Call for Expression of Interest

Independent Final Evaluation

ILO is seeking expressions of interest from individual consultants or teams of consultants for (1) an international evaluator/Team Leader, and; (2) a Thai national consultant who is based in Thailand, to conduct an independent Final Evaluation of the “Strengthening Social Security Office capacities in policy design with a focus on research and actuarial service, Thailand”

Candidates/teams intending to submit an expression of interest must supply the following information:

1) A description of how the candidate’s skills, qualifications and experience are relevant to the required qualifications of this assignment
2) A list of previous evaluations/work that are relevant concerning the context and subject matter of this assignment
3) A statement confirming the availability of the candidates to conduct this assignment and the daily professional fees expressed in US dollars.
4) A copy of the candidates’ CVs (which must include information about the qualifications held by the candidates).
5) A statement confirming that the candidates had no previous involvement in the delivery of the project to be evaluated or have a personal relationship with any of the ILO Officials who are engaged in the project.
6) The names of two referees (email address) who managed the evaluations mentioned in the #2.

The deadline to apply is by COB (Bangkok time) on Monday 27 May 2024. Please send an e-mail with the subject header “Thailand Social Security project” to the Evaluation Manager, Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka (pamornrat@ilo.org)

For further details about the evaluation, please see the Terms of Reference below.
## Terms of reference

Independent Final Evaluation of a project on Strengthening Social Security Office capacities in policy design with a focus on research and actuarial services, Thailand

As of 13 May 2024

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Code</th>
<th>THA/19/01/THA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Period</td>
<td>1 July 2019 to 30 September 2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type and Timing of the evaluation</td>
<td>Independent final evaluation; May to July 2024 (data collection is expected to be in June 2024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor and Funding</td>
<td>Government of Thailand, Social Security Office USD 1,354,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners</td>
<td>Social Security Office of Thailand Ministry of labour of Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;B outcomeTR</td>
<td>Outcome 6: Gender equality and equal opportunities and treatment for all in the world of work Outcome 7: Adequate and effective protection at work for all Outcome 8: Comprehensive and sustainable social protection for all DWCP outcome THA 251 improving the existing social security systems - bringing gaps of inequality and expanding coverage of social protection/social security to the informal sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to SDGs</td>
<td>SDG target 1.3 “Implement nationally appropriate social protection systems and measures for all, including floors, and by 2030 achieve substantial coverage of the poor and the vulnerable”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative unit</td>
<td>ILO Country Office for Thailand, Lao PDR, and Cambodia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Backstopping Unit</td>
<td>ILO Decent Work Technical Team for East and South-East Asia and the Pacific and Actuarial Services Unit of the Social Protection Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Manager</td>
<td>Pamornrat Pringsulaka, ILO Regional Evaluation Officer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Introduction

These Terms of Reference (TOR) concern a final independent evaluation of the project entitled “Strengthening Social Security Office capacities in policy design with a focus on research and actuarial services, Thailand”. Hereafter, to be called ‘the project.’ It sets out the purpose, scope, and objectives of the final evaluation. The independent final evaluation aims to examine the extent to which the project outcomes’ have been achieved and it will be conducted systematically and impartially as much as possible.

The project is coming to its end in September 2024 and as per the ILO evaluation policy, an independent final evaluation will be conducted. The project conducted its internal midterm evaluation in early 2022.

The Project Document’s provision on evaluation, the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) for evaluation, ILO’s Policy guidelines for results-based evaluation provide the framework for carrying out the Project’s independent final evaluation. The evaluation will address the evaluation’s objectives that address the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria including relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability, and ILO cross-cutting evaluation criteria and concerns including gender equality and non-discrimination, promotion of international

---

1 TOR maybe slightly revised pending inputs from SSO, Thailand
labour standards and social dialogue. The evaluation will provide strategic recommendations, lessons learned for future projects of similar objectives.

The final evaluation will be managed by an independent certified ILO Evaluation Manager, who has no previous involvement with the project and it will be conducted by an independent evaluator(s). The evaluation will systematically assess the performance of the project against a set of key criteria and derived questions, document lessons learned and good practices, and make recommendations for possible similar future interventions.

The evaluation complies with the United Nations Evaluation Guidelines (UNEG) Norms and Standards, ILO policy guidelines (4th edition). Key stakeholders, including the donor and key partners, ILO-DWT/CO- Bangkok Office, and ILO technical backstopping unit, will be consulted throughout the evaluation process.

2. Project Background

Thailand has one of the most comprehensive social protection systems in the Asia-Pacific Region. However, issues like the adequacy of benefits and the future sustainability of the system are significant challenges, particularly in a context of rapid ageing and a high dominance of the informal economy. The current social protection system, including the social insurance scheme run by the Social Security Office (SSO) as a major pillar, needs to adapt to new social and economic challenges, including an ageing society. Coverage needs to be improved to reach those without standard working careers. The need for further reforms towards the development of more comprehensive, inclusive and integrated schemes is recognised in the country as a key priority. The project, which is a result of extensive consultations with the SSO and constituents, aims to provide concrete outcomes to support social protection development and capacity in Thailand. It also builds on a long history of social protection work undertaken by the ILO in the support and promotion of social security in Thailand.

The project is funded by the SSO, Thailand. It is a pioneer project that aims to develop and strengthen actuarial and research capacity and expertise. The project is managed by an ILO Senior Actuary who works within the SSO to support capacity building and to strengthen social security through better policymaking and management. As well as the Senior Actuary, the project calls on other ILO expertise and resources to support the project.

The Project is aligned with the objectives of the 12th National Economic and Social Development Plan (2017-21) and the 20th-year national strategy (2017-2036). The 20-year national strategic plan consists of six areas, six primary strategies, and four supporting strategies. The six areas include (1) security, (2) competitiveness enhancement, (3) human resource development, (4) social equality, (5) green growth, and (6) rebalancing and public sector development. The 12th Plan is geared to reduce income disparity and poverty, strengthen the Thai economy and enhance the country’s competitiveness, promote natural capital and environmental quality, and further boost the confidence of Thailand in the international community. The Project also contributed to the objectives of the 5 years Strategic Plan for the Social Security Office of Thailand (2015-2019).

The development objective of the project is to enhance the effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of Thailand Social Security System and therefore contribute to enhanced and improved social protection of women and men residing in Thailand.

There are three project outcomes:

**Outcome 1 – The SSO Actuarial Bureau is in place and its team has the necessary capacity to provide the organization with actuarial services**

*Output 1.1: SSO Actuarial Bureau structure developed, approved and ongoing management processes defined*

*Output 1.2: SSO Actuarial Bureau officials have enhanced capacity through their participation in training activities and continuing professional development*

**Outcome 2 – Relevant and gender responsive Social Security Policy reforms are prepared and approved by the Thai Government, informed by evidence produced by the SSO Actuarial Bureau and by the Project services**
Output 2.1: Analysis and input into policy and reform options
Output 2.2: Policy, management and administration recommendations for extending social protection for all women and men, including costing estimations
Output 2.3: SSO Actuarial Review produced and available to inform policy decisions
Output 2.4: Workers compensation actuarial valuation produced and available to inform policy decisions
Output 2.5: Retirees’ contributions for health and other health related issues
Output 2.6: Investment Governance, developing a Funding Policy and reviewing Investment Policy and management
Output 2.7: Research and dialogue on options to expand the scope of hospitals available to SSO members for use
Output 2.8: Training of SSO staff /improving social security knowledge

Outcome 3 – Thai society, including social partners and Thai citizens in general, is increasingly aware of the functioning of social security schemes and to the importance of gender responsive Social Security.

Outcome 3.1: Journalists and/or correspondents have increased knowledge in Social Security topics, with the target of parity
Outcome 3.2: Social Partners have increased knowledge in Social Security topics, with a focus on those represented in SSO Board, with minimum critical mass of 35% women participants, with the target of parity (45% to 55%)
Outcome 3.3: Capacity of all SSO Departments increased to communicate social security gender responsive technical messages
Outcome 3.4: Annual Public Statistical and Actuarial Updates available and shared with the broad public (one per year), including gender disaggregated data
Outcome 3.5: Increased knowledge of the planning agency, line ministries and parliamentarians in the area of social insurance, with minimum critical mass of 35% women participants, with the target of parity (45% to 55%)
Outcome 3.6: A public dialogue on Social Security is created at national level involving broad relevant national stakeholders, inclusive of women representative associations

Institutional Framework: The ILO is an executing agency responsible for overseeing the technical and administrative aspects of project implementation. This includes supervision of the policy recommendations and other project outputs to ensure their conformity with the ILO Conventions and Recommendations. The project is under the overall responsibility of ILO Country Office for Thailand, Cambodia and Lao PDR.

The project management is led by a Chief Technical Advisor with two project team members, a National Project Coordinator who is responsible for day-to-day management of the project, and a Finance and Administrative Assistant. The Project management is done in strict articulation with the Social Security Office management.

The project has been technically backstopped by the ILO Senior Technical Specialist on Social Protection from the Decent Work Technical Support Team for East and South-East Asia and the Pacific based in Bangkok and the Head of the Actuarial Services Unit from the ILO Social Protection Department in Geneva. ILO has worked in strict articulation with the SSO Secretary General and the Unit in charge of Actuarial Services.

In addition, the Project closely coordinates activities with the Workers’ activities and Employers’ Activities Specialists of the ILO DWT in Bangkok, particularly in activities related to the capacity building of social partners.

Project steering committee: The PSC has been set up with representatives of the ILO CO-Bangkok and the SSO to oversee the progress of the project implementation. From the SSO side, led by the SSO Secretary General, PSC comprises relevant senior management and members of SSO Board of Management which include worker and employer representatives. The PSC meets once or twice a year and oversees, reviews and signs off on project activities, deliverables, work plans and budget planning.
Key stakeholders/partners: The main partner of the Project is Thailand Social Security Office. The Project also includes collaboration with other stakeholders who directly or indirectly involved in the topic of social protection, including other government departments, workers’ and employer’s organizations, research institutes and other national and international organisations. The project also works with academic partners i.e. Mahidol University and its Actuarial Science course.

3. Evaluation Purpose, Scope and Clients

**Purposes:** The final evaluation has two purposes: accountability and learning. The evaluation will seek to determine ways in which the project has been delivered and whether its planned objectives have been fully realized as per the project document. The evaluation will also attempt to contribute to the learning and generating key stakeholders’ knowledge by identifying and documenting the project’s lessons learnt and emerging good practices.

The final evaluation has the following specific objectives:

- To assess the project using OECD/DAC criteria with a focus on effectiveness, impact, and sustainability
- To assess the extent of changes in the SSO and constituents’ capacity and institutional transformation that the project has brought in the area of social protection policy, financing, communication, investment, management and actuarial work
- To assess the extent to which gender equality/mainstreaming and empowerment of women has been considered throughout the project design and implementation.
- Identify unintended results (positive and negative) or unanticipated effects of the project on gender equality.
- Identify lessons learnt and good practice and strategic recommendations that can be applied to similar projects in future.
- To assess the extent to which the midterm evaluation recommendations were applied

**Scope:** Sets boundaries around the object of evaluation. It determines what is included in the evaluation and what is excluded. The scope of this evaluation is all activities of the project from the start of the project in July 2019 to the time of the final evaluation in 2024. This evaluation seeks to provide critical insights into the project’s alignment with Thailand’s social protection needs and outreach, the aims of the SSO in building capacity and the SSO’s coordination with stakeholders.

The evaluation will address all crosscutting issues—COVID19 responsiveness, gender equality, disability inclusion and non-discrimination, and social transformation. In terms of this evaluation, this implies involving both men and women, families left behind and other social/cultural categories as relevant in the consultation. Moreover, the evaluators should review data and information that are disaggregated by sex at a minimum and assess the relevance and effectiveness of gender-related strategies and outcomes to improve lives of women and men. All this information should be included in the inception report and final evaluation report.

**The clients:** will be the project management team, the donor (SSO), ILO Regional Actuarial Services, ILO Country Office for Thailand, Cambodia and Lao PDR. Secondary parties making use of the results will include tripartite constituents, academia, and civil society organizations who have partnered with the project.

4. Evaluation Criteria and Questions

Based on UNEG, and ILO guidelines and standards, the criteria in Table 1 will be applied to assess the relevance of the project to target group’s needs, the coherence of the project, the project effectiveness, efficiency and the potential impact of the results and the potential for sustainability. For each criterion, two or three specific evaluation questions are suggested. The questions seek to address priority issues and concerns of the national constituents, SSO, and other stakeholders. In consultation with the Evaluation stakeholders, the
evaluation team is expected to refine the below key questions and elaborate sub-questions and means for answering them in an evaluation matrix.

Table 1. Evaluation Criteria and Key Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Questions to be addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Relevance** *(The extent to which the intervention objectives, design and approach continue to respond to beneficiaries, country, and partners/institution/donors’ needs, policies, and priorities, and is expected to continue to do so if circumstances change (or have changed)).* | • To what extent has the project design, objectives and approach support the goals outlined in the Thailand 2030 Agenda for SDGs, Thailand Decent Work Country Programme, Thailand national development plan, and the ILO Programme and budget (20-21 and 2022-23)?  
• To what extent has the project responded to the needs of Thailand tripartite constituents and key partners (SSO)?  
• To what extent the project has responded and adapted appropriately and according to the priorities and needs of the Thai government workers and employers’ organization and key stakeholders within the shifting and dynamic context at country levels, including COVID-19 pandemic?  
• To what extent is the project identifying, reaching and responding to the priorities and needs of the most excluded groups e.g. those in the informal economy? |
| **Coherence** *The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution)* | • To what extent has the project adhered to decent work principles including international labour standards, human rights-based approach and gender equality and non-discrimination?  
• Within the parameters of the Thailand DWCP, assess the extent of compatibility of interlinkages between the project and other ILO or other UN projects in Thailand and other interventions carried out by SSO and Government and social partners. |
| **Effectiveness** *(The extent to which the interventions achieved, or are expected to achieve, its objectives and its results, including any differential results across groups)* | • To what extent has the project achieved its planned objectives? Have all the outputs been delivered with quality and quantity as planned? If not, why? What are the risk factors, challenges and opportunities encountered that contributed to or adversely affected the following achievements: -  
  - Improved national social protection strategies, policies or legal frameworks with extended coverage or enhanced benefits, the extent to those strategies, policies and/or legal framworks are gender sensitive/responsive  
  - Strengthened governance, management, administration, communication financial management including investment and sustainability of social protection delivery through policy and regulatory reform and institutional capacity building  
  - Increased constituents capacity and an expanded knowledge base for an effective implementation of national social protection system, including SDG monitoring |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Questions to be addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Efficiency** *(The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way)*                  | • How economically and timely are the project resources/inputs (e.g. financial, human, institutional, technical, etc.) converted to results?  
• Is the project management capacities and structure (including the operational/implementation arrangements) facilitating good results and efficient delivery?  
• Is there a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities by all parties involved? How effective is communication between the project team, ILO Country Office, SSO, and other key partners?  
• How effectively does the project management team employ results based monitoring approach?                                                                 |
| **Impact** *(The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects.)* | • To what extent have the projects' interventions contributed to transformative change due to national stakeholders’ enhanced capacity on social security research and actuarial service?  
• How has the Project contributed to social protection reform process (including policy changes to relevant laws)?  
• Were there any unintended effects that may have been caused by the Project?                                                                 |
| **Sustainability** *(The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are likely to continue)*                                 | • To what extent the actuarial bureau and staff capacities will likely be sustained?  
• The extent relevant and gender disaggregated information and statistical information made available to public and other relevant agencies |
| **Crosscutting**                                                                    | • To what extent are gender and disability inclusion, and non-discrimination being mainstreamed as a cross-cutting concern throughout project design, implementation and deliverable?  
• To what extent the project enhanced social dialogue and tripartism and promoting ILO Labour standards.  
• To what extent has social dialogue contributed to achieving the planned objectives? Any lessons learned? |

5. **Evaluation Approach and Methodology**

The evaluation will use a mix of evaluation approaches and ensure triangulation of information using available information such as current results achievements, annual reports of the project, research studies, currently available data sources etc. It will use a theory-based and gender responsive approach to examine the project achievement.

It will use a mixed methods approach (e.g. document analysis, interviews, direct observation and surveys) to ensure the validity and reliability of the findings. It will, in part, use a participatory approach in that, to the extent possible, the evaluation will involve key stakeholders such as SSO, Min. of Labour, social partners, civil society, other government agencies, and strategic partners.

**Evaluation methodology**

The following are suggested methodologies but are not exhaustive. The evaluator may adapt the methodology outlined in this TORs, but any fundamental changes should be agreed upon by the evaluation manager, and reflected them in the inception report.
A desk review will analyze the project and other documentation including the Theory of change, the log-frame, implementation plan, technical progress reports, project deliverables and other relevant documents. The desk review will suggest a number of initial findings that in turn may point to additional or fine-tuned evaluation questions. The desk review will include orientation interviews with the project team, the donor, and key partners.

- Examining the intervention’s Theory of Change, with particular attention to the identification of assumptions, risk and mitigation strategies, and the logical connect between levels of results and their alignment with ILO’s strategic objectives and outcomes at the national levels, as well as with the relevant SDGs and related targets. If TOC does not exist, the evaluator should reconstruct it.
- Interviews with key informants (tripartite constituents ILO project team, technical specialists and relevant staff, representative of the SSO, Min of Labour, and other key stakeholders)
- Stakeholders workshop - as part critical reflection process, the evaluator(s) will present the findings and key recommendations. They will be validated by the key stakeholders; dissemination workshop may be organized to share the final report and findings

The evaluation must be conducted with gender equality as a mainstreamed approach and concern. This implies (i) applying gender analysis by involving both men and women in consultation and evaluation’s analysis; (ii) inclusion of data disaggregated by sex and gender in the analysis and justification of project documents; (iii) the formulation and/or analysis of gender-sensitive strategies and objectives and gender-specific indicators; (iv) inclusion of qualitative methods and utilization of a mix of methodologies; (v) forming a gender-balanced team, and (vi) assessing outcomes to improve lives of women and men. Thus, analysis of gender-related concerns will be based on the ILO Guidance Note 3.1: Integrating Gender Equality in Monitoring and Evaluation, and the Supplementary Guidance Note: integrating gender equality in ILO M&E (Nov. 2023).

Stakeholder participation
Stakeholders have been identified based on their role in the project. Stakeholders are not only key informants, but they need to be meaningfully engaged in the process to be able to express their beliefs on an equal footing. These fundamental power dynamics amongst stakeholders must be recognized in the process and ways for engaging meaningful stakeholder participation should be proposed by the evaluation team. The evaluation proposal should propose ways in which various stakeholders will be engaged, ensuring that representatives of the most marginalized or groups in vulnerable situation are able to participate throughout the evaluation process.

6. Expected Outputs

Deliverable 1: Inception Report and workplan (not more than 15 pages excluding annexes)

The Inception Report will include the details on how the evaluator understands what is being evaluated including the evaluation questions. The inception report must elaborate the methodology being proposed in the TOR, with changes if applicable, including proposed methods, data sources, and data collection procedures. The report shall also include selection criteria or sampling methodology for the selection of individuals for interviews or group discussions and list of stakeholders that will be included in the evaluation. A detailed timeline / workplan along with a detailed methodology should clearly state the limitations of the chosen evaluation matrix methods, including those related to representation of specific group of stakeholders. A detailed timeline / workplan will also be part of the inception report.

Deliverable 2: Debriefing and National Stakeholders consultation workshop (PowerPoint presentation to be submitted by the evaluator and delivered during a face-to-face workshop or online meeting, PPT to be translated into Thai as well)

A debriefing to ILO and a national stakeholders workshop will be organized for the evaluator to share and validate the findings. The Evaluation Manager will coordinate with the Project team for the list of stakeholders
for the workshop/online meeting. On this activity, the evaluator will present the initials findings to validate information and data collected through the various data collection methods.

**Deliverable 3: A first draft of the evaluation report** (not more than 35 pages excluding annex) The draft evaluation report will have to be written in English and should adequately cover the evaluation criteria and questions as finalised in the inception report, along with the recommendations, lessons learned, good practices, technical recommendations for the key stakeholders. The draft evaluation report should be in the format of the ILO [https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746808.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746808.pdf)

**Deliverable 4: Final Evaluation Report including an Evaluation Summary in standard ILO format** (not more than 35 pages excluding executive summary and annexes) The final evaluation report will be submitted to the evaluation manager. The Evaluation Manager has to ensure that all comments from the Project team and the Project’s key stakeholders are addressed and integrated. If not, written justifications for not incorporating them will be required. The Report’s annexes shall include the TOR, evaluation matrix, tools used during data collection, field work schedule, a list of interviewees, list of documents analysed, lessons learned template and emerging good practices in standard ILO template.

The quality of the report will be determined based on quality standards defined by the ILO Evaluation Office as per Checklist 4.9 Rating of an Evaluation Report [wcms_746818.pdf](https://ilo.org)

The report and all other outputs of this evaluation must be produced in English. All draft and final reports, including other supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided in electronic version compatible with Microsoft Word for Windows. The approval of the final evaluation report might take a couple of weeks as it must proceed through three ILO internal control layers (evaluation manager, regional evaluation office, and ILO Evaluation Office - Geneva).
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### 7. Evaluation Management and Resources

**Evaluation Management**

An ILO Regional Evaluation Officer based at ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific will manage and lead the evaluation process in consultation with the Project CTA, the National Project Coordinator and representatives of SSO. Evaluation Manager/Regional Evaluation Officer provides oversight of the evaluation process ensuring the process and report meets UNEG quality standards.

The evaluation manager develops the ToRs in consultation with key stakeholders. The evaluator(s) reports to ILO evaluation manager. Evaluation manager has overall day to day supervision of the evaluator’s work and sharing of the Evaluator’s deliverables for review by key stakeholders.

**Evaluator(s)**

The evaluation will be conducted by a team of independent evaluators (Team leader and national evaluator as team member) with strong evaluation experience and RBM expertise. Social protection expertise will be an advantage. The responsibilities and profile of the “evaluation team” can be found below. The project will provide support in contacting key stakeholders.

#### Responsibilities and Profile of the Team Leader

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
<th>Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Defining roles and responsibilities of the team leaders guiding and managing the team throughout the evaluation phases and ensuring quality control and adherence to ethical guidelines;</td>
<td>• Post graduate degree in a field of relevance to the evaluation (Economics, Actuarial Science, or other related Political/Social Science degree), and have</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responsibilities

- Defining the methodological approach. Producing and delivering the inception powerpoint. 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.
- Ensuring the evaluation is conducted per TORs, including following ILO EVAL guidelines, methodology and formatting requirements.
- Adhering to evaluation report quality standards
- Liaising with the evaluation managers and representing the evaluation team in meetings with stakeholders;
- Contributing to the report dissemination and communication by participating in webinars and supporting or providing inputs to evaluation communication products.
- Ensure that all key stakeholders are consulted and have the chance to provide their inputs during the evaluation process

Profile

- specific experience in the field of evaluation
- Contextual knowledge of the UN and in particularly the ILO and Thailand context
- At least 10 year experience in evaluation of UN projects and programmes and experience in leading evaluations
- Demonstrated knowledge and expertise of social protection and social security will be an advantage;
- Demonstrated knowledge and experience on gender issues, including gender mainstreaming
- Expertise in qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and an understanding of issues related to validity and reliability;
- Fluency in spoken and written English,
- Postgraduate degree in a field of relevance to the evaluation (Economics, Actuarial Science, Gender, Political Science, Anthropology, or other Social Science degree)
- Expertise and experience in social protection and gender mainstreaming will be an asset.
- 3 years experience in conducting evaluation of UN projects/programmes
- Expertise in qualitative and quantitative research
- Fluency in spoken and written English and Thai

Responsibility and Profile of a team member (nationals of Thailand)

Responsibilities

- Provide context specific and technical (particularly on Thailand-related social protection aspects) and methodological advice necessary to the team leader
- Support the evaluation team leader throughout the evaluation process (inception, data collection, data analysis, and report writing);
- Represent the evaluation team in meetings/interviews/focus group discussions with stakeholders;
- Ensure that all key stakeholders are consulted
- Contribute to the report drafting, dissemination and communication by participating in webinar and supporting or providing inputs to evaluation communication products.
- Provide interpretation as required including translation of PowerPoint presentation to Thai

Profile

- Postgraduate degree in a field of relevance to the evaluation (Economics, Actuarial Science, Gender, Political Science, Anthropology, or other Social Science degree)
- Expertise and experience in social protection and gender mainstreaming will be an asset.
- 3 years experience in conducting evaluation of UN projects/programmes
- Expertise in qualitative and quantitative research
- Fluency in spoken and written English and Thai

The project team will be consulted throughout the evaluation process and they will facilitate inputs to first and secondary data collection. They will provide all relevant documents and support the logistics needed by the evaluation team. ILO team will provide the necessary budget required for this evaluation and will issue contracts for the evaluation team.

Resource: the project will cover the cost of the evaluation as follows:-
- professional fee: Proposed professional fee's terms of payment:-
  - 20% upon the approval of the inception report;
- 50% upon submission of the quality draft evaluation report as per agreed ToR/inception report and ILO evaluation report checklist
- 30% upon the approval of the final evaluation report by ILO Evaluation Office
- travel and DSA where relevant and applicable

8. Evaluation Workplan

It is estimated that the scope of effort required by the evaluation team will be approximately 25 days for the international consultant/team leader and approximately 18 days for the national consultant. The successful evaluation consultants will be remunerated on an output-based total fee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Responsible Person</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Team leader – Number of Workdays</th>
<th>National consultant - Number of Workdays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOR finalisation in consultation with key stakeholders</td>
<td>Evaluation Manager</td>
<td>End of April 2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call for proposals and selection of evaluator</td>
<td></td>
<td>May 2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing evaluation team and inception report finalization</td>
<td>EM and Evaluators</td>
<td>By end of May 2024</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and debriefing</td>
<td>Evaluators</td>
<td>Mid-end June 2024</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft report submission</td>
<td>Evaluators</td>
<td>By mid July</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders consultation workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and provide feedback/comments on evaluation report</td>
<td>Project and stakeholders</td>
<td>By end of July 2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalization of report</td>
<td>Evaluator</td>
<td>By mid Aug 2024</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve the final evaluation report</td>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td>By end of Aug 2024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Legal, Ethical matters and code of conduct

The evaluation will comply with UN Norms and Standards. The evaluator will abide by the EVAL's Code of Conduct 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 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, girls and boys. 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.

Ethical considerations will be considered in the evaluation process. As requested by the UNEG Norms and Standards, the evaluator(s) will be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs, and act with integrity and honesty in relationships with all the stakeholders. The evaluator(s) shall respect the people's right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality while ensuring that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source.

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 the written agreement of the ILO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgment.

All deliverables will be paid for on satisfactory completion and certification by the ILO evaluation manager and in line with the ILO Evaluation report checklist.

Annex1

1. Relevant ILO guidelines on Development Project Evaluation/ Website EVAL portal on mangning and conducting evaluation (all guidance notes, checklist, templates, etc.)
2. ILO Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation, 2020
3. Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO: Practical tips on adapting to the situation
4. SDG related materials
5. Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) for Thailand
6. Code of conduct for evaluation/ Code of conduct form (To be signed by the evaluators)
7. ILO EVAL Gender Guidance Note 3.1 on integrating gender equality and non-discrimination
8. ILO EVAL Social Dialogue Guidance Note 3.2 on Integrating social dialogue and ILS in monitoring and evaluation of projects
10. UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation
    http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/548
11. Writing the inception report
12. Checklist 4.3: Data collection method
13. Checklist 4.1: Validating methodology
14. Checklist 4.2: Preparing the evaluation report
15. Checklist 4.9 Rating the quality of evaluation reports
16. Guidance Note 4.5: Stakeholders engagement