



## Governing Body

332nd Session, Geneva, 8–22 March 2018

GB.332/PFA/8

**Programme, Financial and Administrative Section**  
*Audit and Oversight Segment*

**PFA**

**Date:** 21 February 2018

**Original:** English

### EIGHTH ITEM ON THE AGENDA

## ILO results-based Evaluation Strategy 2018–21

#### **Purpose of the document**

The present document contains the International Labour Organization (ILO) results-based Evaluation Strategy 2018–21, which operationalizes the ILO's Evaluation Policy 2017, as endorsed by the 331st Session of the Governing Body. The Governing Body is invited to take note of the report and endorse the ILO's results-based Evaluation Strategy 2018–21 (see the draft decision in paragraph 32).

**Relevant strategic objective:** All.

**Main relevant outcome/cross-cutting policy driver:** Enabling outcome B: Effective and efficient governance of the Organization.

**Policy implications:** None.

**Legal implications:** None.

**Financial implications:** Time of existing staff.

**Follow-up action required:** Implementation of Evaluation Strategy 2018–21 as approved.

**Author unit:** Evaluation Office (EVAL).

**Related documents:** GB.331/PFA/8; GB.329/PFA/8.



## A. Introduction

1. At its 331st session, the Governing Body adopted a new International Labour Organization (ILO) Evaluation Policy (2017) (GB.331/PFA/8, appendix). The new Evaluation Policy is built on the previous Evaluation Policy (2005), the recent Independent Evaluation of the ILO's Evaluation Function (2016 IEE)<sup>1</sup> and extensive consultative processes that involved ILO staff and constituents. A time-bound evaluation strategy, aligned with the ILO's Strategic Plan for 2018–21 (GB.328/PFA/1), is required to identify outcomes and targets through which the Evaluation Policy will be gradually rolled out. The new Evaluation Strategy complements the Evaluation Policy and identifies implications and key areas of action that will result from it; it must therefore be read in conjunction with the key principles and values contained in the Evaluation Policy.
2. The previous Evaluation Strategy 2011–15 (subsequently extended to 2015–17) was operationalized within the context of the 2010–15 Strategic Policy Framework (GB.304/PFA/2/Rev.), the ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization (Social Justice Declaration)<sup>2</sup> and biennial programme and budgets. These strategic documents called upon the Organization to strengthen knowledge management and accountability in the areas of decent work and to enhance the relevance and usefulness of evaluation to constituents. The Evaluation Strategy 2018–21 is aligned with corresponding key ILO policy and programme documents, particularly those related to the strengthening of the ILO's role as knowledge leader and the call for effective and efficient use of resources to deliver effective services to member States.
3. In building on the achievements of the evaluation function, the new Evaluation Strategy proposes a more significant and integrated relationship with the Organization's performance, as recognized in the Strategic Plan for the period 2018–21. Other important drivers for an enhanced Evaluation Policy and Evaluation Strategy are the 2016 IEE, recent advances made by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) in developing new norms and standards for evaluation and the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).
4. While the Evaluation Policy sets out principles for evaluation, the new Evaluation Strategy identifies concrete outcomes, milestones and targets for implementing those principles. The Evaluation Strategy is also time-bound and is aligned with the ILO's Strategic Plan for 2018–21. The Evaluation Policy (2017) adheres to the following six core principles:
  - adherence to international good practices;
  - upholding the ILO mandate and mission;
  - ensuring professionalism;
  - transparency and learning;
  - independence of process; and
  - gender equality and non-discrimination.

<sup>1</sup> ILO: *Independent Evaluation of ILO's Evaluation Function – IEE, 2011–2016, Final Report* (Geneva, 2017).

<sup>2</sup> ILO: *ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization*, International Labour Conference, 97th Session, Geneva, 10 June 2008.

5. The Evaluation Policy (2017) calls for innovation that reinforces the main principles of the ILO's Strategic Plan for 2018–21, as follows:
- more strategic evaluations of projects and programme activities under identical or similar themes, programme frameworks and locations by means of clustering and integrated funding;
  - evaluation approaches, methods and frameworks that are participatory and people-centred, are inclusive of disadvantaged workers, human rights and gender equality and are adapted to the ILO's specific mandate and context (for example tripartism, social dialogue, normative work);
  - use of evaluation in post-evaluation follow-up, with a particular focus on strengthening such follow-up for decentralized evaluations;
  - enhanced independence of decentralized components of the evaluation function to ensure the highest possible level of independence and impartiality of evaluations and mechanisms to further improve the use of findings at the regional level;
  - automated management response systems that systematically track the follow-up to evaluation recommendations, whether independent or internal; and
  - a framework for the evaluation of capacity development, including tripartite constituents and other relevant stakeholders on a demand basis.

## **B. Evaluation Strategy outcomes at the organizational level**

6. The Evaluation Strategy is operationalized through a theory of change (see appendix). It operates at two levels, reflecting: (a) the activities of the Evaluation Office (EVAL) as they feed into an evaluation function; and (b) an Organization-wide set of outcomes and impacts within a culture of more comprehensive evaluation in support of the ILO's mandate. The two levels are linked through the 2018–19 Programme and Budget Enabling Outcome B.5 (Effective and efficient governance of the Organization).
7. External assessments have confirmed that the ILO evaluation function has matured as a model deliverable of an independent United Nations (UN) Evaluation Office. For the evaluation function to reach the next and highest level of maturity, evaluation findings must play a more significant role in influencing decision-making. Therefore, the theory of change for the evaluation function has three dimensions: the contribution of evaluation to an effective and efficient ILO, delivering decent work policies and programmes; enhancement of the credibility and leadership of the ILO through an embedded accountability, transparency and evaluation culture; and the advancement of decent work goals by leveraging national and international partnerships to measure the contribution to the SDGs. In brief, the evaluation function advances effectiveness, credibility and partnerships.
8. The evaluation function will contribute to these impacts by realizing the following three outcomes:
- Outcome 1. Enhanced capacities and systems of evaluation for better practice and use;
  - Outcome 2. Enhanced value of evaluation through the use of more credible and higher-quality evaluations (independence, credibility, usefulness); and

- Outcome 3. Stronger knowledge base of evaluation findings and recommendations.

These three outcomes will be achieved by focusing on 13 sub-outcomes underpinned by an enabling environment for evaluation at the ILO, as set out in paragraphs 10–26 below and the accompanying results frameworks. The three outcomes reflect the expectation that the evaluation function will have a more significant influence on the decision-making, credibility, visibility and performance of the Organization.

9. As outlined in the Evaluation Policy, a strong evaluation culture is required to achieve better organizational performance, effectiveness and learning in pursuit of the Decent Work Agenda. The theory of change proposes a considerable advance on the previous Evaluation Policy and Evaluation Strategy by reflecting the growing maturity and effectiveness of the ILO’s evaluation function to influence decision-making at all levels; enhancing credibility and leadership; and leveraging partnerships to advance the Decent Work Agenda within the framework of the SDGs.

## **C. Results frameworks for an effective evaluation function in the ILO**

### **Outcome 1. Enhanced capacities and systems of evaluation for better practice and use**

10. The strong support provided to colleagues and constituents by skilled EVAL staff, regional evaluation officers (REOs) and the extended evaluation network are critical for developing a more effective evaluation culture in the Organization. This support is realized in the form of training, support and encouragement in building their skills and in using the ILO quality standards for evaluation management and use. The evaluation function has progressively improved its products and services for evaluation management and the evaluability of programme activities, including in the context of the SDGs and in the communication of evaluation results. As a result, constituents and staff will develop better analytical capacities to learn from programme results, giving them the ability to have a practical influence on design and implementation.

#### **1.1. Evaluation activities conducted in a timely fashion and in accordance with Evaluation Policy requirements**

11. Ensuring that evaluations are completed in a timely fashion and maintain a high quality is a primary concern of the Evaluation Policy. However, high workload requires the application of efficient and innovative measures to implement the Evaluation Policy. Reforms such as the clustering of evaluations, budget flexibility, quality assurance and new methods will support this process.

#### **1.2. Strengthened evaluation capacity of staff in regions and departments**

12. The Evaluation Manager Certification Programme (EMCP) and the Internal Evaluation Certification Programme (IECP) are important tools for strengthening participation in independent evaluations and for developing self-evaluation skills and a stronger evaluation culture. Regions and departments will be fully engaged in building monitoring and evaluation capacity for staff, constituents and other partners. The certification provided by both training programmes implies that learning will be applied. The evaluation network,

which is vital for establishing an evaluation culture, will be strengthened by the provision of incentives and support.

### **1.3. Constituents engaged in monitoring and evaluation of decent work country programmes and development cooperation activities in an SDG-responsive manner**

13. With the advent of the SDGs and the development of EVAL instruments and tools to improve evaluability and monitoring and evaluation systems, the framework for capacity development needs to include a stronger evaluation culture. EVAL has developed a framework for the rapid assessment of the national, structural and technical capacities required for the systematic monitoring and evaluation of decent work in the context of the SDGs. This should lead to capacity-building efforts that support partnerships in providing sufficient country capacity for the analysis and conduct of systematic country-led follow-up and national reviews.

### **1.4. Evaluation integrated in decent work country programmes and development cooperation activities, including a focus on SDGs**

14. More decent work country programmes (DWCPs) need to engage constituents in the evaluation function. The SDGs are highly relevant to the Decent Work Agenda and DWCPs and the ILO is required to report on both the performance of DWCPs and their contribution to the SDGs. The diagnostic tool developed by EVAL can be applied to analyse the linkages between DWCPs and SDGs and their monitoring plan and to generate reports on the DWCP contribution to the SDGs.

### **1.5. Established capacity of regions and departments to mainstream and use evaluation**

15. Several actions are required to ensure that monitoring and evaluation is used as a tool for good management and knowledge building, including advocacy, provision of incentives, training support and the development of cost-effective and time-effective monitoring and evaluation tools.

## **Results framework for outcome 1**

<b>Outcome of Evaluation Strategy</b>				
<b>1.1. Evaluation activities conducted in a timely fashion and in accordance with Evaluation Policy requirements</b>				
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Biennial milestone 2018–19</b>	<b>Target 2020–21</b>	<b>Linkages and assumptions</b>
All mandatory evaluations are completed in a timely manner for use by management, constituents and donors.	90% coverage for independent evaluations and 33% coverage for internal evaluations.	95% of independent evaluations and 50% of internal evaluations completed in a timely manner by the end of the biennium.	By end-2021, 95% of independent evaluations and 75% of internal evaluations completed in a timely manner to influence decision-making.	(a) Capacity to ensure independence of evaluations within regions through strengthened capacity and independence of REOs; (b) Creation of regional Evaluation Advisory Committees (EACs); and (c) Quality control and assessment of evaluations.

**Outcome of Evaluation Strategy****1.2. Strengthened evaluation capacity of staff in regions and departments**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Biennial milestone 2018–19</b>	<b>Target 2020–21</b>	<b>Linkages and assumptions</b>
1.2.1. ILO staff evaluation capacities are upgraded.	By end-2017, 77 staff members had been certified as evaluation managers and two were certified as part of IECP.	At least 30 additional ILO staff members are certified as evaluation managers and internal evaluators.	By end-2021, at least 120 ILO staff members are certified as evaluation managers or internal evaluators.	Interest, use and availability of EMCP and IECP.
1.2.2. The ILO evaluation network is functioning based on clearly established roles and job descriptions.	Currently, evaluation network functions (departmental level and evaluation managers) are performed on a voluntary basis, resulting in limited availability of evaluation capacity.	Evaluation responsibilities are included in job descriptions of departmental focal points for evaluation and certified evaluation managers receive standardized assessments in their performance appraisals.	By end-2021, a fully functioning evaluation network is firmly embedded in the relevant regional and departmental functions, and appropriate resources and incentives are allocated.	Independence of REOs and departmental focal points for evaluation is strengthened and capacity building for evaluation activities is established in regions and departments.

**Outcome of Evaluation Strategy****1.3. Constituents engaged in monitoring and evaluation of decent work country programmes and development cooperation activities in an SDG-responsive manner**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Biennial milestone 2018–19</b>	<b>Target 2020–21</b>	<b>Linkages and assumptions</b>
Relevant monitoring and evaluation training is mainstreamed into training and capacity-building programmes for constituents in order to enhance their participation in evaluations.	During 2010–17, 1,052 constituents were trained, 124 of them in 2016.	Evaluation training and capacity-building modules responsive to SDG issues developed for mainstreaming into programmes, covering all three constituent groups.	By end-2021, at least 150 constituents (in equal proportions of the three groups) given tailored evaluation training as part of larger EVAL and ILO-wide training programmes.	Collaboration within the ILO and with external institutions with a view to including evaluation training modules in other training and capacity-building programmes.

**Outcome of Evaluation Strategy****1.4. Evaluation integrated in decent work country programmes and development cooperation activities, including a focus on SDGs**

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Biennial milestone 2018–19</b>	<b>Target 2020–21</b>	<b>Linkages and assumptions</b>
Number of DWCPs and development cooperation projects that have well-established evaluation processes and mechanisms in place and that regularly engage with constituents in meeting monitoring and evaluation requirements.	No baseline yet established.	Process is developed and piloted to a sample of DWCPs for ensuring that DWCPs and projects have mechanisms (diagnostic instruments) to assess their evaluability, SDG-responsiveness and level of participation of constituents in monitoring and evaluation.	By end 2021, 75% of DWCPs and development cooperation projects have mechanisms in place to assess their evaluability, SDG-responsiveness and level of participation of constituents in monitoring and evaluation.	Collaboration within the ILO enhances the evaluability, SDG-responsiveness and level of participation of constituents in monitoring and evaluation of DWCPs.

**Outcome of Evaluation Strategy****1.5. Established capacity of regions and departments to mainstream and use evaluation**

Indicator	Baseline	Biennial milestone 2018–19	Target 2020–21	Linkages and assumptions
Evaluation-related initiatives taken by regions and departments other than mandatory requirements systematized.	Examples of such initiatives and their use have not been systematically documented since the Annual Evaluation Report (AER) 2015.	Systematic documentation of such initiatives, establishing good practices based on the experience of large or flagship programmes.	By end-2021, a systematic process for quantitative and qualitative documentation of initiatives by departments and regions will be in place to show progressive increase and added value.	(a) Development of guidelines within ILO Evaluation Policy guidelines; (b) EVAL provides minimal facilitation and support; (c) Advocacy role of evaluation network; (d) Decentralized monitoring and evaluation of capacity in regions and departments.

## **Outcome 2. Enhanced value of evaluation through the use of more credible and higher-quality evaluations (independence, credibility, usefulness)**

**16.** The evaluation function needs to continue its upward trajectory as a maturing and high-quality operation in the UN system. The ILO’s complex and inclusive mandate requires innovative methodologies to be tested in a participatory manner. The Organization’s contribution to the SDGs needs to be monitored and evaluated, adding to greater complexity. Therefore, while an impressive number of evaluations have been carried out during the period of the previous Evaluation Strategy, steps will be taken to improve their quality and hence their credibility. This includes a more strategic focus by clustering and using funding in a more integrated manner. Reducing oversight for regional evaluations will allow EVAL to devote more time to developing new evaluation models specific to the ILO’s mandate.

### **2.1. Use of strategic cluster evaluations to gather evaluative information more effectively**

**17.** A greater focus on the choice of evaluations is required. The current conventional approach to carrying out individual project evaluations rather than strategic cluster evaluations that respond to needs will be re-examined. As requirements for project-level, independent and internal evaluations and self-evaluations are established by EVAL, evaluation practice will promote more strategic evaluations. This new focus will also apply to compulsory evaluability reviews for high-value projects in their start-up phase. Collectively, this has implications for the use of resources: pooling of extra-budgetary evaluation funds may be required, drawing on similar experiences from other UN agencies.

**18.** More evaluations of project and programme activities with similar themes, programme frameworks and locations (thematic, strategic and regional/country) will be promoted. This will allow evaluations to be more strategic, possibly take an ex-post view and allow coverage of broader performance issues, such as contribution to the Decent Work Agenda, the Social Justice Declaration and the SDGs.



## 2.2. *Improved quality of internal, decentralized and centralized evaluations*

19. Enhanced independence of decentralized and internal evaluations can ensure higher levels of credibility, impartiality and quality through stronger quality control. This is expected to contribute to improved evaluation quality and managers' self-learning and to a strengthening of constituents' demand for, participation in and ownership of evaluation. The progress made by UNEG in developing norms and standards for evaluation, as well as existing Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)/Development Assistance Committee standards, has assisted EVAL in further advancing quality control. Nearly half of its recommendations target constituents and decentralized evaluations require stronger participation by constituents. Self-evaluation and internal evaluations are required for all projects below a US\$1 million threshold, leading EVAL to administer evaluation training programmes on their conduct.

## 2.3. *Credible impact evaluations conducted to build knowledge for effective policy interventions*

20. Greater use of impact evaluations has the potential to improve the quality of evidence gathered, but such evaluations require substantial resources for implementation and skills development and given their subject-specific nature are best conducted by technical departments. EVAL provides technical support through guidance and methodological review facilities in order to ensure internal quality assurance so that impact evaluations will meet UNEG guidelines and other relevant standards.

## 2.4. *Evaluation framework further aligned with the ILO mandate and context, including SDGs*

21. The introduction of more strategic evaluations will allow for greater understanding of issues that concern constituents. More substantial resources for fewer evaluations will allow the introduction of more participatory, people-centred methods that are inclusive of disadvantaged workers, human rights and gender equality and are better adapted to the ILO's specific mandate and context, including tripartism, social dialogue and normative work. This approach will also enable the incorporation of indicators in which the ILO's mandate overlaps with the monitoring of SDGs and will require a continuing emphasis on building the capacity of constituents and staff.

### Results framework for outcome 2

Outcome of Evaluation Strategy				
2.1. Use of strategic cluster evaluations to gather evaluative information more effectively				
Indicator	Baseline	Biennial milestone 2018–19	Target 2020–21	Linkages and assumptions
Strategic cluster evaluations established as a modality in a substantial proportion of programmes and projects.	Currently, no documented processes or procedures are in place to conduct strategic cluster evaluations for development cooperation projects.	Methodology and procedure developed for strategic cluster evaluations, including a modality for pooling evaluation funds, and piloted in at least five projects.	By end-2021, a procedure for strategic cluster evaluations approved by a critical number of donors (25%) will be in place.	Defined mechanism for pooling of resources, including establishment of trust fund for pooling resources.

**Outcome of Evaluation Strategy****2.2. Improved quality of internal, decentralized and centralized evaluations**

Indicator	Baseline	Biennial milestone 2018–19	Target 2020–21	Linkages and assumptions
2.2.1. All evaluations of development cooperation projects comply with OECD and UNEG norms and standards and are tailored to the ILO's specific mandate and learning needs.	External quality assessment for in 2015–17 shows that about 90% of development cooperation project evaluations meet the required quality standards.	Guidelines will be updated to incorporate new evaluation models that reflect the ILO's specific mandate while maintaining quality.	By end-2021, external quality assessment confirms that 95% of development cooperation project evaluations meet OECD and UNEG standards.	Highest level of independence and impartiality of evaluations, further improving the use of findings at the regional level; use of a rigorous quality control system; compliance with requirements for evaluability reviews; and use of ILO-specific evaluation models and approaches that reflect the ILO's specific mandate and context.
2.2.2. Additional capacity released in EVAL at headquarters to focus on new evaluation models by reducing oversight of regional evaluations of development cooperation projects.	The 2016 IEE identified the issue of independence at the regional level as a priority and recommended the integration of REOs as full staff members of EVAL.	Preparation of a detailed report that analyses reporting lines for REOs and includes a presentation of possible scenarios, with the aim of ensuring the highest level of independence.	By end-2021, all evaluations in the regions are conducted to the highest standard of independence, requiring minimal oversight by EVAL at headquarters.	
2.2.3. Corporate governance-level evaluations incorporate UNEG norms and standards and are tailored to the ILO's specific mandate and learning needs.	Independent review in 2013 confirmed quality met required standards as reconfirmed by the 2016 IEE.	Protocols will be updated to incorporate new evaluation models that reflect the ILO's specific mandate while maintaining quality.	The 2021 IEE confirms that corporate governance-level evaluations are tailored to the ILO's specific mandate and continue to be of good quality as benchmarked against similar evaluations in comparable UN agencies.	Use of evaluation models and approaches that reflect the ILO's specific mandate and context.

**Outcome of Evaluation Strategy****2.3. Credible impact evaluations conducted to build knowledge for effective policy interventions**

Indicator	Baseline	Biennial milestone 2018–19	Target 2020–21	Linkages and assumptions
Impact evaluations are considered credible and used for documenting effective policy interventions.	Quality of impact evaluations not optimal or uniform, as indicated in EVAL stocktaking report of 2014. A new ex-post quality analysis of a sample of impact evaluations, to be carried out in 2018, will establish a new baseline.	Improved impact evaluations by technical departments and ILO offices as a result of improved technical support by EVAL and increased conformity with EVAL guidance for 50% of impact evaluations.	By end-2021, 85% of impact evaluations at the ILO will be considered credible and will meet required quality and relevance standards.	Impact evaluations are within the responsibility of regions and departments, with EVAL providing technical support though guidance and a methodological review facility.

**Outcome of Evaluation Strategy****2.4. Evaluation framework further aligned with ILO mandate and context, including SDGs**

Indicator	Baseline	Biennial milestone 2018–19	Target 2020–21	Linkages and assumptions
ILO-specific evaluation approaches, models and methods used for evaluations at various levels.	Currently, minimal ILO-specific approaches and models are used in ILO evaluations.	Pilot evaluation framework developed and used in five pilot evaluations; Evaluation Policy guidelines updated.	Updated evaluation framework applied in 50% or more of evaluations and 20% of evaluations have SDG-specific indicators.	Linked to risks and assumptions under suboutcomes 1.2, 1.3 and 1.5 above.

---

### **Outcome 3. Stronger knowledge base of evaluation findings and recommendations**

22. A higher evaluation profile, both internally and externally to the ILO, will show constituents that the ILO is an evidence-based, credible and transparent Organization. Methods such as meta-studies and synthesis reviews bring valuable knowledge about what works in programme implementation. EVAL has recently expanded its knowledge management tools to generate an effective evaluation knowledge system. It is also launching an automated system to keep track of management responses to independent evaluations, which is intended to place an emphasis on the quality of follow-up. EVAL also produces communication products such as newsletters and fact sheets, employs new social media efforts and will revisit its 2014 communications strategy to create a more targeted product.

#### **3.1. Strengthened accessibility and visibility of evaluation information through i-eval Discovery**

23. Evaluation information should be used for planning and organizational learning that leads to improved decision-making. The i-eval Discovery platform is publicly accessible<sup>3</sup> and is constantly updated, thereby providing a full suite of evaluation information on a real-time basis, including planned and completed evaluations and related recommendations, lessons learned and good practices. The availability of these modalities needs to be supported by a targeted communication campaign.

#### **3.2. More targeted communication of evaluation findings**

24. EVAL's revised communications strategy will reflect the needs of current users and new partnerships linked to the SDGs. Considering that the 2016 IEE recommended that the evaluation function be more participatory, this will require revised and targeted communication products that should be presented in a user-friendly manner and linked to critical points of evaluation use in the results-based management (RBM) cycle. The rebranding of communication products and use of innovative methods will support this effort.

#### **3.3. Improved use of evaluation findings and recommendations by constituents and management for governance and decision-making**

25. The use of evaluation findings (for strategic guidance, strategic plans, programme and budget reports and other high-level reports, plans and strategies) requires an institutional structure and incentives to promote the use of evaluation-related knowledge. The prime mechanism of this effort is the Evaluation Advisory Committee (EAC), whose effectiveness depends on the frequency and quality of its decisions and advice regarding the relevance of the evaluation programme of work to Governing Body policy decisions and strategic objectives of the International Labour Office. Building on the successes of the EAC, the establishment of regional evaluation advisory committees is encouraged in order to improve the use of evaluation findings. The automated follow-up management systems will provide data on the use of recommendations and enhance follow-up to recommendations through monitoring. Uptake of findings also requires appropriate packaging that provides for

<sup>3</sup> See <http://www.ilo.org/ievaldiscovery/#a6y632k>.

evaluation findings to be analysed, synthesized and documented in knowledge products that support planning and knowledge building.

### 3.4. *Evaluations used to meet strategic knowledge requirements through further analysis of findings and results from evaluations*

26. The main modality for documenting the use of evaluation findings is the AER. This is linked to supporting the capacity of the regions and departments to use evaluations systematically and to upgrade the record of that use. Further meta studies and synthesis of evaluation findings form the basis of providing strategic knowledge, including efforts to measure the overall effectiveness of the ILO and inputs into strategic discussions and documents.

#### Results framework Outcome 3

Outcome of Evaluation Strategy				
3.1. Strengthened accessibility and visibility of evaluation information through i-eval Discovery				
Indicator	Baseline	Biennial milestone 2018–19	Target 2020–21	Linkages and assumptions
i-eval Discovery contains all planned and completed evaluations, including recommendations, lessons learned and good practices; is consistently accessed by internal and external users; and is considered the gateway to ILO evaluation information.	Data to be provided by INFOTEC.	Further development and use of i-eval Discovery and the i-Track database to support targeted communication and use of evaluation information. Target: 25% increase over baseline level.	By end-2021, i-eval Discovery will be broadly used internally and externally as the gateway to reliable ILO evaluation information. Target: 50% increase over baseline level.	(a) Required coverage and availability of evaluation information and outcomes; (b) Awareness and support activities of a communication campaign.

**Outcome of Evaluation Strategy****3.2. More targeted communication of evaluation findings**

Indicator	Baseline	Biennial milestone 2018–19	Target 2020–21	Linkages and assumptions
Revised communications strategy leads to better targeting of evaluation findings to management, constituents and other users.	The 2016 IEE recognized progress made (newsletter, think pieces, i-eval Discovery) but called for better presentation of evaluation findings to improve their use.	A communication and rebranding strategy is designed (target: 2018) and rolled out (target: 2019) in collaboration with the Department of Communication.	The 2021 IEE acknowledges progress made in the communication strategy.	(a) Communication products linked to critical points of possible use of evaluations in the RBM cycle; (b) rebranding and use of innovative methods and support activities.

**Outcome of Evaluation Strategy****3.3. Improved use of evaluation findings and recommendations by constituents and management for governance and decision-making**

Indicator	Baseline	Biennial milestone 2018–19	Target 2020–21	Linkages and assumptions
3.3.1. EAC advice on timing and use of evaluations prompts more robust uptake of evaluation findings for policy and strategic decisions at the global and regional levels.	The EAC met on average four times per year and qualitative analysis showed it held strategic debates on about 40 of the corporate governance level evaluations. Although the regions participate in the EAC, there are no regional evaluation advisory committees (REACs).	The EAC continues to meet on a consistent basis (four times annually) and has strategic discussions on 50% of the corporate governance-level evaluations. By early 2019, a report on added value of REACS will be produced. Subject to the outcome of that review, by end-2019 two regions will have piloted an REAC.	By end-2021, the EAC continues to meet on a consistent basis (four times annually), holds strategic discussions on 75% of the corporate governance-level evaluations and maintains a renewed focus on coalescing support to address systemic issues identified in evaluations. Target on expanding practice of REACs to be set subject to outcome of pilot.	(a) High-level evaluations of a credible quality are produced; (b) appropriate composition of the EAC.
3.3.2. Enhanced follow-up to evaluation recommendations through systematic monitoring.	Follow-up to management response stood at 83% in 2016 (partially addressed and completed).	An automated online application for management to follow up evaluation recommendations will have been established, improving overall efficiency and maintaining a high follow-up response rate (target: 85%).	By end-2021, the automated application for management to follow up evaluation recommendations will lead to both higher quality of evaluations and higher quality of management responses to evaluation recommendations (target 90%).	The use of automated follow-up management system will provide analytical data on the ongoing use of recommendations.
3.3.3. Enhanced use of evaluations in strategic guidance, reviews and reporting for strategic plans, programme and budget reports and other high-level plans and strategies.	The AER documents the use of recommendations and lessons learned from evaluations (40–50% for period 2010–15, based on stock-taking exercise).	By end-2019, 75% of evaluation recommendations and findings are fully or partially reflected in relevant strategic guidance and reporting (for example implementation reports, 2020–21 Programme and Budget reports and other strategic and programmatic documents).	By end 2021, 80% of evaluation recommendations and findings are fully or partially reflected in relevant strategic guidance and reporting (for example implementation reports, 2020–21 Programme and Budget reports and other strategic and programmatic documents).	Linked to suboutcome 3.2 above.

**Outcome of Evaluation Strategy****3.4. Evaluations used to meet strategic knowledge requirements through further analysis of findings and results of evaluations**

Indicator	Baseline	Biennial milestone 2018–19	Target 2020–21	Linkages and assumptions
3.4.1. Evaluation findings analysed, synthesized and documented in knowledge products in support of planning and knowledge building.	In the previous strategy period, 22 think pieces, meta studies and synthesis reviews were carried out.	Process established to determine topics in line with strategic knowledge requirements, maintaining an average of at least three studies per year.	By end-2021, the number of knowledge projects produced will have increased by 25% and the 2021 IEEF confirms topics are in line with strategic knowledge requirements.	(a) Adequate EVAL capacity; (b) Existence of appropriate topics.
3.4.2 The AER provides annual overview of overall effectiveness of the ILO.	Analysis of decent work results and effectiveness of ILO development cooperation completed, covering 2009–2016 with ongoing revision of methodology.	Analysis conducted for 2017 and 2018, providing a synthesis on the ILO's effectiveness; methodology further revised to facilitate regular analysis and reporting in the AER.	Analysis conducted up to 2021 and communicated to relevant parts of the ILO for use, and the AER reports on the uptake and use of the findings.	Linked to suboutcomes 3.1 and 3.2 above.

## **D. The enabling environment for the evaluation function in the ILO and the assumptions that underpin it**

### **Evaluation culture**

27. The evaluation function will depend on the enabling environment provided within the Organization and by its constituents, particularly the Partnerships and Field Support Department (PARDEV), the Strategic Programming and Management Department (PROGRAM) and technical departments. Strengthening monitoring systems will rely heavily on the organizational environment. A growing evaluation network involving the REOs and departmental evaluation focal points is expected to grow in the strategy period. As evaluation criteria and reflection are mainstreamed into ILO activities, the Organization needs to commit adequate capacities and resources for evaluation activities. At the governance level, the management response to evaluation recommendations supports EVAL at the Governing Body level. Institutional incentives for staff to perform evaluation activities and to use and learn from evaluations should be improved.

### **Organizational learning culture**

28. Evaluations are of little value unless there is enhanced organizational learning and knowledge management. Evaluations contribute to the organizational knowledge base.

### **Results-based management culture**

29. The RBM culture provides mechanisms for staff to focus on results and their achievement, on outputs and outcomes rather than inputs and on generating theories of change and logical frameworks. The support of staff and the engagement of stakeholders in this regard has helped the ILO to become a leader in evaluation. Emphasis should now be placed on how programme managers use evaluation findings to improve performance indicators and targets in order to monitor the contribution of specific activities to objectives and outcomes.

30. This effort will involve continued activities by departments to strengthen the appraisal function in the design phase of projects. Support for development cooperation design needs to be expanded to improve the quality and evaluability of project proposals by strengthening RBM and formulating theories of change and logical frameworks. The quality and record-keeping of progress reports, as developed in 2016–17, should be enhanced by a recommendation for an end-to-end project cycle management system.

## **E. Monitoring and evaluation of the Evaluation Strategy**

31. Monitoring and reporting of the roll-out of the Evaluation Strategy will be conducted through the existing mechanism of the AER. An independent evaluation will be conducted in 2021 to assess the results and impact of the Evaluation Strategy on the function and performance of the Office in the context of the Evaluation Policy. This evaluation will form the basis of an updated Evaluation Strategy to give full implementation to the Evaluation Policy.

### **Draft decision**

- 32. The Governing Body endorses the Evaluation Strategy 2018–21 outlined in paragraphs 1–31 of the present document.*





# Appendix

## Theory of Change

