
 - Communication and visibility products
- **Interviews and focused group discussions (FGDs).** Access to local communities is currently restricted in light of security issues as well as the pandemic situations. In the absence of face-to-face interviews, data collection using electronic channels will be used as the reasonable alternative for this evaluation. The IE can choose from an array of videoconferencing platforms to conduct the interviews and FGDs including MS Teams, Google Meet, Zoom and Skype, as long as those are accessible by the respondents. Telephonic interviews may be done in the absence of internet connectivity. The IE will be accompanied and supported in terms of interpretation services by two interpreters – one for Kayin and the other for Mon language, to be hired locally. The main sources for answering the evaluation questions will be the following stakeholders, including but not limited to:
 - Project beneficiaries in the two states & one region (e.g. community contractors, workers, TVET trainees etc.)
 - The Project team in Myanmar
 - ILO Liaison Officer and Deputy Liaison Officer for Myanmar
 - Representatives of the EAOs and their relevant departments
 - Senior management of the implementing partners (RPF and CDI)
 - Project Managers, engineers and other staffs of the national implementing partners
 - Members of PSCs, PITs, VDCs and VIOMCs
 - Representatives from the regional/state, provincial and village level agencies
 - MFAT focal person for the Project
 - ILO Migration project CTA who supported the Project design & implementation
 - ILO projects/programmes of relevance (for assessing synergies and coordination)
 - TVET institutions supported by the Project

Note that the availability of stakeholders, specifically members of the EAOs, can be challenging in the current context of Myanmar. Therefore, the IE must rigorously and bearing conflict sensitivity in mind, consult the stakeholder list for interviews with the Project team and include the rationale for selecting

specific individuals in the Inception Report. The interview schedule must be made available to the Project team in advance to support necessary logistic arrangements.

- **Direct observations** of project activities, in particular infrastructures such as improvement and construction of school buildings, health centres, WASH facilities, as well as TVET trainings. This could be arranged via videoconferencing, in coordination with the Project team and implementing partners.
- The IE may use **surveys** (online or offline) to collect data for the evaluation from the target groups, if applicable.
- **Validation workshop** will be held to discuss and validate the preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations with all key stakeholders. This will be conducted after the preliminary findings are presented to the Project & the EM, following data collection.

The IE would be provided with a list of recommended/potential persons/institutions to interview that will be prepared by the Project Team in consultation with the EM.

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

Data analysis and Triangulation /Validation: The IE will ensure that the findings are evidence based. This implies that perceptions, hypotheses and assertions obtained in interviews will be validated through cross checks and triangulation of sources.

It is noted that the evaluation methodology will be designed by the IE taking the evolving situation and the associated risks into account. The methodology should include multiple approaches, with analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data, and should be able to capture the contribution of each output to the achievement of expected outcomes.

To the extent possible, the data collection, analysis and presentation should be responsive to and include issues relating to diversity, gender and non-discrimination, including disability issues. All gender concerns should/will be addressed in accordance with [ILO/EVAL Guidance Note no. 3.1, Integrating gender equality in monitoring and evaluation](#).

If the IE wish to propose any fundamental changes to the methodology of this evaluation, s/he should do so after consulting the EM and shall reflect the changes in the *Inception Report*.

Main deliverables

The IE will deliver the following main outputs:

Deliverable 1: Inception report

The inception report is a means of ensuring mutual understanding of the IE's plan of action and timeline for conducting the evaluation. It also provides additional guarantee of adherence to, and interpretation of the TOR. The IE will draft the inception report after completing review of the available documents and online briefings/initial discussions with the Project team, relevant ILO officials/specialists and, if required, the donor. The inception report will include the final evaluation questions, data collection methodologies and techniques, and evaluation tools as well as a completed [Standard Evaluation Instrument Matrix](#). The methodology should clearly state the limitations of the chosen evaluation methods, including those related to representation (and non-representation) of specific group of stakeholders and beneficiaries.

Any fundamental changes to the [Proposed Evaluation Questions](#) or [Proposed Evaluation Methods](#) illustrated in this TOR must be captured in the inception report.

The inception report will be prepared in accordance with the [ILO/EVAL Checklist 4.8: Writing the inception report](#), and be approved by the EM.

Deliverable 2: Presentation on the preliminary findings of the evaluation and validation workshop with stakeholders

Followed by the data and information collection, the IE will prepare a PowerPoint presentation detailing preliminary findings of the evaluation and will propose key evaluation recommendations. The findings will be shared with the ILO and later validated at the stakeholders' workshop arranged virtually. The ILO Project team will provide necessary administrative and logistic support to organise the stakeholder validation workshop, while the interpreters will support the IE in conducting and providing translation support during the validation workshop.

Deliverable 3: Draft evaluation report

The draft evaluation report should be prepared in accordance with the [ILO/EVAL Checklist 4.2: Preparing the Evaluation report](#). The draft report will be improved by incorporating EM's comments. Then the EM will circulate the draft report to key stakeholders including the Project team, the ILO officials concerned with this evaluation, the donor representatives and national partners for comments.

Deliverable 4: Final evaluation report with evaluation summary (in standard ILO format)

The IE will incorporate comments received from the ILO and other key stakeholders into the final evaluation report. The evaluator must ensure that it is done in accordance with the [ILO/EVAL Checklist 4.2: Preparing the Evaluation report](#).

The reports and all other outputs of the evaluation will be produced in English language. All draft and final reports, including other supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided in electronic version compatible with Microsoft Word/Excel/PowerPoint for Windows. The final evaluation report should not exceed **30 pages** (*excluding annexures*). Findings, gaps and results should have a logical flow, be credible and clearly presented.

The draft report will be circulated to key stakeholders and partners of the Project, donor, relevant national partners, and the ILO's staff i.e., the project management, the ILO's Regional office in Bangkok, the ILO specialists for their review. Comments from all the stakeholders will be consolidated by the EM who will ensure the IE receives and incorporates those feedback into the revised evaluation report. If required, the IE will prepare an additional matrix depicting all modifications made in the evaluation report, categorized by stakeholder comments. The evaluation report will be considered final only when it gets final approval by the ILO's Evaluation Office. The quality of the report will be assessed against the [ILO/EVAL Checklist 4.9: Rating the quality of evaluation report](#).

Ownership of the data from the evaluation rests jointly between the ILO and the IE. The copyrights of the evaluation report rest exclusively with the ILO. Use of the data for publication and other presentation can only be made with the prior agreement of the ILO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

Draft and final evaluation reports should include the following sections:

1. Cover page with key project data (project title, project number, donor, project start and completion dates, budget, technical area, managing ILO unit, geographical coverage); and evaluation data (type of evaluation, managing ILO unit, start and completion dates of the evaluation mission, name(s) of evaluator(s), date of submission of evaluation report). See [Checklist 4.3: Filling in the Evaluation Title Page](#) for further detail.
2. Acronyms and abbreviations

3. Executive Summary (according to [Checklist 4.4: Preparing the Evaluation Report Summary](#) and [ILO template](#)) with key findings, conclusions, recommendations, lessons and good practices (*lesson learned and good practice need to be annexed using standard ILO format*)
4. Description of the project and its intervention logic
5. Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation
6. Methodology and evaluation questions
7. Limitations
8. Presentation of findings for each criterion
9. A table presenting the key results (i.e., figures and qualitative results) achieved per output & KPIs
10. Conclusions and recommendations, (including to whom they are addressed)
11. Lessons learned (see [ILO template](#)), emerging good practices⁹ (see [ILO template](#)) and models of intervention/possible future direction
12. Appropriate Annexes (list of meetings and interviews, ToR, and other relevant documents, lesson learned and good practice using standard ILO format, maps etc).
13. Standard evaluation instrument matrix (adjusted version of the one included in the Inception report)

Management arrangements

Responsibilities of the evaluation manager

The evaluation will be managed by an EM working for the ILO with no prior involvement with the Project, with oversight provided by the ILO Evaluation Office (EVAL). The IE, on the other hand, will report to the EM and oversee the work of the national consultants (interpreters).

For this assignment, the EM is Ms Sohana Samrin Chowdhury who will coordinate this evaluation in consultation with Ms Pamornrat Pringsulaka, Regional Evaluation Officer (REO) of ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific. The EM will undertake the following tasks, in coordination with the REO:

- Serve as the first point of contact for the IE and national consultants
- Provide background documentation to the evaluator, in collaboration with the Project team
- Brief the IE on ILO evaluation procedures
- Oversee 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 evaluation reports to all concerned stakeholders for comments
- Assist with the stakeholder workshop
- Consolidate stakeholders' comments for the IE
- Review final evaluation report to ensure quality
- Submit final report package (including the submission form and evaluator review form) to the REO for initial approval and then send to EVAL HQ for formal approval
- Once approved by EVAL, the EM endorses payment to the IE and national consultants

Responsibilities of the project team

The Project team will handle all the contractual arrangements with the IE and national consultants, including logistic and administrative support to the evaluation throughout the process. The specific responsibilities of the Project team include:

- Provide all the project documents to be reviewed
- Provide all assistance to the IE and EM in finalising the interviewee list

⁹ Good practices refer to good approaches or practices of this project which can be further built upon by the project in the future and can also be replicated in other similar projects

- Ensure IE has adequate documentation, assist in data gathering and logistical support
- Arrange meetings and coordinate exchanges between the IE and partners
- Participate in the evaluation related workshop(s) and provide input to EM on the draft evaluation report

Responsibilities of the independent international evaluator

Last but not the least, the IE will perform the following tasks, in relation to the scope and methods of the evaluation listed above in the ToR:

- Undertake the evaluation according to the agreed ToR
- Conduct all interviews using electronic means. The interpreter will support the IE in conducting and providing translation support in stakeholder meetings, and focus group discussions and survey (if any), under the IE's supervision
- Prepare MS PowerPoint presentation on the preliminary findings of the evaluation, present it to the ILO and incorporate feedback into the draft evaluation report
- Conduct the validation workshop with stakeholders, validate preliminary findings & recommendations, and collect necessary information
- Prepare and submit inception report, draft and final evaluation reports to the EM
- Remain independent and hold sole responsibility for the substantive content of the final evaluation report which must adhere to EVAL quality requirements and formats

Desired competencies of the IE

As a general principle the IE should:

- adhere to internationally accepted good practices and solid ethical principles
- be skilled in implementing diverse evaluation methodologies
- ensure the evaluation is an inclusive and participatory learning exercise; and
- be culturally and gender-sensitive

In particular for this evaluation, the following competencies are required from the candidate:

- Holds no previous involvement/engagement in the design and delivery of the Project
- Has minimum of **ten years of experience** in conducting programme or project evaluations
- Holds **substantial working experience in implementing and /or conducting evaluation for projects/programmes in fragile & conflict affected states**, relating to migration, skills development, employment and cash for work
- Has **experience and knowledge on the socio-political context of the country, including an understanding of the ethnic and political dynamics in Myanmar's Southeast**. Previous experience of conducting an evaluation in Myanmar will be an added advantage.
- Has expertise and **extensive experience in designing M&E systems** for similar programme/projects
- Holds knowledge of the ILO's roles and mandate and its tripartite structure as well as UN evaluation norms and its programming
- Has excellent analytical skills and communication skills
- Has excellent report writing skills in English

Evaluation work plan with indicative timeline

Activity	Responsibility	Proposed timeline	Number of working days for IE
1. Preparation and finalisation of the evaluation ToR	EM/Project team/other stakeholders		-
2. Approval of the ToR	REO		-
3. ToR Advertisement	EM		-
4. Selection of the evaluation consultant	EM		-
5. Issuing excol contract based on the ToR prepared/signed	Project team	2 nd week of Jan '23	-
6. Briefing for IE on the ILO evaluation policy	EM	13 Jan '23	-
7. Reviewing programme documentation; Stakeholder mapping; Online interviews with the relevant ILO officials/specialists and donor; preparation and submission of the inception report to the EM	IE	16 – 20 Jan '23	7
8. Approval of the inception report, including ensuring any necessary adjustments by the IE	EM/Project team	23 – 27 Jan '23	-
9. Data/information collection and presenting preliminary findings to the EM and Project team	IE & interpreter	30 Jan – 18 Feb '23	10
10. Validation workshop with stakeholders	IE, EM, Project team	21 Feb '23	1
11. Drafting evaluation report; submitting draft report to the EM	IE	22 Feb – 2 Mar '23	7
12. Sharing the draft evaluation report with all the concerned stakeholders, including the donor, for comments	EM	6 – 19 Mar '23	-
13. Comments on the draft report collected and consolidated, and sent to the IE	EM	20 – 21 Mar '23	-
14. Finalisation and submission of the report to the EM	IE	22 – 24 Mar '23	3
15. Submission of final evaluation report to the ILO Evaluation Office	EM	24 Mar '23	-
16. Approval of the evaluation report	EVAL	29 Mar '23	-
Total working days for the IE			28

Legal and ethical matters

The evaluation will comply with UN Norms and Standards. UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) ethical guidelines will be followed. The IE will abide by the EVAL's Code of Conduct for carrying out the evaluations. The evaluator should not have any links to project management, or any other conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of the evaluation.

Application

The **deadline to submit an Expression of Interest for undertaking this evaluation is Thursday, 15 December 2022, by 17:00 hrs (Bangkok time)**. Applications should be sent by e-mail with the subject header **"ILO/Myanmar COVID-19 Response Programme Final Evaluation"** to the Evaluation Manager, Ms. Sohana Samrin Chowdhury (chowdhuryso@ilo.org), copied to Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka (pamornrat@ilo.org).

All relevant ILO evaluation guidance notes, checklists and standard templates

All relevant ILO evaluation guidance notes, checklists and standard templates can be found accessing the following links:

1. ILO Evaluation Guidance
https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_853289.pdf
2. Code of conduct form (to be signed by the evaluator)
https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746806.pdf
3. Checklist 4.8 Writing the inception report
https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746817.pdf
4. Checklist 4.2 Preparing the evaluation report
https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746808.pdf
5. Checklist 4.9 Rating the quality of evaluation report
https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746818.pdf
6. Template for evaluation title page
http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_166357/lang--en/index.htm
7. Template for evaluation summary
https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746822.pdf
8. Template for Lessons Learned
https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746820.pdf
9. Template for Emerging Good Practices
https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746821.pdf
10. Guidance notes 3.1 Integrating gender equality in M&E of programmes
https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/@ed_mas/@eval/documents/publication/wcms_165986.pdf
11. Guidance notes 4.5 Stakeholders engagement
https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746724.pdf