![International Labour Organization logo]

Call for interest for an evaluation team for the final independent evaluation of ILO SCORE (Sustaining Competitive and Responsible Enterprises) Programme Phase III

Terms of Reference

Title of Project	ILO SCORE (Sustaining Competitive and Responsible Enterprises) Programme Phase III
TC CODE	**Global SCORE (GLO/17/54/MUL)** • SCORE China (CHN/17/50/MUL) • SCORE India (IND/17/50/MUL) • SCORE Indonesia (IDN/17/50/MUL) • SCORE Myanmar (MMR/17/51/MUL) • SCORE Vietnam (VNM/17/51/MUL) • SCORE Ghana (GHA/17/50/MUL) • SCORE Bolivia (BOL/17/50/MUL) • SCORE Colombia (COL/17/50/MUL) • SCORE Peru (PER/17/50/MUL) • SCORE Tunisia (TUN/17/51/MUL) • SCORE Ethiopia (ETH/17/01/MUL)
Administrative Unit	**ENTERPRISES (ILO Geneva)**
Technical Backstopping Units	SME (ENTERPRISES)
Donor	Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (SECO) and the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD)
Implementation Partners	
Type of Evaluation	Independent Final Evaluation
Timing of Evaluation	September-December 2021
Project budget	USD 20,751,939

Project implementation duration	November 2017 – December 2021
Scope of timeframe for final evaluation	November 2017 – September 2021
Evaluation Manager	Mr. Adam Adrien-Kirby (adrien-kirby@ilo.org)

Introduction

These terms of reference are a call for interest for an evaluation team to develop and deliver the final, independent evaluation of the ILO SCORE (Sustaining Competitive and Responsible Enterprises) Programme Phase III, funded by the Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (SECO) and the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD).

SCORE is an ILO global programme improving productivity and working conditions in SMEs, contributing to achieving outcome 4: Sustainable enterprises as generators of employment and promoters of innovation and decent work under the ILO's Programme & Budget 2020-2021. The key intervention of the global programme is support for the implementation of SCORE training, which combines practical classroom training with in-factory consulting. SCORE Training demonstrates best international practices in the manufacturing and service sectors and helps SMEs to participate in global supply chains.

The ILO is assisting government agencies, training providers, industry associations and trade unions in emerging economies in Africa, Asia and Latin America to offer SCORE Training to enterprises. The SCORE project has been funded by the Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (SECO) and the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD) since 2009. During Phase I (2009-2014), the donors contributed USD 9.7 Million to the ILO; Phase II of the SCORE project (2014-2017) was funded with USD 19.4 Million; and, during the Phase III, both donors funded USD 20.7 Million.

The evaluation of this development cooperation project is an assessment of the intervention, focusing on what worked, what didn't work (and why), and the lessons learned. The evaluation process also examines if the best approach was taken, and if it was optimally executed, particularly with regard to the adaptations required in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. The evaluation will structure its enquiry around the OECD DAC pillars of a project's relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and contribution to broader impact, as well as the suitability of project design to ILO's strategic and national decent work programme frameworks.

This evaluation will be an independent final evaluation, conducted by external, independent evaluators selected in consultation with the project's administrative unit and managed by an evaluation manager at ILO Headquarters in Geneva with no prior involvement in the project. Key stakeholders, ILO constituents, partners and the donor will be consulted throughout the evaluation process.

Project Background

The project falls under ILO Programme & Budget Policy Outcome 4: Sustainable enterprises as generators of employment and promoters of innovation and decent work. It also contributes to the realisation of SDG 8 and SDG 9.

With a total budget of US$ 20.7million, the project has undertaken activities in eleven countries (China, India, Indonesia, Myanmar, Vietnam, Ghana, Bolivia, Colombia, Peru, Ethiopia and Tunisia) alongside a global component administered by the ILO HQ in Geneva.

Project strategy and goals

The development objectives of SCORE Programme during Phase III is that SMEs in national and global supply chains have improved productivity and working conditions and provide decent work. The project is expected to achieve the following two outcomes:

1. Public and private implementation partners have embedded SCORE Training in their national programs and budgets for SME development in strategic sectors and clusters

2. Lead buyers support suppliers through SCORE Training[1]

A global project document describes these objectives and outlines a project implementation framework. For each country component, a specific project strategy document has been drafted which operationalizes the global project strategy at the country level according to the local context. A performance plan with bi-annual milestones and yearly work plans guide the implementation of project activities.

Project activities are at different stages of implementation depending on their starting year of intervention and different country projects are offering the SCORE Training services in different economic sectors.

Institutional and management structure

The SCORE project started operations in September 2009 and is scheduled to end in December 2021. It is funded by the Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (SECO) and the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD) with an overall

---

[1] In the case of Bolivia, Outcome 2 has been adjusted as follows: Two high-potential sectors are selected and the main factors affecting export development and the formalization of informal enterprises are identified.

budget of USD 9.7 Million in Phase I (topped up by USD 1.3 Million USD by NORAD), USD 19.4 Million in Phase II and USD 20.7 Million in Phase III.

The eleven SCORE country projects, with an average annual budget of USD 300,000 – 400,000[2] per country, report directly to the Director of the closest ILO Country Office and receive support from regional Decent Work Country Teams. A global component (Chief Technical Advisor, 1.5 technical officer and admin support) based in Geneva coordinates the project and serves as a knowledge hub. The Project sits in the SME Unit of the Enterprises Department and is a central pillar of the unit's SME Productivity and Working Conditions thematic area. As such, support is provided by a regular budget technical officer covering this topic for the unit.

In each country, the project works with the appropriate government agencies, industry associations and employers' and workers' organizations and supports the local Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP). The project is regularly advised by a Tripartite Advisory Committee (social partners and donors) at the national and global level.

Previous evaluations

Phase I

From April to June 2011, the project conducted an independent mid-term evaluation of phase I. A final independent evaluation was conducted from July to November 2012, covering the period from September 2009 to November 2012. The final evaluation included desk reviews for Indonesia, India and South Africa and field work in Colombia, China, Viet Nam and Ghana. Separate evaluations were conducted in South Africa and India from October to November 2012 and from August to October 2013 respectively.

Phase II

Between September 2015 and February 2016, the SCORE project phase II underwent an independent mid-term evaluation following ILO EVAL standards and in line with donor agreements. The objectives of the evaluations were to assess the progress of the project, provide recommendations and lessons learned for the remaining phase II, and make suggestions for the design of a possible SCORE phase III. The evaluation covered the

---

[2] Budgets in Myanmar, Peru and Vietnam are higher due to 1 P4 and 1 P3 staff (currently 2 P3) in Myanmar; 1 P4 position in Peru and Vietnam; and 1 P3 position in Bolivia.

country projects in China, India, Indonesia, Viet Nam, Ghana, South Africa, Colombia and the global component.

Based on the agreement with donors, three impact evaluations in India, Ghana and Vietnam were conducted at the end of the project Phase II, in lieu of a final evaluation. In 2016, a three-year impact evaluation in Peru was initiated. Two reports have been produced and a final report was published in 2020.

Phase III

Between August 2019 and January 2020, the project conducted an independent mid-term evaluation of phase III. Due to the different project structure, the Myanmar and Ethiopia project components were evaluated from October 2020 to January 2021 and in early 2021, respectively. The three-year impact evaluation in Peru was finalized in 2019. Currently, an impact assessment on SCORE interventions, focusing on the institutional level changes and impact on the sustainability of business development services, is ongoing in China, Ghana, Indonesia, Vietnam, Colombia, Peru and Bolivia.

All evaluation reports will be made available to the evaluation team.

Purpose, Scope and Clients

Purpose

The objective of the evaluation is to:
- Assess the SCORE intervention focusing on what has worked, what has not worked, and why this was the case;
- Assess whether the SCORE Programme has effectively adapted its intervention during the Covid-19 pandemic;
- Examine if the best approach[3] was taken and was optimally executed;
- Provide a clear articulation of the 'lessons learned' and identify good practices.

Recommendations will be used to improve the implementation of future projects and programmes; to enhance accountability; and to generate learning both for the ILO and key stakeholders.

---

[3] 'Best' is taken to mean an effective balance between the levels of impact and sustainability on one side and, on the other, the time and resources used to achieve that balance.

This evaluation will comply with UN norms and standards for evaluation and ensure that ethical safeguards concerning the independence of the evaluation will be followed. Please refer to the UNEG ethical guidelines: www.unevaluation.org/ethicalguidelines

Scope

The evaluation will cover the period from November 2017 to end of September 2021, to create an accurate and comprehensive picture of the global project's context and development.

It will evaluate the SCORE project components in Global, Tunisia, Bolivia, China, Peru, Vietnam, Indonesia, Ghana and Colombia. Considering the ongoing SCORE Phase III impact assessment and planned post-programme evaluability assessment in September-November 2021, the final evaluation will be conducted in the following countries:

- Full review: Global, Tunisia, Bolivia, China, Peru
- Desk review: Vietnam, Indonesia, Ghana, Colombia

For the following reasons, three countries are not part of the final evaluation:

- Myanmar - Due to the political unrest and recent mid-term evaluation finalized in February 2021.
- Ethiopia - evaluated as part of One-ILO project.
- India - SCORE interventions were completed in 2019.

The evaluation should look at the linkages between the various country projects and the global component, generate findings on the six evaluation criteria for all country projects and the global components and compare the lessons learnt between intervention models in other countries where SCORE has been implemented.

The evaluation process will examine how the ILO's cross-cutting issues were taken into account (where applicable) and closely follow EVAL guidelines on these topics[4]. These include international labour standards, social dialogue, gender equality, disability inclusion, other non-discrimination concerns, and medium and long-term effects of capacity development initiatives. Specific attention will also be paid to how the SCORE

---

[4] ILO EVAL, Guidance Note 3.2 Adapting evaluation methods to the ILO's normative and tripartite mandate
ILO EVAL, Guidance Note 3.1 Integrating gender equality in monitoring and evaluation

programme has been relevant to the ILO's programme and policy frameworks at the national and global levels. These include Decent Work Country Programmes, UNDAF/UNSDCF frameworks and national sustainable development strategies (or their equivalent) or other relevant national development frameworks, including any relevant sectoral policies and programmes. Specific attention will also be paid to how COVID-19 has affected project implementation and how the ILO has responded to it through this programme. EVAL's protocol will be followed for this purpose.

Clients and stakeholders

The clients of the evaluation are:

a) The donors SECO and NORAD - close collaboration (such as asking for comments on the draft report and meetings in Geneva) with the donors during the evaluation will ensure that donor requirements are met and no additional, external evaluation by the donor will be necessary;

b) The SCORE project staff, ILO Country Offices and other field and headquarter staff;

c) Tripartite members of the global and national advisory committees and partner organizations in the evaluated countries.

The evaluation will be used in the following ways:

a) Findings and recommendations will inform future project strategy and operations design;

b) The evaluation report will be disseminated in the ILO for organisational learning through the EVAL's i-eval Discovery evaluation database. A summary of the evaluation will be made available in public through EVAL's and SCORE's websites.

Evaluation Criteria and Questions

The evaluation will use the core OECD/DAC evaluation criteria (e.g. relevance, coherence and validity of the design, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability), in order to assess the initiatives carried out throughout the life of Phase III of the ILO SCORE Programme.

The final evaluation is expected to address all of the questions detailed below to the extent possible. The evaluator may adapt the evaluation criteria and questions, but any

fundamental changes should be agreed upon with the evaluation manager. The evaluation instruments (to be detailed in the inception report) should identify the general areas of focus listed here as well as other priority aspects to be addressed in the evaluation.

The following themes are deemed to cut across all aspects of the scope of the evaluation and are to be taken into consideration during data collection following EVAL's guidelines[5].

(i)   the normative and tripartite mandate of the ILO;

(ii)   social dialogue and tripartism;

(iii)   gender equality, non-discrimination and the inclusion of people with disabilities

(iv)   a just transition to environmental sustainability;

(v)   responsiveness to the Sustainable Development Goals and Agenda 2030; and

(vi)   COVID-19 response measures.

Relevance and strategic fit

- Are the objectives of SCORE phase III intervention consistent with beneficiaries' requirements and country needs? To what extent have they been involved in the design?
- Are the objectives of SCORE phase III intervention in line with Norad's and SECO's priorities?
- Is SCORE phase III intervention linked to national and ILO's development frameworks (Country's national development plan, UNDAF, DWCPs, P&B, SDGs)?
- To what extent is the SCORE Phase III intervention relevant to the pursuit of the ILO's cross-cutting issues?

Coherence and validity of the programme's design

- Are the project strategy, objectives and assumptions appropriate for achieving planned results?
- How well has the project complemented other ILO projects (including Better Work and Vision Zero Fund)?

---

[5] ILO EVAL, Guidance Note 3.2 Adapting evaluation methods to the ILO's normative and tripartite mandate
ILO EVAL, Guidance Note 3.1 Integrating gender equality in monitoring and evaluation

- What lessons can be learnt for the design of future projects in similar fields of expertise, improving productivity and working conditions in SMEs?
- Within the context of ILO's goal of gender equality as well as national level policies in this regard, to what extent did the project design take into account specific gender equality concerns relevant to the project context?

Effectiveness (including effectiveness of management arrangement)

- To what extent has the project so far achieved its objectives and reached its target groups?
- What obstacles did the project encounter in project implementation, especially during the Covid-19 pandemic? What corrective action did the project take to achieve its objectives and support business recovery?
- Within its overall objectives and strategies, what specific measures were taken by the project to address issues relating to gender equality?
- To what extent did the project implemented specific measures to promote international labour standards, social dialogue and tripartism, and a green economy?
- Are the Global and National Tripartite Advisory Committees functioning and what value do they add?
- How effective is the project in sharing good practices between country components and communicating success stories and disseminating knowledge internally and externally (including gender-related results and knowledge)?
- To what extent were the monitoring practices adequate for the purpose of the intervention?
- What were the lessons learnt and good practices of this intervention?

Efficiency

- Does the project make efficient use of its financial and human resources?
- Is the implementation strategy cost-effective?
- Is the distribution of resources between staff and activities optimal?
- Were the intervention resources used in an efficient way to address gender equality in the implementation?

Sustainability

- To what extent are the project results likely to be durable?
- Concerning the institutional-level, how far has the capacity of partner organizations been built in relation to delivery of the outputs/objectives under SCORE exit/sustainability strategy?
- To what extent can the project results be maintained or even scaled up/replicated by other partners beyond project completion?
- What are the obstacles (including the global pandemic) the project encountered towards achieving sustainability and how did the project address these?
- What are the areas of engagement that should be continued? What are the areas that need further emphasis?
- How effective was the project in establishing national ownership?
- To what extent have government institutions benefited from policy dialogue support and process?

Impact

- How effectively has the project built national ownership and capacity of people and institutions?
- Has the project made a significant contribution to broader and longer-term development, including national sustainable development plans, UNSDCF, and SDG targets?
- Has the project reached sufficient scale to justify the investment? Are the approach and its results likely to be up-scaled or replicated?

Methodology

The evaluators are expected to propose a methodology that includes examining the programme's Theory of Change (or reconstruct one if the TOC is not in place) with particular attention to assumptions, risks and mitigations strategies and the logical connect between levels of results and their alignment with ILO's strategic objectives and outcomes at global and national levels as well as with the relevant SDGs and related targets.

The evaluation will apply specific methodologies to measure how the ILO's cross-cutting issues were taken into account (where applicable), in line with EVAL guidelines on these topics[6]. These include specific approaches and methods that are responsive to international labour standards, social dialogue, gender equality, disability inclusion, other non-discrimination concerns, and medium and long-term effects of capacity development initiatives. The evaluation is expected to include key findings, conclusions and related recommendations on the above cross-cutting issues.

The evaluation will be based primarily on desk reviews for the following countries: Vietnam, Indonesia, Ghana and Colombia.

The final evaluation is expected to include both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis, leading to conclusions that benefit from credibility based on triangulated findings. Additionally, a closer review into the relevance and quality of indicators to measure end-line values of the results framework is crucial to ensure robust information is available for the final impact evaluation. The evaluation may also include photographs and short case studies that demonstrate the evaluation's conclusions and recommendations.

The evaluation process will be participatory. All key stakeholders identified by the project team will have the opportunity to be consulted, to provide inputs to the TOR and to the evaluation report, and to use the evaluation findings and lessons learnt, as appropriate. Consultation modality selection and meetings will be made in accordance with COVID-19 related restrictions.

Data sources will include primary and secondary data. The former will centre around meetings with key stakeholders of the project and the inclusion of inputs from meetings and discussions with the ILO Country Director; ILO staff; and key stakeholders, including constituents and technical partner. Secondary data will include project documents, including previous evaluation reports, progress reports, training reports, minutes, reports from partners, relevant correspondence and others as deemed appropriate.

The methodology should clearly state the limitations of the chosen evaluation methods, including those related to representation of specific group of stakeholders. The methodology should ensure involvement of key stakeholders in the implementation as well as in the dissemination process (e.g. stakeholders workshop, debriefing of project manager etc.). An inception report will be prepared, followed by a draft evaluation

---

[6] ILO EVAL, Guidance Note 3.2 Adapting evaluation methods to the ILO's normative and tripartite mandate
ILO EVAL, Guidance Note 3.1 Integrating gender equality in monitoring and evaluation

report, which will be shared with all relevant stakeholders and a request for comments will be asked within a specified time (not more than 10 working days).

Primary data collection

The evaluation will follow the [practical guidelines](#) issued by EVAL on conducting evaluations during the COVID-19 pandemic. Individual interviews or focus group discussions will be conducted with project staff, representatives from partner organizations, consultants and SMEs as appropriate at the different project locations. Meetings will be scheduled by the ILO in advance of national consultants' field visits, in accordance with the evaluators' requests and consistent with these terms of reference. However, international travel should not be envisaged due to the ongoing COVID19-related travel restrictions imposed by different governments. A tentative list of individuals to be interviewed include:

- ILO staff in Geneva and in field offices who are involved in the management and implementation of the project;
- Selected individuals from the following groups:
  a) Enterprises (workers and employers) who have participated in project activities;
  b) Employers organizations, trade unions, and ministry representatives that have received training or worked with the project;
  c) Service providers/trainers;
  d) Donor representatives from SECO and NORAD in HQ and embassies in project countries; and
  e) Other organizations and groups as needed ensuring gender representation.

The evaluators will develop and administer a systematic survey as part of the inception report to guide the interviews, capture qualitative and quantitative data and ensure objectivity and consistency in interviews in the different countries. This will also help the evaluators identify knowledge gaps that need to be verified and validated through the interviews.

The evaluator will ensure that opinions and perceptions of women are equally reflected in the interviews and that gender-specific questions are included.

Secondary data collection

Key here will be desk review that will analyse project and other documentation including the approved log frame, periodic progress reports to donors, research products, tools, mission reports, seminar and stakeholder consultation reports, concept notes and any other related documentation provided by the project management and backstopping officers. The desk review will suggest a number of initial findings that in turn may point to additional or fine-tuned evaluation questions. Any fundamental changes should be agreed between the evaluation manager and the evaluator, and reflected in the inception report. This will guide the final evaluation instrument to be included in the evaluation inception report. The evaluator will review the documents before conducting interviews.

The following documents will be shared with the evaluator at the commencement of the work:

- SCORE Project documents
- SCORE Knowledge Sharing Platform (which can be used to access following materials):
  - Quarterly progress reports
  - Training materials
  - Performance plans
  - Mid-term evaluation Phase I report
  - Final independent evaluation Phase I report
  - Mid-term evaluation Phase II report
  - Four impact evaluations in India, Ghana, Vietnam and Peru
  - Mid-term evaluation Phase III report
  - Institutional level impact studies
  - Implementation Guide
  - M&E Guide
  - Exit strategies
  - Any other documents that might be useful for the evaluation

Debriefings

Soon after the end of the data collection stage, the lead evaluator will present preliminary findings to the ILO project staff, Country Director and other staff designated by the Director. If time permits and at the discretion of the ILO Country Directors, a debriefing will be held for employers', workers' and government representatives. Upon completion of the report, the evaluator will take part in a teleconference to provide a

debriefing/sense-making workshop to SECO, NORAD and the ILO on the evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations as well as the evaluation process.

Limitations

The limitations of the proposed evaluation methodology are acknowledged:

- Quantifying the preliminary impact of SCORE training in SMEs poses many challenges. Many SMEs do not track performance indicators (KPIs) and thus cannot provide accurate baseline data or progress data. Many enterprises consider the data as confidential and are reluctant to share data with trainers or project staff.

- Even where impact is quantifiable, the evaluation will not be able to measure the net impacts of program participation. That would require knowledge of the counterfactual i.e. the outcomes that would have occurred in the absence of the program, which can only be measured using control groups.

- Travel restrictions due to the ongoing global health pandemic.

Main Outputs

This section is to be read in conjunction with the proposed work plan and timeframe. The consultants will be contracted to produce the following main outputs, to be led by the principal evaluator and supported by the evaluation team. Quality of the reports will be assessed against the relevant ILO Evaluation Checklists.

1. An inception report containing justification and details of the action to be carried out and agreed prior to the commencement of work. The inception report should be developed in line with ILO Checklist 4.8.

   The consultant will be expected to include in the inception report a list of anticipated risks, the likelihood of such risks and measures to be undertaken to mitigate these. All data gathering mechanisms and methods used should be disaggregated by sex. Evaluation methodology and subsequent analysis should address gender concerns. Linkages should be identified between data sources, data collection methods, and analysis methods.

2. A sense-making workshop with relevant stakeholders following the data collection phases and before drafting the evaluation report.

3. A draft evaluation report following a structure similar to that described in ILO Checklist 4.2. This will include the standard ILO Title Page.

4. A stakeholder validation workshop to share the evaluation's results and receive feedback on the content of the draft evaluation report.

5. Evaluation summary (a maximum of four pages following ILO guidance) in line with the standard ILO Template and the guidance provided in ILO Checklist 8.

6. A final evaluation report incorporating and/or responding to all stakeholders' comments.

7. The templates for lessons learnt and emerging good practices duly completed.

8. In the cases of Vietnam, Ghana, Tunisia and Bolivia, the evaluators will deliver one ILO-branded factsheet per ILO constituent (12 factsheets in total: three factsheets per country, one for the national government, one for the employers' organisation and one for the workers' organisation) that are targeted to the needs of each national ILO constituent. Each factsheet, duly translated into English and the local language will contain:

    a. A summary of the project results concerning the work and priorities of the ILO constituent in question.

    b. Detailed points on the challenges, better practices, lessons learnt and recommendations concerning the work and priorities of the ILO constituent in question.

9. A PowerPoint presentation in line with ILO branding presenting the key findings and recommendations to be shared with ILO and key stakeholders and the incorporation of stakeholder comments into the draft evaluation report.

The evaluators should plan for a critical reflection process and quality communication and reporting of evaluation outcomes (which may include debriefing the National Project Coordinator, Country Director and other key stakeholders).

Specifications

- Gender equality issues shall be explicitly addressed throughout the evaluation activities of the consultant and all outputs including final reports or events need to be gender mainstreamed as well as included in the evaluation summary.

- All deliverables must be prepared in English, using Microsoft Word, and delivered electronically to ILO. ILO will have ownership and copyright of all deliverables.

- Deliverables will be regarded as delivered when they have been received electronically by the Evaluation Manager and confirmed acceptance of them.

- Acceptance will be acknowledged only if the deliverable(s) concerned are judged to be in accordance with the requirements set out in the contract, to reflect agreements reached and plans submitted during the contract process, and incorporate or reflect consideration of amendments proposed by ILO.

Management Arrangements

The final independent evaluation will be conducted by an independent evaluator. The evaluator can constitute his/her team as he/she sees fit (hiring additional staff from the local countries for example). All members of the evaluation team (including the additional staff) shall thus fall under his/her supervision and responsibility.

The independent evaluator is responsible for conducting the evaluation according to the terms of reference (ToR).

On the ILO's side, the evaluation will be supervised by the Evaluation Manager. The Evaluation Manager will:

- Coordinate the meeting schedule with the administrative unit;
- Review and provide comments and coordination the submission of comments by stakeholders on the inception and evaluation reports;
- Ensure that the evaluation is conducted in accordance with terms of references, for the preparation of the draft report of the evaluation, discussing it with the evaluator, beneficiaries and stakeholders;
- Liaise with SCORE project staff wherever their engagement is needed to fulfil the requirements above.

Quality assurance & formatting requirements

Quality recommendations in the evaluation report must meet the criteria below. The evaluator should refer to ILO Policy Guidelines for Results-Based Evaluation for further guidance.

1. Recommendations are based on findings and conclusions of the report.
2. Recommendations are clear, concise, constructive and of relevance to the intended user(s).
3. Recommendations are realistic and actionable (including who is called upon to act and recommended timeframe).

The ILO Guidelines also provide formatting requirements for evaluation reports, establishing in particular the following criteria, whereby recommendations should be

1. Actionable and time-bound with clear indication to whom the recommendation is addressed
2. Written in two to three sentences of concise text
3. Numbered (no bullet points)
4. No more than twelve
5. Presented at the end of the body of the main report, and the concise statement should be
6. Copied over into the Executive Summary and the Evaluation Summary (that is, the concise statements of recommendations should be verbatim identical in the recommendation section of the main body of the report, the Executive Summary, and the Evaluation Summary).

To ensure compliance with ILO/UN rules safeguarding the independence of the evaluation, the contractor will not be eligible for technical work on the project for the next 12 months and cannot be the evaluator of the final project evaluation.

The consultant will be required to submit all written outputs in conformity with the ILO's branding scheme, templates of which will be provided.

Proposed work plan and timeframe

The evaluation process is expected to commence with the briefing and onboarding of the selected evaluator at the end of August 2021. The evaluation will proceed with the development of the inception report at the beginning of September and, subsequently, data collection and analysis. The evaluation will conclude with possible oral presentations/debriefings and the submission of all written outputs at the beginning of December 2021.

Phase	Responsible Person	Tasks /Activities
1	Evaluation Manager / Project Manager / Evaluation team	• Evaluation team briefing and introductions • Desk review • Submission of inception report on or before 8th October, and the final inception report addressing all comments by 20th October 2021 • Validation of inception report
2	Evaluation team	• Data collection and analysis • Preparation of draft report, evaluation summary and PowerPoint presentation by 24th November 2021.

		• Present findings and recommendations to both internal and key external stakeholder groups • Incorporate comments from stakeholders into draft report for submission to the Evaluation Manager.
3	Evaluation Manager	• Circulation of draft report to stakeholders • Stakeholder review and compilation of comments received by ILO
4	Principal Evaluator	• Finalization of all written documentation by 17th December 2021.

Legal and ethical matters

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

The evaluation report and its contents are the property of the ILO. All draft and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided in electronic version compatible with Microsoft Office for Windows.

Ownership of data from the evaluation rests jointly with the ILO and the consultant. The copyright of the evaluation report will rest exclusively with the ILO. The use of data for publication and other presentations can only be made with written agreement of the ILO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

Qualifications and competencies

The evaluation team

- Evaluation should be part of the team's core services offer, who has evaluated at least one small private sector/ international organization development project in the past five years.

- Projects handled by the team should include work with clients in international organizations and/or private sector. Minimum of 1 project with international clients in the past five years are expected.

- The team should demonstrate gender balance and diversity in their staff and commitment to the principles of gender equality and non-discrimination.

- Familiarity with the ILO mandate, its tripartite structure and international labour standards is a plus.

- Operations or presence of local representatives in countries which are being evaluated is a plus.

Lead evaluator

- Knowledge, skills and experience (at least ten years) in the area of M&E and evaluation, particularly impact evaluations.

- Knowledge and experience (at least five years) of private sector development with a special focus on small and medium enterprises in developing countries. Familiarity with the ILO's mandate and work, and the UN system would be an advantage.

- Experience as a project manager/team leader (at least five years).

- Relevant country experience in one or more of the project countries under review is an advantage.

- Excellent written and oral communication skills in English (level C2). Proficiency in Spanish and French is required unless it is provided by another team member of the evaluation team.

Evaluation team members

The evaluation team proposed by the company should be composed of sufficient number of well-trained project team members to fulfil the obligation of the assignment. The following requirements apply to any team member leading a field visit to a project component:

- Knowledge, skills, and experience (at least five years) in the area of M&E and independent evaluation.

- Knowledge and experience (at least five years) of private sector development with a special focus on small and medium enterprises in developing countries.

Familiarity with the ILO's mandate and work, and the UN system would be an advantage.

- Relevant country experience in one or more of the project countries under review is an advantage.
- Excellent written and oral communication skills in English (level C2). Proficiency in Spanish and French is required unless it is provided by the lead evaluator or another team member of the evaluation team.
- Gender balance in the team composition is expected.

Replacement of evaluation team members

The Evaluation Team assigned by the Contractor to perform the services under this Contract, which is considered essential for the performance of those services, shall be composed of the Personnel indicated in the Technical and Financial Proposal of the Contractor. Accordingly, in addition to the Terms and Conditions applicable to ILO Contracts for Services (Annex 7):

If any of the Contractor's Personnel part of the Team is removed or for any reason is no longer available to perform the services then the replacement Personnel shall be of equal or better knowledge, experience and ability to perform the services;

Prior to replacing any Personnel part of the Team, the Contractor shall notify the ILO reasonably in advance and shall submit detailed justifications together with the resume of the proposed replacement personnel to permit evaluation by the ILO of the impact that such personnel replacement would have on the work plan;

No personnel replacement of the Team shall be made by the Contractor without the prior written consent of the ILO, for which approval shall not be unreasonably withheld; and

The Contractor will not charge the ILO for any additional costs in supplying any replacement Personnel.

The introduction of replacement of any Personnel part of the Team may constitute considerable losses for the ILO. Therefore, the Contractor's Personnel are expected to perform the services until the completion of the assigned tasks and deliverables.

In the event of demonstrable poor performance or misconduct of the Personnel part of the Team, if the ILO so decides, the Contractor shall provide an appropriate replacement

for such Personnel. The Contractor will provide suitable replacement personnel within 15 working days.

Applications

Interested parties are invited to submit the following documentation to the evaluation manager, Mr. Adam Adrien-Kirby (adrien-kirby@ilo.org), **before Friday, 10th September 2021**.

Proposals to undertake any work under these ToRs will be submitted in English and must contain the following information and documents:

Technical Proposal

- A short summary of profile and capacity of the Contractor to conduct an evaluation of a private sector development project, including a record of relevant work executed in the past five years (including references);
- A brief overview detailing how the contractor intends to complete the work described in the ToRs. This should include detailed information on how all evaluation target countries would be covered by the evaluation team, considering the language requirements;
- The CV(s) of the lead evaluator and other team members (including clear indications of their role in the evaluation team) who will undertake the work;
- A timeline with proposed dates for contract start and end dates. Please note that dates indicated serve as guidelines to complete the work in a timely manner.

Commercial Proposal

A proposal, using MS Excel, setting out the cost for the evaluation including a daily fee (or daily fees in case several team members will be involved in the evaluation), and number of workdays per staff member.