**A call for expression of interest**

**ILO evaluation consultancy: Cluster Evaluation of ILO’s support to fostering transition to formality of informal workers and business through integrated approaches**

The International Labour Organization (ILO) is seeking an external evaluator or a team of evaluators to conduct an independent final cluster evaluation of ILO’s support for fostering the transition to formality for informal workers and businesses through integrated approaches. The Terms of Reference (ToR) are provided below.

This assignment will have an estimated duration of approximately 40 working days, spread over a period of four months.

Qualified candidates with relevant experience as outlined in the ToR are invited to submit an expression of interest. The submission should include:

* A brief introductory letter highlighting relevant qualifications and experience for this evaluation
* A list of previous evaluation work related to the subject matter of this assignment
* A statement confirming the availability to conduct this assignment
* A proposed budget
* A CV
* Two references and their email address
* A statement confirming that the candidate has no previous involvement in the delivery of the interventions or have a personal relationship with any of the ILO Officials who are engaged in the interventions.

Expressions of interest should be sent to the evaluation manager, **Pamornrat Pringsulaka** (pamornrat@ilo.org), with the subject line: **"RBSA Cluster Evaluation – Transition to Formality."**

The deadline for submission is by **close of business on 16 April 2025**. Remuneration for this assignment will be in accordance with ILO standards.

**Terms of Reference (TOR)**

**Cluster thematic Evaluation of ILO’s support to fostering transition to formality of informal workers and business through integrated approaches**

**1 April 2025**

# **Key facts**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Title | ILO's support to fostering transition to formality of informal workers and business through integrated approaches |
| Project DC Code | KHM/23/01/RBS;  NPL/23/01/RBS;  PHL/23/01/RBS;  MGN/23/01/RBS;  VNM/23/01/RBS |
| Type of evaluation (e.g. independent, internal) | Independent |
| Timing of evaluation (e.g. midterm, final) | Final |
| Donor | Regular budget supplementary account (RBSA) |
| Administrative Unit in the ILO responsible for administrating the project | KHM/23/01/RBS - CO-Bangkok;  NPL/23/01/RBS – CO-Kathmandu;  PHL/23/01/RBS – CO-Manila;  MGN/23/01/RBS – CO-Beijing;  VNM/23/01/RBS- CO-Hanoi |
| Technical Unit(s) in the ILO responsible for backstopping the project |  |
| P&B outcome (s) under evaluation | Output 4.3. Increased capacity of Member States to develop policies, legislation and other measures that are specifically aimed at facilitating the transition of enterprises to formality.  Output 7.4. Increased capacity of Member States to provide adequate labour protection to workers in diverse forms of work arrangements, including on digital labour platforms, and in informal employment.  Output 8.1. Increased capacity of Member States to develop new or reformed sustainable national social protection strategies, policies or legal frameworks to extend coverage and enhance benefit adequacy |
| SDG(s) under evaluation | 1.3 KHM, MNG, PHL  8.3 KHM, VNM, MNG, NPL, PHL  8.5 KHM, MNG  17.14 KHM, MNG |
| Budget | US$ 2 million |
| Project Duration | March 2023 – September 2025 (with no cost extension) |

# **Introduction**

The evaluation focuses on five RBSA-funded interventions aimed at enhancing formalization and social protection in Cambodia, Mongolia, Nepal, the Philippines, and Vietnam. These interventions collectively aim to strengthen policy coherence, capacity building, and integrated approaches to formalization while addressing social protection for informal workers. A cluster evaluation will assess trends, common issues, patterns, and lessons learned to inform future programming. The 2022-23 RBSA round is expected to contribute to the Global Accelerator[[1]](#footnote-1).

This independent cluster evaluation will be an evaluation of a number of interventions funded from RBSA funds. It will be managed by the Regional Evaluation Officer, based at ILO Regional Office in Bangkok and it will be conducted by an independent evaluation consultant(s). The evaluation will apply participatory approach and will engage all key stakeholders both internal ILO and external.

The evaluation will comply with evaluation norms, standards and follow ethical safeguards, as specified in the ILO’s evaluation procedures

## The RBSA funded interventions

1. **Cambodia (KHM204 & KHM226) - KHM/23/01/RBS:** *Promoting the transition to formalization through integrated approaches in Cambodia* This intervention focuses on facilitating the transition of informal enterprises and workers to formal economic structures while expanding social protection systems. This intervention promotes an integrated approach to formalization and complements Cambodia’s COVID-19 Economic Recovery Plan in strengthening social protection and formalization as a strategy in the recovery landscape.

Cambodia has a high prevalence of informality, with 88% of workers in informal employment. The intervention aligns with the government’s COVID-19 Economic Recovery Plan and aims to strengthen tripartite partnerships.

* **Key Focus Areas**:
  + Establishing an Inter-Ministerial Working Group on Formalization.
  + Supporting sectoral approaches to formalization.
  + Developing e-government tools (e.g., CamDX platform) to integrate business registration and social protection systems.
* **Budget**: USD 400,000
* **Duration**: March 2023 – February 2025
* **Alignment with Cambodia’s Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) 1.1, 2.2, and 4.3** by supporting formalization as a tool for decent employment and enhancing social protection systems, especially for informal workers as follows:
* **Outcome 1.1**: Policies to promote sustainable enterprise development and decent jobs.
* **Outcome 2.2**: Strengthened social protection systems for enhanced coverage and adequacy.
* **Outcome 4.3**: Increased capacity to develop policies and frameworks facilitating the transition to formality.

**2. Mongolia (MNG176 & MNG128) – MNG/23/01/RBS:**  *Fostering the transition to formality of informal workers and businesses in Mongolia.* This intervention aims to promote formalization of informal workers and micro-enterprises through integrated policy, capacity building, and digital solutions.

Nearly 46% of Mongolia’s workforce is informal, with high informality in retail, service, and livestock herding sectors. Many enterprises (82.1 percent) are micro-enterprises with a maximum of 9 employees where many informal MSMEs coexist with more formal sectors.

**Key Focus Areas**:

* + Developing sector-specific strategies for formalization in retail, services, and herding.
  + Strengthening the use of digital platforms (e.g., e-Mongolia, e-tax) for business registration and social protection access.
  + Building capacity among tripartite stakeholders to drive formalization efforts.

**Budget**: USD 400,000

**Duration**: April 2023 – March 2025

**Alignment with** Mongolia’s DWCP goals and outcomes (1.1, 3.1 and 4.3) of fostering formal employment and economic diversification​ emphasizes integrating social protection and formalization in priority sectors (e.g., retail, herding)

* + Outcome 1.1: Social protection policies improved to extend coverage, particularly for herders and informal workers.
  + Outcome 3.1: Promotion of formal employment for inclusive and diversified economic growth.
  + Outcome 4.3: Development of policies and measures aimed at transitioning enterprises to formality.

**3. Nepal (NPL127 & NPL101) – NPL/23/01/RBS:** *Enabling Sectoral Pathways towards Formality for Vulnerable Workers and Enterprises in Nepal’s Informal Economy.* The intervention focuses on developing evidence-based and gender-sensitive strategies to transition informal workers and enterprises in agriculture, construction, and transportation sectors into the formal economy.

In Nepal, 90.5% of women are in informal employment, with high informality in agriculture (97%). The intervention addresses these disparities through sectoral approaches and stakeholder engagement.

**Key Focus Areas**:

* + Conducting diagnostics of informality in target sectors.
  + Developing integrated formalization strategies with sectoral interventions.
  + Enhancing the capacity of tripartite stakeholders and using digital tools for compliance and social security integration.

**Budget**: USD 399,980

**Duration**: March 2023 – February 2025

**Alignment with Nepal’s DWCP outcomes** (1.1, 2.2, and 4.3) by targeting vulnerable workers in agriculture, construction, and transportation sectors, while integrating social protection into formalization strategies​

* + Outcome 1.1: Strengthened capacity to improve entrepreneurial potential and skills in the informal economy while facilitating formalization.
  + Outcome 2.2: Implementation of the Contribution-Based Social Security Act to enhance social protection.
  + Outcome 4.3: Development of gender-sensitive policies to transition enterprises and workers to formality.

**4. Philippines (PHL104 & PHL133)- PHL/23/01/RBS:** *Rise from Multiple Crises through the Integrated Formalization of Informal Economy with Social Protection and Decent Work.* This intervention aims to strengthen the integration of enterprise formalization with social protection, particularly in the aftermath of multiple crises such as typhoons, inflation, and pandemic recovery.

The Philippines has a significant informal economy, with key challenges in implementing policies for formalization and social protection at local levels.

**Key Focus Areas**:

* + Combining enterprise formalization with access to social protection.
  + Developing sectoral approaches in retail, gig work, and domestic work.
  + Leveraging digital solutions (e.g., e-portals for registration and social protection access).

**Budget**: USD 400,000

**Duration**: March 2023 – February 2025

Alignment to DWCP outcomes (1.1, 3.1 and 4.3) the intervention supports local governments in implementing formalization policies, combining enterprise registration with access to social protection to address DWCP priorities​

* + Outcome 1.1: Productive and sustainable work opportunities are promoted, especially in informal and gig economy sectors.
  + Outcome 3.1: Equitable social protection is strengthened, with reforms to establish a national social protection floor.
  + Outcome 4.3: Policies supporting the transition from informal to formal employment are enhanced.

**5. Vietnam (VNM 127) - VNM/23/01/RBS: Addressing informality in Viet Nam through policy coordination and sectoral action,**  Strengthening Formalization Efforts with Focus on MSMEs and Digital Integration

Vietnam's informal economy comprises a significant portion of its labor force, with MSMEs and informal workers forming the backbone of its economy.Persistent challenges include lack of compliance with labor laws, limited access to social protection, and high administrative burdens for formal registration.

**Key focus area:**

1. **Digital Solutions for Formalization**:

* Development of an integrated digital platform to streamline business registration and compliance.
* Linking registration processes with social protection systems to enhance accessibility and efficiency for MSMEs.

1. **Sector-Specific Interventions**:

* Focus on sectors with high informality, such as retail, trade, and food services, to design tailored interventions.
* Policy recommendations to simplify administrative procedures and reduce compliance costs.

1. **Capacity Building**:

* Training programs for government officials, employers, and workers on formalization benefits and processes.
* Workshops to enhance the capacity of local tripartite stakeholders in implementing formalization strategies.

1. **Gender Equality and Inclusion**:

* Integrating gender-responsive approaches into all project components.
* Addressing specific challenges faced by women entrepreneurs and informal workers.

**Budget:** $400000

**Duration:** March 2023 – May 2024 (extended to Aug 2024)

The intervention aligns with Vietnam's Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) and national priorities to reduce informality, particularly in sectors like trade, agriculture, and services.

**Alignment with DWCP Outcomes:**

* **Outcome 4.3**: Increased capacity to develop policies and frameworks for formalization.
* **Outcome 8.1**: Enhanced capacity to extend social protection coverage, particularly to informal workers.

**Progress**:

* Support the development of two Decrees. The Decree on Household Business and the Decree plus guiding Circular on Business Registration of Pre-cooperative, Cooperatives, Cooperative Unions have been developed. Both Decrees aim to ease business registration and thus facilitate enterprise formalisation.
* Capacity-building sessions for stakeholders, including women entrepreneurs. The project helped strengthen the institutional coordination mechanism of the tripartite constituents.
* Number of research products on formalisation of different sector enterprises produced,
* Capacity strengthening for General statistical Office to measure the magniturde, conditions of work and protection of digital platform employment in order to inform policy makers.

# **Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation**

The main purposes of the cluster evaluation serves organizational learning. The review also serves to provide accountability to the donors and ILO constituents. The evaluation findings and insights will serve organisational learning purposes e.g. to develop cross-learning, including success stories to innovate and feed into regional learning on formalisation and social protection.

Primary user of the evaluation findings is ILO constituents, RBSA funding partners, ILO Country Offices, ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP), ILO DWTs and HQ (technical departments, Evaluation Office, PARDEV and PROGRAM). Secondary user of the evaluation findings are other interest partners, academic, other ILO units and regions, and public

The specific objectives of the cluster evaluation are to provide answers to the following key questions.

* The extent to which the interventions play a catalytic role in leveraging financing (domestic and international financing and investment); the extent of partnership with UN agencies and development partners that lead to integrated and coherence of policies.
* What were the major achievements and challenges in implementing formalization and social protection strategies?What common trends and patterns emerged across the five countries? How the different tools (particularly ILO tools) used in the different contexts performed, and how were they useful to push formalization efforts (e.g. we have several uses of the sectoral diagnostics tools, but with very different levels of relevance to further work)
* The extent of partnership with UN agencies and development partners that lead to integrated and coherence of policies;
* How did digital technologies and e-formality contribute to achieving intervention goals?
* To what extent the RBSA interventions have contributed to the Global Accelerator (integrated and evidence-based national strategies and policies; integrated financing combining domestic resources and international financial support; enhanced multilateral cooperation).
* What lessons and good practices can be scaled or adapted to other contexts?
* Identify common themes, challenges, and opportunities across the interventions.
* Provide actionable recommendations for improving formalization and social protection interventions.

# **Scope of the evaluation**

The evaluation scope covers the RBSA 2022-23 Round I formalization RBSA funded interventions. It could encompass other interventions funded by bilateral donors or other sources of fund that contributed to the same CPOs/outputs (mentioned above) in each country, as the goal of RBSA funded intervention is to support the achievement of DWCP outcomes (CPOs).

The gender dimension should be considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation. In terms of this evaluation, this implies involving both men and women in the consultation, evaluation analysis and evaluation team. Moreover, the evaluators should review data and information that is disaggregated by sex and assess the relevance and effectiveness of gender-related strategies and outcomes to improve the lives of women and men. All this information should be accurately included in the inception report and evaluation report.

Summary of the evaluation scope

| **Countries and Interventions (CPOs link)** | **Budget Allocation (USD)** | **Start Date** | **End Date** | **No cost extension until** | **Note** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Cambodia (KHM204 & 226) | $400,000 | March 2023 | February 2025 | - | Self evaluation will be conducted. |
| Mongolia (MNG176 & 128) | $400,000 | April 2023 | March 2025 | May 2025 |  |
| Nepal (NPL127 & 101) | $399,980 | March 2023 | February 2025 | June 2025 |  |
| Philippines (PHL104 & 133) | $400,000 | March 2023 | February 2025 | Sep 2025 |  |
| Vietnam (VNM 127) | $400,000 | March 2023 | May 2024 | Aug 2024 | Final report is available |
| **Total** | **$1,999,980** |  |  |  |  |

# **Evaluation criteria and Questions**

The evaluation should address relevance to beneficiary needs, validity of the design, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, potential for sustainability and impact as defined in the [ILO Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation, Nov-2020](http://www.ilo.ch/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_571339.pdf). The evaluator may adapt the evaluation criteria and questions, but any fundamental changes should be agreed between the evaluation manager and the evaluator, and reflected in the inception report.

## Evaluation criteria:

**Relevance**: Alignment with national priorities, stakeholder needs, and SDG goals.

1. How well do the interventions align with the national priorities and strategies of each country concerning formalization and social protection particularly in promoting gender equality and social inclusion?
2. To what extent do the interventions address the unique challenges faced by women, youth, and marginalized groups in the informal economy?
3. Are the interventions’ objectives aligned with global priorities such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), particularly SDG 8 (Decent Work) and SDG 1 (No Poverty)?

**Coherence**

1. Are the intervention objectives consistent with the ILO’s strategic priorities on formalization, social protection, and advancing equality for marginalized groups?
2. How the interventions managed the internal coherence of actions towards an integrated approach – key challenges (in implementation, but also internally on managing different specialists, technical departments and the efforts of coordination required for this)
3. To what extent the interventions leveraging partnerships with other ILO projects and other organizations in the countries to enhance its results and to promote gender-sensitive policies and interventions?

**Effectiveness:** Achievement of outputs and outcomes in formalization and social protection.

1. How have tripartite constituents (government, employers, workers) contributed to achieving the intervention objectives in ways that address gender equality and promote inclusion of marginalized groups?
2. How effectively have the interventions addressed gender equality and social inclusion in their design and implementation?
3. Identify the key achievements in each country and whether they have been achieved according to plan, if not, what have the challenges. How the different tools (particularly ILO tools) used in the different contexts performed, and how were they useful to push formalization efforts
4. What barriers or challenges hindered the implementation of intervention activities, especially for women and marginalized groups and how were they addressed to ensure equitable outcomes?
5. To what extent the strategies or approaches used have been effective in contributing to the Global Accelerators through formalization and social protection, particularly for women, youth, and marginalized groups in the informal economy?

**Efficiency:** Resource utilization and value for money across interventions

1. How effectively have the interventions utilized their financial and human resources to achieve the intended outputs?
2. Are there synergies or overlaps between the interventions that could be optimized for cost-effectiveness?
3. what extent has digital technology (e-formality solutions) contributed to achieving intervention outcomes efficiently?

**Impact:** Contributions to reducing informality and improving social protection coverage.

1. How have the interventions impacted the formalization of enterprises and workers, particularly in the informal economy?
2. What tangible changes have been observed in the social protection coverage of target groups?
3. To what extent have the interventions influenced changes in attitudes, practices, or policies that address gender disparities and discrimination in formalization and social protection efforts?
4. What unintended positive or negative consequences have emerged from the interventions?

**Sustainability** Likelihood of interventions’ benefits being sustained post-completion.

18. Are the outcomes of the interventions likely to be sustained after intervention completion? What factors contribute to or hinder sustainability?

19. How effectively have the interventions built local capacity among governments, employers, and workers to sustain formalization and social protection efforts?

20. To what extent have the interventions influenced national policies or frameworks for formalization and social protection?

**Comparative and Trend Analysis and Forward-Looking**

1. What common trends or patterns emerge across the five interventions in terms of successes, challenges, and lessons learned? How do the interventions’ approaches to formalization compare, and what can be learned from these variations? What lessons can be learned about the role of digital solutions in formalization and social protection (e.g., e-formality, online registration platforms)?
2. How have the interventions incorporated sector-specific approaches to formalization, and what were the outcomes?
3. Are there notable differences in intervention effectiveness or impact based on regional or cultural contexts?
4. What recommendations can be made to scale successful interventions across other regions or sectors?
5. How can future interventions better integrate formalization and social protection to achieve holistic outcomes?
6. What emerging trends (e.g., gig economy, digital labor platforms) should be addressed in future programming?

# **Methodology**

The cluster evaluation covers several interventions and there is no one, single logical framework to draw upon. An analytical framework should be developed to help analyze this cluster evaluation.

The evaluation should apply a mixed methods approach to addressing the criteria and questions that might include: document analysis, interviews, direct observation and surveys—or some combination thereof. The advantage of this approach is that it permits findings derived from one method to be verified using a different method. This ensures valid findings. The approach for cluster evaluations should consciously build analytical frameworks that would allow providing feedback at a higher (strategic level). For instance, how well did the ILO use its technical expertise and comparative advantage to position a certain theme as a national priority?

**Stakeholder Consultations should be carried out throughout the evaluation process.**

* + Tripartite constituents (government, employers, workers).
  + Others stakeholders and implementation partners eg. Governments and other UN agencies, private sectors
  + Intervention beneficiaries (workers and enterprises).

**Comparative Analysis**: Identify similarities, differences, and overarching patterns.

**Field Visits** (as feasible): On-site observations to assess intervention implementation and outcomes. It is estimated that at least 2 countries will be visited on-site, while others will be covered via document review and remote data collection.

# **Main deliverables**

1. **Deliverable 1: Inception report.** The inception report will include among other elements, a *brief key stakeholders’ analysis* ( importance of each stakeholder) and proposed list of key stakeholders to be interviewed, the evaluation questions and data collection methodologies and techniques, the *analytical framework*, the evaluation tools (interview, guides, questionnaires, etc.), proposed countries to be visited (if and where possible) with clear justification of the selection, work plan and dates for deliverables based on the objectives of this evaluation. The inception report should have a specific sub-set of questions for the in-depth study. The finalization of selected country visits will be done in consultation with the Evaluation Manager, and proposed schedule of field visits (if these are possible) or remote interviews. The instrument needs to make provision for the triangulation of data where possible. The evaluator will prepare an inception report as per the ILO Checklist 3: Writing the inception report.
2. Deliverable 2: Stakeholders workshop/Debriefing on the findings to ILO. Evaluation findings that are based on facts, evidence, and data. This precludes relying exclusively upon anecdotes, hearsay and unverified opinions. Findings should be specific, concise and supported by triangulation of quantitative and qualitative information derived from various sources to ensure reliability, validity and generalizability.
3. Deliverable 3: Cluster Evaluation report (draft and final report) with evaluation summary. The Draft Evaluation Report should include action-oriented, practical and specific recommendations assigning or designating audiences/implementers/users. The Draft Evaluation Report should be prepared as per the ILO Checklist 4.2: Preparing the Evaluation Report which is annexed in this ToR. The Draft Evaluation Report will be improved by incorporating the Evaluation Manager’s comments and inputs. The Final Evaluation Report shall be submitted with the evaluation summary using the template for executive summary annexed to this TOR. The evaluator will incorporate comments received from the ILO and other key stakeholders in the final report. The report should be finalised as per the ILO Checklist 4.2: Preparing the Evaluation Report, which is annexed in this TOR. The quality of the report and evaluation summary will be assessed against the ILO Checklists 4.2, 4.4 and 4.9 listed under the Annex of this ToR. The report shall draw aggregate findings and common issues by established evaluation criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact) based on the country assessments as per the TOR.

All outputs of the evaluation must be produced in English. All drafts and the final report including other supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided in electronic version compatible with WORD for windows. The cluster evaluation report should not be more than 35 pages excluding the case study on Afghanistan and other annexes. Ownership of the data from the evaluation rests jointly between the ILO and the Evaluator. The copy rights of the evaluation report rests exclusively with ILO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

# **Management Arrangements and Work Plan**

**Evaluation Management – Role and responsibilities**

An ILO Regional Evaluation Officer– Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka of the ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, Thailand will manage the evaluation process and the quality assurance. The Evaluation Manager (EM) responsibilities include managing the respective contract with the evaluation consultant(s), consulting on methodological issues and facilitating access to primary and secondary data. The EM will be also responsible for the following tasks:

* + Preparate the TOR and ensure consultation with all key stakeholders before TOR is finalized
  + facilitate and recruit independent evaluator(s);
  + ensure proper stakeholders involvement;
  + approve the inception report;
  + review and circulate draft and consolidate comments from key stakeholders
  + review and submit the final report to ILO Evaluation Office for approval;
  + disseminate final report.

The ILO Evaluation Office, at ILO HQ will approve the final report. The evaluation report will be considered final only when it is approved by ILO Evaluation Office.

Role and responsibility of Country Office team: The responsible staff of ILO Country Offices will handle all arrangements with the chosen evaluator and provide any logistical and other assistance as required. The RBSA funded intervention management team will be responsible for the following tasks:

* + Provide RBSA funded interventions’ background materials,
  + Prepare a list of recommended interviewees,
  + Obtain relevant approvals and consent from key stakeholders to undertake evaluations and interviews,
  + Help in schedule meetings for field visits (if applicable) and coordinating in-country logistical arrangements,
  + Be interviewed and provided inputs as requested by the evaluator during the evaluation process,
  + Review and provide comments on the draft evaluation reports,
  + Provide logistical and administrative support to the evaluator, including travel arrangements (if applicable) and all materials needed to provide all deliverables.

**Evaluator(s)**

The Evaluation Manager will recruit an independent evaluator(s) to conduct this evaluation. The evaluator(s) will be an external independent person or entity. The evaluation team leader will be responsible for all deliverables mentioned above.

Responsibilities of the evaluator

* Providing guidance and definition of roles and tasks in this evaluation throughout the evaluation phases and ensuring quality control and adherence to ethical guidelines,
* Defining the methodological approach and drafting the inception report (including all data collection tools), producing the preliminary findings presentation, draft reports and drafting and presenting a final report,
* Providing any technical and methodological advice necessary for this evaluation,
* Ensuring the quality of data (validity, reliability, consistency and accuracy) throughout the analytical and reporting phases. This includes consultation with all key stakeholders,
* Ensuring the evaluation is conducted per TORs and timeline, including following ILO and UNEG guidelines, methodology and formatting requirements and adheres to evaluation report quality standards: as referred to above,
* Liaising with the evaluation manager,
* Facilitating meetings with stakeholders (scheduling, debriefing and/or stakeholders’ workshop),
* Be flexible on the evaluation timeline if it takes longer time and effort to complete the interviews/data collection through remote methods,
* Contributing to the report dissemination and communication (if any) by participating in webinars, and
* Supporting or providing inputs to evaluation communication products.

Desired competency and qualification of the evaluator

|  |
| --- |
| * + - * At least 10 years experience in evaluations of the UN and multi-lateral agencies with experience as evaluation team leader;       * Contextual knowledge of the UN and ILO       * Experience in qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and an understanding of issue related to validity and reliability;       * Knowledge in gender and non-discrimination, and understanding of ILO, tripartism, social dialogue will be advantage       * Adequate technical specialisation – demonstrate knowledge and expertise in social protection, informal economy and formalisation       * Fluency in spoken and written English       * Previous work experience in Asia and the Pacific Region will be an advantage |

**The estimated level of effort is approx. 40 working days. The duration of work will be from May to Aug 2025.**

## Indicative time frame and responsibilities

| **Tasks/ Responsibilities** | **Responsible person** | **Time frame (by end)** | **Level of effort** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Preparation of the TOR –draft | Evaluation manager | Early Jan 2025 |  |
| Preparation of list of stakeholders with E-mail addresses and contact numbers | ILO CO Offices | By end Jan 2025 |  |
| Finalization of the TOR | Evaluation manager (EM) | End March 2025 |  |
| Call for EOIs | ILO EM | April 2025 |  |
| Selection of Evaluator | Evaluation Manager | April 2025 |  |
| Contracting Evaluator | ROAP | By end of April 2025 |  |
| Brief evaluators /document reviews/preparation of inception report | Evaluation manager and relevant COs | Early May 2025 | 6 days |
| Inception report submitted | Evaluators | Mid May 2025 |  |
| Data collection and debriefing to ILO | Evaluators | May -June 2025 | 21 |
| Draft report submitted to Evaluation manager | Evaluators | Mid July, 2025 | 10 |
| Sharing the draft report with all concerned stakeholders for comments | Evaluation Manager | By early Aug 2025 |  |
| Consolidated comments on the draft report, send to the evaluator | Evaluation Manager | Early Aug 2025 |  |
| Finalisation of the report and submission to Evaluation Manager | Evaluators | End of Aug 2025 | 3 |
| Submission of the final report to ILO Evaluation Office | Evaluation Manager | Sep 2025 |  |
| Approval of the final evaluation report | ILO Evaluation Office | Sep 2025 |  |

**Resources:** Funding will come from the RBSA M&E budget, estimated resource requirements at this point include

* + a professional fee for the evaluator (s)
  + travel cost and DSA (where relevant) as per the ILO rules and regulations
  + actual communication cost (in case of virtual meeting e.g. telephone or skype calls if needed)

Legal and Ethical Matters

The evaluation will comply with UN Norms and Standards. The evaluator will abide by the [EVAL’s Code of Conduct](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_761030.pdf) for carrying out the evaluations. UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) ethical guidelines will be followed. 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.

Evaluators should have personal and professional integrity and abide by the [UNEG Ethical Guidelines](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/2866) for evaluation and the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system to ensure that the rights of individuals involved in an evaluation are respected. Evaluators must act with cultural sensitivity and pay particular attention to protocols, codes and recommendations that may be relevant to their interactions with women. Evaluators will be expected to sign the respective ILO Code of Conduct to show that they have read and understood the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System process.

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.

Annex

1. All relevant UNEG and ILO evaluation guidelines and standard templates

* [ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations 4th edition](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_744068.pdf)
* [Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the ILO](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746806.pdf) (to be signed and returned by evaluator to the evaluation manager)
* [Protocol on collecting evaluative evidence on the ILO’s COVID-19 Response measures through project and programme evaluations](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_757541.pdf)

**Guidance Notes**

* [Guidance Note 3.1 Integrating gender equality in monitoring and evaluation of projects](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746716.pdf)
* [Guidance Note 3.2 Adapting evaluation methods to the ILO’s normative and tripartite mandate](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746717.pdf)
* [Guidance Note 3.3 Strategic clustered evaluations to gather evaluative information more effectively](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746718.pdf)
* [Guidance Note 4.3 Data collection methods](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746722.pdf)
* [Guidance Note 4.5 Stakeholder engagement](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746724.pdf)
* [Guidance Note 5.5 Dissemination of lessons learned and good practices](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746730.pdf)

**EVAL Checklists and Templates for the Evaluator:**

* [Checklist 4.8 Writing the inception report](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746817.pdf)
* [Checklist 4.2 Preparing the evaluation report](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746808.pdf) [including the templates for completing [lessons learned](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746820.pdf) and [emerging good practices](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746821.pdf), as well as the templates for the title page and [executive summary](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746822.pdf)
* [Checklist 4.3 Filling in the title page](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746810.pdf)
* [Checklist 4.4 Preparing the Evaluation Report Summary](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746822.pdf)
* [Checklist 4.5: Documents for Project Evaluators](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746804.pdf)
* [Checklist 4.9 Rating the quality of evaluation report](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746818.pdf)

1. In line with the UN Secretary-General’s *Our Common Agenda*, which calls for “roadmaps to integrated informal workers into formal economies and to benefit from women’s full participation in the workforce”, integrating informal workers into the formal economy is one of the six thematic entry points that will support integrated strategies under the Global Accelerator. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)