

Evaluability Review for PROSPECTS

FINAL REPORT

Oct. 20, 2021

Submitted to:



PROSPECTS

Improving Prospects for Host Communities and Forcibly Displaced Persons

Mr. Rafael Muñoz-Sevilla

Contents

- ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 2
- LIST OF ACRONYMS 3
- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 4
- 1. INTRODUCTION 10
- 2. PROJECT CONTEXT AND DESCRIPTION 10
 - 2.1. Project Context 10
 - 2.2. PROSPECTS Partnership Programme 10
 - 2.3. Prospects M&E Plan..... 11
- 3. EVALUABILITY REVIEW OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE 13
 - 3.1. Objectives 13
 - 3.2. Scope..... 13
 - 3.3. PROSPECTS’ ER Dimensions, Questions and Quality assessment criteria 13
- 4. METHODOLOGY 18
- 5. PROSPECTS EVALUABILITY REVIEW FINDINGS 20
 - 5.1. Situation Analysis 20
 - 5.2. Intervention Logic and assumptions 21
 - 5.3. Theory of Change..... 23
 - 5.4. Objectives/Outcomes 25
 - 5.5. Quality of indicators, baselines, targets and milestones 26
 - 5.6. M&E Plan..... 29
 - 5.7. Sustainability 32
- 8. SOME CONSIDERATIONS ON THE ILO/PROSPECTS MID-TERM EVALUATION 34
- 9. LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES..... 36
 - 9.1. Lessons Learned 36
 - 9.2. Good Practices 37
- ANNEXES..... 38
 - Annex 1: Terms of Reference..... 39
 - Annex 2: ER Work-Plan..... 40
 - Annex 3: ER Checklist 41

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Evaluability Review of the “Improving Prospects for Host Communities and Forcibly Displaced Persons” (PROSPECTS) Project was conducted between September and October 2021. Mr. Rafael Muñoz Sevilla, independent evaluator, conducted the study in collaboration with the ILO/PROSPECTS team (at HQ and Countries). Mr. Muñoz would like to express sincere thanks to all parties involved in this study for their support and valuable contributions.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACT/EMP	ILO's Bureau for Employers' Activities
ACTRAV	ILO's Bureau for Workers' Activities
CPOs	Country Programme Outcomes
CTs	Country Teams
CVNs	Country Vision Notes
DCS	Data Collection Sheet
DO	Development Objective
DQA	Data Quality Assurance
DWCPs	Decent Work Country Programmes
ER	Evaluability Review
FDP	Forcibly Displaced Person
GB	ILO Governing Body
GVN	Global Vision Note for a new partnership
IFC	International Finance Corporation
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IOs	Intermediate Objectives
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MACP	Multi-annual Country Programme
MAGRP	Multi-annual Global and Regional Programme
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands
MTO	Mid-Term Outcomes
ProDoc	Project Document
P&B	Programme and Budget
PROSPECTS	Improving Prospects for Host Communities and Forcibly Displaced Persons
RF	Results Framework
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
STO	Short-Term Outcomes
ToC	Theory of Change
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
WB	World Bank

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

ILO projects with budgets over US\$5 million must undergo an Evaluability Review (ER) within one year of start-up. The Evaluability Review serves two purposes: i) to review the quality of the project's M&E plan and systems in the light of implementation realities; and ii) to recommend changes in the Theory of Change (ToC) and Results Framework (RF) to make the project evaluable. The present document presents the findings and recommendations of the PROSPECTS Partnership Programme Evaluability Review under the second category mentioned above.

Methodology

The ER was conducted in September-October 2021. The PROSPECTS' ER findings are based on the evaluation of the dimensions, questions and quality assessment criteria detailed in Section 3.3. The project different dimensions (Situation Analysis; Intervention Logic and assumptions; Theory of Change; Objectives/Outcomes; Quality of indicators, baselines, targets and milestones; M&E Plan; and Sustainability) were rated based on the following scale (as per ILO/EVAL guidelines): i. Unsatisfactory; ii. Satisfactory; iii. Highly Satisfactory.

Findings and recommendations

1. Situation Analysis

Overall rating: the Situation Analysis is rated as **Highly Satisfactory**

While the PROSPECTS' Situation Analysis is comprehensive and rigorous, the understanding of both the context/s in which the programme intervenes (Global, Regional, countries contexts) as well as the situation/the problems it intends to address, is hindered by the fact that contextual factors are referred to and detailed in 9 different, separated documents (1 MAGRP + 8 MACPs). Looking at the upcoming ILO mid-term evaluation, this situation may encumber the capacity of an evaluator/evaluation team to properly grasp how the key contextual and situational factors have influenced the design and implementation of the project overall and in the respective national contexts.

Recommendations:

Addressed to: The PROSPECT's Partners / The ILO (in view of the upcoming mid-term evaluation)

- 1) Develop a "programmatic" Situation Analysis document/section which includes a synthesized, yet sufficiently detailed description of the operational situation, context, problems, stakeholders and target populations at both the global and the country levels.

2. Intervention Logic and assumptions

Overall rating: the Intervention Logic and assumptions is rated as **Satisfactory**

PROSPECTS' overall internal logic is sound and based on a thorough problem/context analysis. The strategy, proposed interventions, logically addresses the identified needs. Overall, there is a strong causal argument put forward between the project's objectives and outcomes/outputs. Regarding the external logic, the PROSPECTS partnership is being implemented in the larger policy framework of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); the 2016 New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants; the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) and the Global Compact on Refugees (GCR). At the countries' level, the (Egypt) MACP contains some references to relevant international and national development frameworks, though, in a superficial way.

With regard to the references specifying the intervention's contribution and linkages with the ILO Programme and Budget (P&B) as well as the relevant Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) objectives and Country Programme Outcomes (CPOs), are scattered among several documents which obfuscates such logic and hinders its comprehension by external stakeholders.

In relation to specific topics of the ILO's mandate (e.g. cross-cutting policy drivers, pro-poor focus and inclusion of people with disabilities), an "ILO ProDoc" was not elaborated as the MAGRP and MACPs were elaborated for the partnership. Thus the integration/specification of how such specific topics of the ILO's mandate are to be integrated in the project is yet to be developed conceptually.

Regarding the assumptions, risks and mitigations, at the global level (MAGRP) PROSPECTS conducted a thorough risk assessment; however, the MAGRP did not include key assumptions in its design. At the country level, the MACP examined (Egypt) does include a detailed risk analysis and a superficial description of the key assumptions.

Recommendations

Addressed to:

- ILO/PROSPECTS (in view of the upcoming mid-term evaluation)
- 2) Integrate in a single document the PROSPECTS' alignment/contributions to: ILO's P&B and DWCPs; ILO cross-cutting policy drivers; ILO's pro-poor focus and inclusion of people with disabilities
- The PROSPECT's Partners / ILO/PROSPECTS (in view of the upcoming mid-term evaluation)
- 3) Further elaborate on the MACPs PROSPECTS's alignment to National development frameworks.
- 4) Formulate/include key assumptions at the Outcomes/Outputs level in the PROSPECTS' overall results framework.
- 5) Formulate/include key assumptions at the Outcomes/Outputs level in the respective MACPs RFs.

3. Theory of Change

Overall rating: the Theory of Change is rated as **Unsatisfactory**

The MAGRP document contains a "Theory of Change" *section*, however, while this section somehow summarizes the partnership programme logic, it can't be stated that PROSPECTS developed a comprehensive Theory of Change (ToC). The (Egypt) MACP contains a well-structured and sound ToC. Additionally, while efforts were put into developing a ToC by the ILO this does not fulfil the need to have a global PROSPECTS ToC involving all partners.

Recommendations:

Addressed to:

- The PROSPECT's Partners
- 6) Develop a common, all-encompassing PROSPECTS partnership Theory of Change: narrative and graphic representation
- ILO/PROSPECTS (in view of the upcoming mid-term evaluation)
- 7) Update the current "ILO ToC" (narrative and visual) to better reflect ILO's specific contribution to the partnership. This would help delineating the overall evaluation reference framework, as well as contribute to better defining the scope of the evaluation.

4. Objectives/Outcomes

Overall rating: the quality of the Objectives/Outcomes is rated as **Highly Satisfactory**

The Development Objective (DO) was formulated in a rather complex and wordy manner, containing multiple development dimensions in one single statement. It may not be easy to understand for all stakeholders without a proper explanation. Nevertheless, upon analysis, it is considered to adequately reflect the main, global, long-term partnership objective.

The Mid-Term Outcomes (MTOs) corresponding to Pillars 1-3 are adequately, precisely and verifiably defined. The MTO under Pillar 4 is formulated in a rather imprecise way, although, its accompanying short-term outcomes contribute to clarify what the project intends to achieve under this Pillar.

Short-Term Outcomes (STOs) were found to be adequately and verifiably formulated.

Recommendations

Addressed to:

- The PROSPECT's Partners

- 8) To the extent possible replace (MTOs 1, 2 and 3) *forcibly displaced and host community people* with *forcibly displaced persons and host community members*.
- 9) Also, in MTO 2, take into account that *employment in safe/decent work* should not be an “either or statement”. It should read *safe AND decent work*. Safety is an integrated part of ILO’s Decent Work (Security at work).

5. Quality of indicators, baselines, targets and milestones

Overall rating: the quality of indicators, baselines, targets and milestones is rated as **Highly Satisfactory**

PROSPECTS M&E Plan developed a Results Framework, which showcases all key indicators for the Partnership under their corresponding Pillar.

- The indicators, baselines, targets and milestones were formulated in an adequate manner.
- Indicators are appropriate proxies for the objectives/outcomes.
- Indicators are of quality. Indicators are SMART¹ and disaggregated (when relevant) to support performance reporting on areas of special interest for the ILO (e.g. gender equality, non-discrimination, and the concerns of people with disabilities)
- Baseline information was collected or is in the process of being collected for each indicator requiring baseline data.
- Targets were established for each indicator. However, in some cases, the computing of targets seems to be erroneous.
- Milestones were identified for each indicator
- The set-up of targets, baselines and milestones was finalized in September 2021. Targets, baselines and milestones are reflected in the “PROSPECT Report_2021-09-28_Results”.

Recommendations

Addressed to:

- The PROSPECT’s Partners
- 10) Revise the targets computing in order to ensure that all indicators’ target values correspond to the adding of baselines and milestones.
 - 11) The targets for the Global PROSPECTS (programmatic) Indicators could be added in a column in the RF (Annex 1 of the M&E Plan)
 - 12) Baselines, milestones and targets milestones by country could be added in an additional separate annex in the M&E Plan.

6. M&E Plan

Overall rating: the M&E Plan is rated as **Highly Satisfactory**

PROSPECTS M&E plan provides a detailed sound, high quality framework and tools to conduct monitoring and facilitate evaluation processes in a systematic manner.

- The plan includes actions to achieve appropriate results and measure them. Information needs for performance reporting are well identified, and the roles and responsibilities for data collection, evaluation and reporting are specified in a satisfactory manner. However, some sections and annexes in the document are yet to be developed.
- The plan describes comprehensively and clearly the routine data collection, analysis and reporting processes.
- Data collection and analysis methods in the M&E plan are adequately detailed. Methods should be technically and operationally feasible, if an appropriate allocation of human, technical and financial resources by the partners is made.
- Data collection methods can reasonably be expected to inform processes, analysis, and decisions in a gender-responsive manner.
- The analysis and use of data are adequately specified. Additionally, the plan clearly defines the reporting flows from the countries/partners to central/project level for programmatic results.
- The M&E plan contains adequate tools and guidelines.

¹ SMART: Specific; Measurable; Attainable; Realistic (or Relevant); and Time-bound (or Timely or Trackable). Source: Results-based Management in the ILO. A Guidebook. Version 2. June 2011

- Organizational arrangements for M&E are clearly defined. However, while the ILO M&E arrangements are clearly specified, the Plan does not reflect specific information on the partners' respective internal M&E provisions and how these relate to their accountability towards the donor, nor does it include relevant processes and needs; which, in turn, hinders a joint understanding and the potential identification of common areas for monitoring.
- Human resources for M&E (ILO team) are so far found to be adequate, although, as the project reaches cruise speed, implementation is likely to intensify, and resources may prove to be insufficient in the near future.

Whether the partners' M&E staffing at central and national levels is appropriate to implement the M&E plan is unknown to the evaluator.

- ILO financial resources for M&E are considered to be adequate. For that purpose the ILO elaborated a specific M&E budget. However, the rationale behind how and why the resources were distributed among such components at the country level remains unclear for the ILO project management team.

The partners' M&E financial resources to implement the M&E plan are unknown to the evaluator.

- Regarding the evaluation framework, the M&E Plan superficially describes the purpose and overall objectives of mid-term and final evaluations. However, it does not propose any specific approach regarding such evaluations, as it seems that, except for the ILO, none of the partners has any specified internal or external (donor) requirements/obligations to conduct such evaluations.

Recommendations

Addressed to:

- The PROSPECT's Partners/M&E Working Group

- 13) Complete the drafting of the M&E Plan, specifically those sections and annexes in the document that are yet to be developed.
- 14) Support and train PROSPECTS partners and country teams so they can: a) fully understand the partnership's Result Framework; b) PROSPECTS M&E Plan; c) how to operationalize both the RF and the M&E Plan at country level.
- 15) Develop joint M&E Plans at the country levels.

- ILO PROSPECTS/ILO HQ

- 16) Make the necessary adjustments as relevant in order to ensure that the M&E financial resources are distributed adequately among countries/components.
- 17) To the extent possible, ILO PROSPECTS should ensure that M&E officers/focal points are available in all countries.
- 18) Further develop and conceptualize the (ILO) evaluation framework and include it in the relevant M&E Plan section.

- The PROSPECTS' Partners

- 19) The Partners' contribution (e.g. participation in interviews; sharing information) in the ILO's mid-term evaluation will be important in order to provide "a partnership view" to the evaluation.
- 20) The Partners are encouraged to agree on whether PROSPECTS will undertake joint evaluations or only Agency-led evaluations.

7. Sustainability

Overall rating: Sustainability is rated as **Unsatisfactory**

Sustainability and Exit Strategy *sections* have been developed in both the MAGRP and the MACPs. However, it can't be considered that PROSPECTS planned for sustainability of results. As the PROSPECTS partners only knew halfway through the implementation schedule what could be realistically achieved, it might not have been possible to design a detailed sustainability and exit plan earlier on in the lifecycle of the project.

Recommendations

Addressed to:

- The PROSPECTS' Partners

21) PROSPECTS must develop a systematic and detailed Sustainability Plan as well as a clear exit strategy, which identifies the gradual transfer of specific responsibilities from PROSPECTS to national/local institutions.

- The ILO HQ/PROSPECTS

22) Internally, the ILO should reflect on the “*what we want to achieve*” with regard to the enabling contexts for refugees and displaced persons to live and work and also to decide as an organization the “what is next” or the “*what we specifically need to achieve*”. Moreover, the ILO should systematize the knowledge related to the achievement of results by the project, obstacles and challenges, as well as lessons learned and good practices generated through the PROSPECTS project.

Some considerations on the ILO/PROSPECTS Mid-Term Evaluation

Overall, PROSPECTS evaluability review findings indicate that ILO/PROSPECTS is deemed evaluable. However, some challenges may negatively affect the ILO/PROSPECTS Mid-term evaluation process.

- PROSPECTS complex architecture

PROSPECTS is jointly implemented by 5 partners in eight countries (Pillars 1, 2 and 3). Additionally, the partners jointly develop regional and global activities under Pillar 4.

PROSPECTS developed eight MACPs (one per country) and one MAGRP at the global level. Further, the eight MACPs and the MAGRP are updated on a yearly basis. Additionally, the revised and agreed-upon Results Framework is contained in the M&E Plan.

This complex architecture and the fact that key information is scattered among many different documents may hinder the ability of an evaluator/evaluation team to properly understand the PROSPECTS Partnership Programme as well as the ILO’s role, interventions and responsibilities in the project (at the global, regional and countries’ levels). Moreover, the evaluator/evaluation team may find it difficult to rapidly gain an understanding of the linkages and complementarities/dependence on each partner’s interventions at all levels.

- Lack of an ILO Project Document that serves as reference for the evaluation

PROSPECTS programming documents (MAGRP and MACPs) refer to, and were elaborated for the partnership, thus, the ILO did not elaborate an encompassing “ProDoc” across the eight countries and global component, which will prevent the upcoming Mid-term evaluation from having access to an ILO-specific Project Document that serves as a clear reference for the evaluation.

- Defining the scope of the ILO/PROSPECTS Mid-term evaluation

The mid-term evaluation will not address a “usual” ILO Project, but a rather complex *Partnership*. While the mid-term ILO/PROSPECTS evaluation must focus on the ILO components of the PROSPECTS partnership project, it also has to consider its linkages with the implementation of the project by the project partners at the global and regional levels, and in the eight target countries. The ILO’s mid-term evaluation also has to be able to address ILO’s contribution to the achievement of the four intermediate outcomes corresponding to the four Partnership Pillars.

Recommendations

Addressed to:

- The ILO/PROSPECTS Team

23) The ILO/PROSPECTS team, with the contribution of the project partners must carefully and clearly define the scope of the ILO/PROSPECTS Mid-term evaluation.

Lessons Learned

1. While the project’s pillars are interlinked, the coordination among partners may prove challenging

PROSPECTS 4 pillars are interlinked and complementary. This implies that the five organisations are required to coordinate closely and to collaborate to ensure coherence and synergies in both implementation and monitoring. However, this is complex and at times challenging. The five agencies are guided by their respective mandates, relevant instruments and tools, structure, field presence, and expertise in working with

forcibly displaced persons. Moreover, each organization has a project implementing team and is fully responsible for its own activities, reporting bilaterally to the donor.

2. A sound M&E framework to be effective needs shared ownership

The M&E Plan and the results framework (RF) provide for a very sound M&E framework. The designed processes and systems are expected to be effective, sufficient and reliable for decision making; work planning; implementation; and sharing of results; as well as to make available a framework for global performance reporting to the Donor (MFA); on the condition that:

- There are shared monitoring arrangements for PROSPECTS in use across the ILO/PROSPECTS Staff, as well as across the Project partners.
- Adequate workflows are in place to ensure information and monitoring data from the ILO Project teams in each country is shared with the ILO team at HQ level as well as with PROSPECTS M&E Officer (ILO). Likewise, such processes allow for information and monitoring data to adequately flow from the PROSPECTS partners to the M&E working group/M&E Officer.
- The ILO/PROSPECTS M&E team and the PROSPECTS partners, are sufficiently staffed, and adequate technical and financial resources are dedicated to carry out monitoring and evaluation.

3. Data Quality Assurance (DQA) processes would help the partnership to assess "how good the data is".

PROSPECTS' M&E Plan facilitates the aggregation of the common programmatic outputs and outcomes across the eight countries and five partners that are a part of PROSPECTS, using a common set of performance measurement indicators and data collection tools. However, what is missing are processes to ensure the quality of the data that is collected. Conducting DQA periodic reviews would help the partners, the donor and the implementing agencies to assess "how good the data is". Such reviews would also provide an opportunity for capacity-building of implementing partners. Appropriate quality assurance processes should be created and implemented in close collaboration between partners

4. Effective M&E processes would demand joint reporting

The PROSPECTS Partners' monitoring is currently implemented with an emphasis on (bilaterally) reporting to the MFA. The key questions to address in monitoring and evaluation reporting are *whether the planned results were indeed achieved and why*; and *what/which results can be attributed to the project*. In this regard, there is a need to better align the current monitoring and reporting system, so as to be able to properly answer such questions. The elaboration of "joint progress reports" at country and programmatic levels for instance could significantly contribute to doing this.

Good Practices

1. Development of a sound M&E Plan

PROSPECTS M&E plan describes/includes comprehensively and clearly the data collection and analysis methods; the frequency of data collection; relevant and useful tools and guidelines; as well as organizational arrangements for M&E. Roles and distribution of responsibilities for data collection, evaluation and reporting are clearly specified, both within ILO/PROSPECTS and the Project Partners. The Results Framework, as developed in the M&E Plan, provides a global and common results framework for the Partnership.

2. ILO's commitment to PROSPECTS management, monitoring and evaluation.

The ILO has showed a high level of commitment to PROSPECTS management, monitoring and evaluation. ILO/PROSPECTS is well anchored within the Organization's technical cooperation portfolio and it's managed by a rather large full-time dedicated staff at both the global and countries' levels. Moreover, four technical specialists also work with the global team and country teams. In addition, several ILO Branches and Specialists at HQ provide technical support the ILO/PROSPECTS interventions when needed.

1. INTRODUCTION

As per ILO/EVAL Guidance Note 1.3: Procedure and Tools for Evaluability, since 2017, and as per the Governing Body (GB) decision, projects with budgets over US\$5 million must undergo two mandatory evaluability assessments: 1) Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) appraisal conducted by EVAL of the project proposal prior to approval; 2) an Evaluability Review (ER) within one year of start-up.

The Evaluability Review serves two purposes: i) to review the quality of the project's M&E plan and systems in the light of implementation realities; and ii) to recommend changes in the Theory of Change (ToC) and Results Framework (RF) to make the project evaluable. The ER takes place within the first year of the project start-up.

The present document presents the findings and recommendations of the PROSPECTS Partnership Programme Evaluability Review under the second category mentioned above.

2. PROJECT CONTEXT AND DESCRIPTION

2.1. Project Context

The forced displacement crisis has increased in scale and complexity in recent years. According to the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), there were about 79.5 million forcibly displaced persons (FDPs) in 2019, of whom about 30.2 million refugees and asylum-seekers. Overall, men and women were almost equally represented in the population of concern. Forced displacement is increasingly protracted and disproportionately affects children: one in two refugees worldwide is a child. The overwhelming majority of the forcibly displaced is hosted in developing countries with limited resources and capacities to respond to the situations – with substantive socioeconomic impacts on both refugees and host communities.

The impact of forced displacement is substantial both among those in displacement and hosting communities. Forcibly displaced persons face specific vulnerabilities, including loss of assets and psychological trauma, limited rights, lack of opportunities, a protection risk as well as a risk to be out of school, and a lack of planning horizon. Host communities, which tend to be among the poorest in their country, typically in lagging regions, have to pursue their own development efforts in an environment that has been transformed by a large inflow of newcomers. Economic opportunities and access to jobs as well as services, especially education and protective services, are key to a successful management of such situations – for both refugees and host communities.

Action is urgently needed to mitigate the plight of both forcibly displaced persons and hosting communities. Humanitarian assistance is critical, but insufficient when situations become protracted, and they need to be complemented by a development approach that is focused on the medium- and long-term socioeconomic dimensions of the crisis. This is in line with the global effort to “leave no-one behind” and to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): refugees and their hosts are among the most vulnerable and ‘furthest behind’ groups.

2.2. PROSPECTS Partnership Programme

In response to this context, UNICEF, UNHCR, ILO, IFC and the World Bank, in collaboration with and supported by the Government of the Netherlands, are developing a joint and fully integrated approach to respond to the forced displacement situation in the Middle East and North Africa and the Horn of Africa by joining the partners' efforts to develop a new paradigm in responding to forced displacement crises through the involvement of development actors in eight countries: Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Sudan, Jordan, Lebanon, Iraq and Egypt.

The Partnership aims to help transform the way governments and other stakeholders, including the private sector, respond to forced displacement crises – and in particular: **(1)** to enhance the enabling environment for the socio-economic inclusion of forcibly displaced persons (to mitigate their plight during years of exile and to best prepare them for their return); **(2)** to enhance access to education and child protection for vulnerable children on the move; and **(3)** to strengthen the resilience of host communities through inclusive socio-economic development that also benefits forcibly displaced persons.

The Partnership provides a platform for demonstrating the benefits of innovative approaches that can enhance impact on the ground – including, but not limited to, by fostering synergies across the engagement of partnering organizations. The Partnership encourages the participating institutions to create and test innovative approaches to forced displacement leveraging their respective comparative advantages.

In this partnership, ILO brings significant expertise and experience in supporting enabling environments to underpin inclusive socio-economic growth and decent work, strengthen labour markets and promote access to improved working conditions and fundamental rights at work, including through the involvement of its tripartite national constituents. The ILO stimulates labour market demand and immediate job creation through employment-intensive investment, local economic and business development and promotion of specific value chains and market systems. It provides targeted support to labour market institutions, services and compliance and monitoring mechanisms that facilitate the integration of refugees into the labour market in accordance with its strong normative foundation of international labour standards. The ILO brings also expertise on technical and vocational education and training and on the recognition of prior learning for certifying the skills of refugees to better ensure access to the labour market, and methods for assessing labour market demand to provide the right skills to refugees needed by employers.

2.3. Prospects M&E Plan

PROSPECTS developed an Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan in order to ensure that the project is equipped with the tools and methodologies needed to systematically generate, capture, utilize and disseminate monitoring data and knowledge, with a view to strengthen the effectiveness, efficiency, impact of and awareness of PROSPECTS' interventions. This M&E plan also aims at ensuring a common vision about M&E aspirations across all six PROSPECTS partners, including the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands (MFA).

At the strategic level, the M&E Plan intends to:

- **Support management decisions** through guidance on how to perform the monitoring of indicators and internal reviews (including risk assessment) which will provide the Partnership with a clear picture of results achieved, results in progress, delays, challenges in programme implementation, and the reasons of their occurrence. This, in turn, will help the Partnership steer the Programme, foster learning and ensure that strategic decisions are informed by accurate and timely data.
- **Support communication of results and learning with internal and external stakeholders** in order to demonstrate the joint work and results that PROSPECTS has achieved. The Partnership aims to transparently inform the donor, government stakeholders, implementing partners and beneficiaries on results achieved, challenges, lessons, and innovative ways to improve collaboration regarding the challenges faced by Forcibly Displaced Person (FDPs) and their sustainable integration into host communities. The Partnership also aims to demonstrate the impact of the joint work across partners.

At the operational level, the M&E Plan aims at:

- **Providing a global and common results framework for the Partnership**, including performance indicators to which multi-annual country programmes (MACP) and the multi-annual global and regional programme (MAGRP) will contribute;
- **Facilitating the measurement** of progress of activities, interventions and results of the Programme;
- **Guiding the design of data collection sheets** to ease reporting for each PROSPECTS country as well as for the global and regional levels;
- **Facilitating the “roll up” of the common programmatic outputs and outcomes** around the eight countries that are a part of PROSPECTS, using a common set of performance measurement indicators and data collection tools;
- **Creating synergies across the PROSPECTS Learning Framework**, especially to report on learning deliverables and outcomes;
- **Providing a framework for global performance reporting to the Donor** (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands – MFA);
- **Guiding the development of country work plans** which will encompass all activities to operationalize M&E on the ground, efficiently monitor relevant indicators and support reporting functions; and
- **Serving as a reference tool for all M&E tasks and tools** PROSPECTS partners may require performing M&E activities effectively.

In order to achieve these objectives, the M&E Plan brings together a set of key components of the PROSPECTS M&E system, which include:

1. PROSPECTS result framework
2. Guidelines for Using PROSPECTS Indicators
3. Data Analysis Plan for PROSPECTS Indicators measured through the HH Survey
4. PROSPECTS Risk Register (Global/Regional level)-In preparation
5. Livelihood, Decent Work and Social Protection Household Survey
6. Business Development / Entrepreneurship Survey
7. PROSPECTS Progress Report Template
8. MACP Update Template
9. M&E Working Group Governance-In preparation
10. Opportunity Fund Requirements- In Preparation

The M&E Plan contains details on all these components and provides guidance on how to use them, for all stakeholders involved in the M&E cycle.

3. EVALUABILITY REVIEW OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

3.1. Objectives

The consultant conducted an Evaluability Review (ER) in order to evaluate the extent to which the project is ready for an evaluation as well as to identify changes required to improve its current monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system to demonstrate performance and generate learning.

Sub objectives include:

- Identifying strengths and weaknesses in the current M&E system;
- Documenting the extent to which PROSPECTS meets the ILO EVAL (Evaluation Unit) requirements in terms of M&E;
- Documenting practical methods for defining and evaluating impacts, taking into consideration the constraints and context of PROSPECTS;
- Providing recommendations on the way forward to improve the current M&E system and prepare the project for the upcoming mid-term evaluation.

3.2. Scope

The evaluability assessment looked at the current PROSPECTS M&E system that was set up to define, monitor and evaluate performance. This consultancy focused primarily on the extent to which the ILO has the proper tools and system in place to comply with ILO EVAL requirements, within the overall PROSPECTS partnership. The consultant did not assess the specific M&E systems of other partners. Nonetheless, the consultant assessed the global M&E tools used by the Partnership, wherever they apply to the ILO, such as the Global PROSPECTS M&E Plan.

The consultant collected relevant documentation and conducted a stock-taking exercise of the PROSPECTS M&E plan, system and tools used by the ILO. Under the scope of this assignment the consultant:

- Analysed PROSPECTS results framework, database, reporting tools and all other tools that are part of the PROSPECTS M&E system, to identify potential gaps.
- Reviewed the impact measurement strategy taken by the project to assess the effectiveness and impact of the project, and determine the soundness of the approach in terms of the future evaluability of project.
- Analysed the adequacy of planned monitoring and reporting activities.
- Identified potential issues in terms of data quality, adequacy, timeliness and usefulness that need to be addressed.
- Assessed the capacities, resources and management arrangements for implementing the M&E.
- Identified good practices and specific improvements to be made to the M&E system to enhance outcome and impact demonstration for the second half of the project, and overall readiness for evaluation exercises.

3.3. PROSPECTS' ER Dimensions, Questions and Quality assessment criteria

The consultant considered the ILO guidance notes on evaluability reviews to propose, in consultation with the ILO/PROSPECTS M&E Officer, the following dimensions, questions and quality assessment criteria for conducting the PROSPECTS evaluability assessment.

1. Situation Analysis	
Question	Quality assessment criteria
1.1. Has the context been properly analysed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pre-operational situation is well described (precise, relevant and up-to date information on socio-economic, political, cultural context etc.) The context analysis clearly identifies the problems the project seeks to address, their causes and why these issues need to be addressed.
1.2. Have the problems been appropriately identified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A problem statement has been formulated through a situation analysis, baseline study or other evidence Stakeholders have been identified The target population has been differentiated (e.g. gender, age, economic or ethnic groups)
2. Intervention Logic and assumptions	
Question	Quality assessment criteria
2.1. Does the project strategy logically match the problem analysis?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Project is clearly focused to address the need of target groups, and concentrates on dealing with root causes (causal logic established). There is a strong causal argument put forward between outputs and outcomes. The logic is based on sound assumptions and problem analysis. The intervention specifies its contribution to the long-term ILO priorities and outcomes The intervention specifies its linkage with DWCP objectives, CPOs, national strategies and the international development frameworks, including SDG targets.
2.2. Is the project's external logic clearly defined?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The intervention is linked to specific topics of the ILO's mandate (e.g. cross-cutting policy drivers) as well as pro-poor focus and inclusion of people with disabilities. The principal challenges, obstacles or limitations to achieving outcomes have been identified.
2.3. Are assumptions, risks and mitigations adequately identified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The risks associated with each strategy for achieving project outcomes have been identified. The risk mitigation measures are clearly defined, and are supported by theory, logic, empirical evidence and/or past ILO experience. Assumptions have explicitly been presented for the project logic to hold true.
3. Theory of Change	
Question	Quality assessment criteria
3.1. Is there a strategy or Theory of Change for dealing with the problem?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has a Theory of Change/intervention model that reflects the logical connection between the project's situation analysis and its objectives and outcomes. The intervention model explains the what, how, and why of the intended change process, specifying causal links, mechanisms for change and assumptions. The intervention concentrates on dealing with root causes (causal logic established) The intervention is relevant to the needs of the target group(s).
3.2. Is the Theory of Change clearly expressed and explicitly laid out in the narrative, and/or as a graph?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The causal links, mechanisms for change and assumptions between outputs and outcomes, as well as between outcomes and impact, are clearly and convincingly explained. The focus of the explanation is on the achievement of outcomes (rather than the delivery of activities, and the achievement of

- outputs).
- Outputs appear sufficient for the likely achievement of outcomes. The expected contribution of outcomes to impact is also clear.
- It is clear from the Theory of Change which actors are expected to benefit from capacity development and how capacity development is expected to lead to outcome results such as enhanced performance or changed behaviour etc.
- Key assumptions are identified.

4. Objectives/Outcomes	
Question	Quality assessment criteria
4.1. Is the Development Objective clearly defined?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the DO clearly defined as the primary condition the project will address? • Immediate objectives (IOs) clearly state the final situation to be achieved and the target groups that will benefit. • Are the IO's formulated as a desired state, not a process?
4.2. Is the immediate objective adequately formulated?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the IO's precisely and verifiably defined? • Are the IO's realistic (likely to occur once the project outcomes have been produced)? • Have (at least two) precise and reliable indicators been defined for each IO? • Do the IO's contribute significantly to the fulfilment of the DO • Outcomes clearly state the final situation to be achieved. • Have all essential outcomes necessary for achieving the IO's been included?
4.3. Are outcomes relevant, precise, and verifiable?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can each outcome be seen as a necessary means to achieving the related IO? • Are the outcomes precisely and verifiably defined? • Have (at least two) precise and reliable indicators been defined for each outcome?

5. Quality of indicators, baselines, targets and milestones	
Question	Quality assessment criteria
5.1. Are indicators appropriate proxies for the objectives/outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a logical fit between indicators and objectives/outcomes, meaning that the indicators measure the intended result. • Indicators include a clear definition of what is being measured. • Indicators measure intended results.
5.2. Are indicators of quality?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicators are SMART. • Indicators allow capturing gender equality, non-discrimination and the concerns of people with disabilities concerns.
5.3. Does Baseline information exist for each indicator?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A baseline exists for each indicator. • Baselines clearly describe the situation prior to the intervention. • Data is available to track the baseline. • Baselines permit comparison of results.
5.4. Are targets established for each indicator?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targets are specified for all indicators. • Targets were computed by adding amount of change desired to baselines.
5.5. Are milestones identified for each indicator?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Milestones provide a clear sense of the timeframe for achieving results. • Milestones are identified for all indicators. • Milestones provide a clear sense of progress made for achieving goals.

- 5.6. Can data be disaggregated to support performance reporting on areas of special interest for the ILO?
 - Indicators, baselines, targets and milestones will permit gender disaggregation and disaggregated data on other relevant concerns for the project.

6. M&E Plan	
Question	Quality assessment criteria
6.1. Does an M&E plan exist to conduct monitoring and evaluation in a systematic manner?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A monitoring and evaluation plan has been developed. • The Plan includes actions to achieve appropriate M&E results. • Information needs for performance reporting are well identified. • Roles and responsibilities for data collection, evaluation and reporting are specified. • Risks for the monitoring and evaluation system have been defined with identified mitigation strategies.
6.2. The M&E plan describes comprehensively and clearly the routine data collection, analysis and reporting processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The M&E Plan clearly defines the reporting flows from the countries to central/project level (including frequency of reporting and timeline at each level of reporting) for programmatic results. • The M&E plan describes comprehensively and clearly the data sources, collection and analysis processes and tools. • The M&E plan defines the frequency of data collection and responsibilities.
6.3. Are the data collection and analysis methods in the M&E plan adequate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A data gathering system to generate information on all indicators has been created and is operational. • Methods are technically and operationally feasible with appropriate levels of efforts and cost for value added by the information.
6.4. Do data collection methods support gender disaggregated monitoring and reporting?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient gender-focused problem and baseline analysis is in place. • Data collection methods can inform gender equality related matters. • Storage and analysis software/systems are developed. • The M&E plan clearly defines the reporting processes and tools.
6.5. Is analysis and use of data and the form and timing of outputs adequately specified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roles and responsibilities are clearly specified. • Type, form, frequency and circulation of reports/products are clearly stated. • The M&E Plan clearly defines the reporting flows from the countries to central/project level (including frequency of reporting and timeline at each level of reporting) for programmatic results. • The M&E plan makes clear reference to relevant tools and guidelines that will be used for implementing the plan.
6.6. Are there adequate tools and guidelines?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These include: registers, data collection and reporting forms that will be used from the national level to central level; tools/guidelines for data quality assurance, surveys, and program evaluation. • The M&E plan clearly outlines how M&E activities will be coordinated. • The planned feed-back loop of information on progress into project management decisions is outlined and information needs for performance reporting is well identified.
6.7. Are organizational arrangements for M&E effective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The M&E Plan is used for work planning, implementation and reporting practices. • Tripartite partners engage in M&E and use information.
6.8. Are there adequate human	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A member of project management has been designated to

resources for M&E?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • be responsible for M&E issues • The adequacy of M&E staffing at central and national levels is appropriate to implement the M&E plan. • Social partners and beneficiaries participate in monitoring and evaluation • Reporting mechanisms and products are identified with clear responsibilities • The monitoring and evaluation budget is adequate for the size and duration of the project • Resources have been identified and committed to ensure that predefined data will be collected and analysed
6.9. Are there adequate financial resources for M&E?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The M&E Plan conforms with ILO evaluation policy guidelines by including the appropriate amount of annual reviews, mid-term and final evaluations • The project has an adequate communication strategy for evaluation results • Evaluation results are intended to be communicated to constituents and stakeholders in a timely fashion
6.10. Does the M&E Plan propose the appropriate combination of annual reviews, mid-term and final evaluations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The evaluation budget is on a separate line of the project budget
6.11. Is there a plan for evaluation reporting and dissemination?	
6.12. Is the budget for the evaluation properly expressed in the project budget?	

7. Sustainability	
Question	Quality assessment criteria
7.1. Did the project plan for sustainability of results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has formulated an exit or sustainability strategy. • Plans exist to gradually and effectively hand over the project to national partners • The project has established a knowledge management strategy with national partners and civil society, as appropriate

4. METHODOLOGY

The evaluability review was conducted in September-October 2021 and set out to answer a list of specific questions organized according to the thematic criteria described above. These were agreed upon by the ILO M&E Officer and the consultant. The methodology for data collection and analysis was primarily qualitative in nature. The consultant addressed the questions using multiple sources of evidence, combining primary qualitative data with secondary quantitative data.

Primary data consisted of information the consultant collected directly from stakeholders about their first-hand experience with PROSPECTS. This data was collected through remote interviews and a debriefing session with the project team that involved direct interaction with the respondents. Collection of data was carried out in a confidential manner.

Secondary data is documentary evidence that has direct relevance for the purposes of the evaluability review and that has been produced by the ILO, PROSPECTS, or agencies for purposes other than those of the evaluability review.

Methods and techniques included:

a. Comprehensive document review

Based on the TORs and in consultation with PROSPECTS M&E Officer, the consultant conducted a *preliminary* document mapping of relevant documents that have been made available by PROSPECTS. The consultant reviewed a variety of documents related to the current evaluability review. Examples include:

- ILO's Policy Guidelines for Result Based Evaluation and relevant guidance notes.
- Global and Country Vision Notes
- Multi-Annual Global and Regional Programme (MAGRP)
- MAGRP Update
- 1 Multi-Annual Country Programme (MACP)-Egypt
- 1 MACP Update (Egypt)
- PROSPECTS. ILO Development Cooperation Project Document. Global and Regional Component
- PROSPECTS M&E Plan (including the revised Results Framework) and Annexes
- ILO/PROSPECTS bi-lateral progress reports
- PROSPECTS Internal Quarterly Reports
- Data collection sheets and data aggregation forms.
- PROSPECT Report-2021-09-28-Results

b. Checklist for the PROSPECTS' ER

The review of the dimensions, questions and quality assessment criteria for conducting the PROSPECTS evaluability assessment (as detailed in Section 3.3.) was based on the ER Checklist (in Annex 1).

c. Remote Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)

The evaluator conducted a series of remote Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) with the following key stakeholders:

Name	Position
Nick Grisewood	ILO/PROSPECTS Global Programme Manager
Fatma Kaya	ILO/PROSPECTS Programme Technical Officer
Louis-Pierre Michaud	ILO/PROSPECTS M&E Officer
Amir Obeid Faheem	ILO/PROSPECTS Country Programme Manager
Amira Eid Mohammed	ILO/PROSPECTS M&E Officer for Egypt
Meredith Byrne	ILO/PROSPECTS Technical Officer for Jordan, Lebanon and Iraq
Jean-François Klein	ILO HQ Senior Advisor – EMPLOYMENT
Ricardo Furman	Senior Evaluation Officer ROAF
Jopy Willems	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands – M&E focal point for PROSPECTS

d. Focused interviews/data collection

The consultant carried out additional *focussed* interviews/data collection with the ILO/PROSPECTS M&E Officer to address aspects that required further investigation/clarification.

e. Debriefing session

The consultant facilitated a remote session with the ILO/PROSPECTS Team, to jointly examine, contrast, and validate the key findings and recommendations of the ER.

5. PROSPECTS EVALUABILITY REVIEW FINDINGS

The PROSPECTS' evaluability review findings that follow hereafter are based on the evaluation of the dimensions, questions and quality assessment criteria detailed in Section 3.3. The project different dimensions were rated based on the following scale (as per ILO/EVAL guidelines).

- i. Unsatisfactory.
- ii. Satisfactory.
- iii. Highly Satisfactory.

The ratings are intended to raise attention to potential challenges. The consultant's findings have served to identify such challenges, as well as good practices, and they have been used to make recommendations for improvements.

Summary of Ratings

Dimension	Overall rating
Situation Analysis	Highly Satisfactory
Intervention Logic and assumptions	Satisfactory
Theory of Change	Unsatisfactory
Objectives/Outcomes	Highly Satisfactory
Quality of indicators, baselines, targets and milestones	Highly Satisfactory
M&E Plan	Highly Satisfactory
Sustainability	Unsatisfactory

5.1. Situation Analysis

Overall rating: the Situation Analysis is rated as **Highly Satisfactory**

Question	Rating
1.1. Has the context been properly analysed?	Highly satisfactory
1.2. Have the problems been appropriately identified?	Highly satisfactory

The PROSPECTS partnership programme was devised through a long process of consultation and negotiation between the five implementing agencies (IFC, ILO, UNHCR, UNICEF and the WB) and the MAF. The early conceptualization of the programme included the joint drafting of a *Global Vision Note for a new partnership* (GVN) that was followed by the elaboration of eight common *Country Vision Notes* (CVNs). These vision notes constitute the foundation for the Multi-Annual Global and Regional Programme (MAGRP) and the respective Multi-Annual Country Programmes (MACPs).

Consultations in an exploratory phase conducted by the implementing agencies at the global, regional and national levels provided an extensive and thorough level of technical input into the process of elaborating the GVN and the CVN; as well as the formulation of the MACPs and the MAGRP. This process provided sound and informed inputs to the context analysis and the identification of problems, stakeholders and target populations. Moreover, the MACPs and subsequently the MAGRP are updated on a yearly basis, which allows for the identification of contextual changes.

This exploratory phase allowed for access to/ use of ILO's technical expertise as well as the meaningful engagement of experts and constituents in the partnership approach in the different countries; and ensuring alignment with recently developed ILO policy frameworks, including ILO Recommendation No. 205 concerning Employment and Decent Work for Peace and Resilience, and

the ILO Guiding Principles on the access of refugees and other forcibly displaced persons to the labour market.

The ILO constituted programme teams to support the exploratory phase development, to implement activities and to ensure a more coordinated, coherent and integrated engagement by the ILO, leveraging the scale and scope of its policy departments and technical branches both in the field and HQ. Since the beginning of the exploratory phase, ILO field and HQ technical departments, the Bureau for Workers’ Activities (ACTRAV) and the Bureau for Employers' Activities (ACT/EMP) were involved in all stages of programme discussions and design.

While the PROSPECTS’ Situation Analysis is comprehensive and rigorous, the understanding of both the context/s in which the programme intervenes (Global, Regional, countries contexts) as well as the situation/the problems it intends to address, is hindered by the fact that contextual factors are referred to and detailed in 9 different, separated documents (1 MAGRP + 8 MACPs).

Looking at the upcoming ILO mid-term evaluation, this situation may encumber the capacity of an external reader (for example an evaluator/evaluation team) to properly grasp how the key contextual and situational factors have influenced the design and implementation of the project overall and in the respective national contexts.

Recommendations:

Addressed to: The PROSPECT’s Partners / The ILO (in view of the upcoming mid-term evaluation)

- 1) Develop a “programmatic” Situation Analysis document/section which includes a synthesized, yet sufficiently detailed description of the operational situation, context, problems, stakeholders and target populations at both the global and the country levels.

5.2. Intervention Logic and assumptions

Overall rating: the Intervention Logic and assumptions is rated as **Satisfactory**

Question	Rating
2.1. Does the project strategy logically match the problem analysis?	Highly Satisfactory
2.2. Is the project’s external logic clearly defined?	Unsatisfactory
2.3. Are assumptions, risks and mitigations adequately identified?	Satisfactory

- Internal logic

PROSPECTS’ overall internal logic is sound and based on a thorough problem/context analysis. The strategy (proposed interventions): *(1) to enhance the enabling environment for the socio-economic inclusion of forcibly displaced persons (to mitigate their plight during years of exile and to best prepare them for their return); (2) to enhance access to education and child protection for vulnerable children on the move; and (3) to strengthen the resilience of host communities through inclusive socio-economic development that also benefits forcibly displaced persons;* logically address the identified needs. Overall, there is a strong causal argument put forward between the project’s objectives and outcomes/outputs.

At the country levels, the MACPs are based on the overall PROSPECTS’ vision and strategy and adapted to the countries’ contexts. The Egypt MACP internal logic and strategy was found to be relevant and solidly grounded in a thorough situational analysis.

- External logic

Regarding the external logic, as outlined in the MAGRP, the PROSPECTS partnership is being implemented in the larger policy framework of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); the 2016 New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants; the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) and the Global Compact on Refugees (GCR).

With regard to the specification of the intervention's contribution and linkages with the ILO Programme and Budget (P&B) as well as the relevant Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) objectives and Country Programme Outcomes (CPOs), the ILO/PROSPECTS team elaborated a "Mapping of PROSPECTS Linked CPOs and Global Product". This includes a Power Point presentation that illustrates the alignment of PROSPECTS with the ILO P&B Outcomes as well as to the national DWCPs and their respective CPOs.

Further, the "ILO Development Cooperation Project Document, Global and Regional Component" document specifies the contribution of ILO/PROSPECTS to the ILO Programme & Budget 2020-21, and, more specifically, to the **Enabling Outcome A** "*Authoritative knowledge and high-impact partnerships for promoting decent work*" through the global product **GLO384** "*Strengthened ILO partnerships within the multilateral system for greater integration of the human-centred approach to the future of work into global debates and policies for achieving the SDGs*".

However, references (to the ILO P&B, the DWCPs and CPOs) related to the projects' external logic are scattered among several documents which obfuscates such logic and hinders its comprehension by external stakeholders.

In relation to specific topics of the ILO's mandate (e.g. cross-cutting policy drivers, pro-poor focus and inclusion of people with disabilities), the non-existence of an encompassing "ILO ProDoc" for all global component and eight countries must be recalled. All programming documents (MAGRP and MACPs) refer and were elaborated for the partnership. Thus, in such documents there are no sections specifically addressing the contribution of the partnership programme to the ILO's priorities, objectives, and cross-cutting policy drivers. Proper integration/ specification of how the ILO cross cutting policy drivers, the pro-poor focus, and the inclusion of people with disabilities are to be integrated in the project is yet to be developed conceptually.

At the countries' level, the Egypt MACP contains some references to relevant international and national development frameworks, though, in a superficial way.

- Assumptions, risks and mitigations

Following the UN Development Group definition, "**Assumptions** are the variables or factors that need to be in place for results to be achieved. **Risk** corresponds to a potential future event, fully or partially beyond control that may (negatively) affect the achievement of results"²

Assumptions explain what needs to be in place for the project to work, while risks are anticipated elements that can compromise its achievements. Risks are identified to support the development of mitigation measures, as part of the project's or programme's overall strategy³; while the assumptions are essential contextual conditions, external to the intervention, that are needed for expected results to be achieved according to the theory of change. Such conditions should be defined at the level of the different outcomes⁴.

² United Nations Development Group. Results-based Management Handbook. October 2011.

³ ILO/EVAL. Checklist 1.1: Elements of good project design. January 2021

⁴ Creating results-based theories of change in the ILO. Concepts and examples. ILO/ITC. June 2019

At the global level (MAGRP) PROSPECTS conducted a thorough risk assessment. In this regard, through a risk matrix, PROSPECTS identified “Contextual” and “Programmatic” Risks. Such risks were analysed in terms of their Impact on results and likelihood of occurrence. Mitigation measures to address such risks were proposed and Responsible partners were identified. However, the MAGRP did not include key assumptions in its design.

At the country level, the MACP examined (Egypt) does include a detailed risk analysis and a superficial description of the key assumptions.

Recommendations

Addressed to:

- ILO/PROSPECTS (in view of the upcoming mid-term evaluation)
- 2) Integrate in a single document the PROSPECTS’ alignment/contributions to:
 - ILO’s P&B and DWCPs
 - ILO cross-cutting policy drivers
 - ILO’s pro-poor focus and inclusion of people with disabilities
- The PROSPECT’s Partners / ILO/PROSPECTS (in view of the upcoming mid-term evaluation)
- 3) Further elaborate on the MACPs PROSPECTS’s alignment to National development frameworks.
- 4) Formulate/include key assumptions at the Outcomes/Outputs level in the PROSPECTS’ overall results framework.
- 5) Formulate/include key assumptions at the Outcomes/Outputs level in the respective MACPs RFs.

5.3. Theory of Change

Overall rating: the Theory of Change is rated as **Unsatisfactory**

Question	Rating
3.1. Is there a strategy or Theory of Change for dealing with the problem?	MACPs: Highly Satisfactory MAGRP: Unsatisfactory
3.2. Is the Theory of Change clearly expressed and explicitly laid out in the narrative, and/or as a graph?	MACPs: Highly Satisfactory MAGRP: Unsatisfactory

A *Theory of Change* can be defined as a results-based management approach to determine *why* and *how* a desired change takes place, under specific conditions, providing a clear description of how a change initiative is expected to work and a plausible explanation of its impact. Therefore, this approach requires a complete analysis and a description of the links between what the initiative *does* (activities, outputs), what it expects to *achieve* (outcomes, impact) and the *context* in which it operates⁵.

⁵ Source: Creating results-based theories of change in the ILO. ILO/ITC, 2019

Through document review, the consultant found that, on the one hand, the MAGRP document contains a “Theory of Change” *section*, however, while this section somehow summarizes the partnership programme logic, it can’t be stated that PROSPECTS developed a comprehensive Theory of Change (ToC). On the other hand, the (Egypt) MACP contains a well-structured and sound ToC. Additionally, while efforts were put into developing an institutional ToC only for ILO PROSPECTS, this does not fulfil the need to have a global PROSPECTS ToC involving all partners.

Recommendations:

Addressed to:

- The PROSPECT’s Partners

6) Develop a common, all-encompassing PROSPECTS partnership Theory of Change

Such a ToC should present how and why PROSPECTS can be expected to address the identified problem(s) and how it contributes to impact. It would explain how the PROSPECTS partners’ will be enabled to, and can be expected to actively respond to outputs, and initiate changes aimed at addressing the identified problem(s) and achieving the expected outcomes. Further, the partnership’s ToC should describe the expected series of necessary changes that will eventually contribute to the desired impact. Moreover, it should highlight the assumptions that illustrate the project’s dependence on the specific contexts in which PROSPECTS is being implemented, and where changes are expected to happen.

In addition, the ToC should highlight the importance of the different intervention contexts (global/regional/countries) and the interlinked nature of the proposed pillars as well as the proposed actions at each level. This includes describing how partner interventions complement each other, as well as the connections and interdependence among these actions, to contribute to the expected results/impacts.

Moreover, the ToC narrative should be supplemented with a graphic representation of the different “change pathways”, presenting the linkages between them; what PROSPECTS does (activities, outputs), what it expects to accomplish (outcomes) as well as the project’s contribution to long-term impact. It also should include the assumptions that explain external factors that occur or are expected to occur in the contexts in which PROSPECTS is being implemented.

- ILO/PROSPECTS (in view of the upcoming mid-term evaluation)

7) Update the specific “ILO ToC” already developed

While the ToRs of the upcoming mid-term evaluation haven’t been drafted yet, it would be reasonable to assume that the scope of such an evaluation would be limited to the ILO’s contributions to the partnership. It would be thus helpful for ILO/PROSPECTS to update the “ILO ToC” (narrative and visual) which encompasses specifically ILO’s contribution to the partnership. This would help delineating the overall evaluation reference framework, as well as contribute to better defining the scope of the evaluation.

5.4. Objectives/Outcomes

Overall rating: the quality of the Objectives/Outcomes is rated as **Highly Satisfactory**

Question	Rating
4.1. Is the Development Objective clearly defined?	Satisfactory
4.2. Is the immediate objective adequately formulated?	Highly Satisfactory
4.3. Are outcomes relevant, precise and verifiable?	Highly Satisfactory

- Development Objective (DO) formulation

PROSPECTS Development Objective, as reflected in the MAGRP, is as follows:

The Partnership aims to enhance the enabling environment for socio-economic inclusion of forcibly displaced persons and host communities, enhance access to protection, including social and child protection, education, and training for host and displaced populations, including children and young people, and strengthen the resilience of forcibly displaced persons and host communities through inclusive socio-economic development. In this context, the Partnership aims to develop an enhanced paradigm in responding to forced displacement crises through meaningful engagement of development and humanitarian actors, governments and, host communities as well as young people directly affected by forced displacement.

The evaluator observes that this DO was formulated in a rather complex and wordy manner, containing multiple development dimensions in one single statement. It may not be easy to understand for all stakeholders without a proper explanation. Nevertheless, upon analysis, it is considered to adequately reflect the main, global, long-term partnership objective.

- Intermediate Objectives (IOs) formulation

Mid-Term Outcomes (as referred to in the Results framework) –MTO- were formulated as follows:

- Pillar 1: Education
Outcome: *Increased number of forcibly displaced and host community people with quality education and training.*
- Pillar 2: Employment and Livelihoods
Outcome: *Increased number of forcibly displaced and host community members with enhanced livelihoods and/or employment in safe/decent work.*
- Pillar 3: Protection
Outcome: *Increased government protection, (social) protection, and inclusion for forcibly displaced and host communities.*
- Pillar 4: Partnership
Outcome: *Transformation in the way partners and other global/regional stakeholders respond to forced displacement crises.*

The evaluator considers that the MTOs corresponding to Pillars 1-3 are adequately, precisely and verifiably defined. They clearly state the final situation to be achieved and the target groups that will benefit (these are further detailed in the indicators) and are formulated as a desired state, not a process. The MTO under Pillar 2 is formulated in a rather imprecise way, although, its accompanying short-term outcomes contribute to clarify what the project intends to achieve under this Pillar.

- Short-term Outcomes formulation

Short-Term Outcomes (as referred to in the Results Framework) –STO- were found to be adequately and verifiably formulated. They clearly state the situation to be achieved; in principle, all essential STO necessary to achieving the related MTOs are included; and, each STO can be seen as a necessary means to achieving the related MTO.

Further, the Outcomes are likely to significantly contribute to the fulfilment of the DO

Recommendations

Addressed to:

- The PROSPECT’s Partners
- 8) To the extent possible replace *forcibly displaced and host community people* with *forcibly displaced persons and host community members*.
 - 9) Also, take into account that *employment in safe/decent work* should not be an “either or statement”. It should read *safe AND decent work*. Safety is an integrated part of ILO’s Decent Work (Security at work).

5.5. Quality of indicators, baselines, targets and milestones

Overall rating: the quality of indicators, baselines, targets and milestones is rated as **Highly Satisfactory**

Question	Rating
5.1. Are indicators appropriate proxies for the objectives/outcomes?	Highly Satisfactory
5.2. Are indicators of quality?	Highly Satisfactory
5.3. Does Baseline information exists for each indicator?	Highly Satisfactory
5.4. Are targets established for each indicator?	Highly Satisfactory
5.5. Are milestones identified for each indicator?	Highly Satisfactory
5.6. Can data be disaggregated to support performance reporting on areas of special interest for the ILO?	Highly Satisfactory

As explained in the PROSPECTS M&E Plan, PROSPECTS developed a Results Framework, which showcases all **key indicators for the Partnership** under their corresponding Pillar. However, it is sufficiently flexible and no outcome is mandatory, should it not fit the country context. Country Teams (CTs) can create custom indicators, relevant to their specific programs and activities, titled “**output indicators**” under the corresponding short-term and mid-term indicator.

Due to the fact that output indicators can be customized to each partner and each country, they are not included in the globally agreed upon results framework. These custom output indicators are mapped against globally agreed upon “**tracking indicators**” to enable aggregation across various and multiple output indicators. Tracking indicators are intentionally general in nature in order to encompass as many country-specific output indicators as possible.

Given the number and variations of output indicators across the eight countries and partners, 'Tracking Indicators' enable cumulative aggregation of output indicators across partners in each country, and across countries.

At the global level, PROSPECTS global teams are responsible for using the Results Framework as appropriate to their global and regional activities. Not all outcomes and indicators from the Results Framework are included at the global level. The global team can also create their own custom output indicators for global and regional specific activities.

The following table summarizes the description of indicators per MTO/STO/Outputs under Pillars 1-3

MTO/STO/Outputs	Indicator level	Description
Medium-term Outcomes	Medium-term Indicator	Agreed on by all partners as shown in the Results Framework. These are fixed and the language cannot be edited.
Short-term Outcomes	Short-term Indicators	
Outputs	Output Indicators	Customizable to each partner's program for each country
	Tracking Indicators	Agreed on by all partners as shown in the Results Framework. All output indicators (at country level) are mapped to tracking indicators (from the PROSPECTS results framework).

Also as explained in the PROSPECTS M&E Plan, while Pillars 1, 2, and 3 relate to direct impacts on PROSPECTS beneficiaries, Pillar 4 is a cross-cutting pillar that speaks to the added value of all five partners working together. The M&E approach of Pillar 4 differs from the three other pillars as it includes both qualitative and quantitative indicators and requires the CTs and the global team to report on both. All indicators in Pillar 4 are relevant at the country level, and, at the global level, partners report on specific indicators.

Through document review the evaluator found that:

- The indicators, baselines, targets and milestones were formulated in an adequate manner.
- Overall, and at the different levels, indicators are appropriate proxies for the objectives/outcomes. There is a logical fit between indicators and objectives/outcomes, meaning that the indicators measure the intended result.
- Indicators are of quality. The M&E Plan provides a clear definition of what is being measured. Indicators are SMART⁶ and adequate to measure the intended results. Moreover, indicators are disaggregated (when relevant) to allow to capture gender equality, non-discrimination, and the concerns of people with disabilities.
- Baseline information was collected for each indicator, which allows for defining the situation prior to the intervention; track progress; and compare results.

⁶ SMART: Specific; Measurable; Attainable; Realistic (or Relevant); and Time-bound (or Timely or Trackable). Source: Results-based Management in the ILO. A Guidebook. Version 2. June 2011

- Targets were established for each indicator. Overall, these targets were computed by adding the level or amount of change desired as compared to baselines. However, in some cases, the computing seems to be erroneous.

For example:

Indicator	Baseline (1)	Year 1 (2)	Year 2 (3)	Year 3 (4)	Year 4 (5)	End of project goal (6)	1+2+3+4+5
1.2a Number of people enrolled in formal or non-formal education and training	0	1.000	2.280	6.360	6.160	16.300	15.800
2.1a Number of job seekers using employment services	0	2.500	2.740	5.230	5.280	35.750	15.750

- Also, milestones were identified for each indicator, which provides a clear sense of the time frame for achieving results.
- Additionally, data can be disaggregated to support performance reporting on areas of special interest for the ILO. Indicators, baselines, targets and milestones allow (when relevant) gender disaggregation and disaggregated data on other relevant issues for the project.
- The set-up of targets, baselines and milestones was finalized in September 2021. Targets, baselines and milestones are reflected in the "PROSPECT Report_2021-09-28_Results".

Recommendations

Addressed to:

- The PROSPECT's Partners
- 10) Revise the targets computing in order to ensure that all indicators' target values correspond to the adding of baselines and milestones.
 - 11) The targets for the Global PROSPECTS (programmatic) Indicators could be added in a column in the RF (Annex 1 of the M&E Plan)
 - 12) Baselines, milestones and targets milestones by country could be added in an additional separate annex in the M&E Plan.

5.6. M&E Plan

Overall rating: the M&E Plan is rated as **Highly Satisfactory**

Question	Rating
6.1. Does an M&E plan exist to conduct monitoring and evaluation in a systematic manner?	Highly Satisfactory
6.2. The M&E plan describes comprehensively and clearly the routine data collection, analysis and reporting processes	Highly Satisfactory
6.3. Are the data collection and analysis methods in the M&E plan adequate?	Highly Satisfactory
6.4. Do data collection methods support gender disaggregated monitoring and reporting?	Highly Satisfactory
6.5. Is analysis and use of data and the form and timing of outputs adequately specified?	Highly Satisfactory
6.6. Are there adequate tools and guidelines?	Highly Satisfactory
6.7. Are organizational arrangements for M&E effective?	Highly Satisfactory
6.8. Are there adequate human resources for M&E?	Satisfactory
6.9. Are there adequate financial resources for M&E?	Highly Satisfactory
6.10. Does the ILO/PROSPECTS M&E Plan propose the appropriate combination of annual reviews, mid-term and final evaluations?	Satisfactory
6.11. Is there a plan for evaluation reporting and dissemination?	Unsatisfactory
6.12. Is the budget for the evaluation properly expressed in the project budget?	Satisfactory

The M&E Working Group coordinated by the ILO/PROSPECTS M&E Officer developed an M&E Plan for PROSPECTS. The overall objectives of this plan are, *to ensure that PROSPECTS is equipped with the tools and methodologies needed to systematically generate, capture, utilize and disseminate monitoring data and knowledge with a view to strengthen the effectiveness, efficiency, impact of and awareness of PROSPECTS' interventions. (...). This M&E plan also aims at ensuring a common vision about M&E aspirations across all six PROSPECTS partners, including the MFA*⁷.

Through document review and interviews with key stakeholders, the evaluator concluded that PROSPECTS M&E plan provides a detailed sound, high quality framework and tools to conduct monitoring and facilitate evaluation processes in a systematic manner.

- The plan includes actions to achieve appropriate M&E results. Information needs for performance reporting are well identified, and the roles and responsibilities for data collection, evaluation and reporting are specified in a satisfactory manner. However, Section 2, chapter 9. *Crosscutting Factors: Gender, Disability and Youth*; and Section 4, chapter 3. *Communication of Results*, have not been drafted yet. In addition, Annex 4: *PROSPECTS Risk Register (Global/Regional level)*; Annex 8: *M&E Working Group Governance*; and Annex 9: *Opportunity Fund Requirements* are yet to be developed.
- The M&E plan describes comprehensively and clearly the routine data collection, analysis and reporting processes. The Plan clearly defines the reporting flows that are expected from the countries/partners to central/project level (including the frequency of reporting and timelines at each level of reporting) for programmatic results.

⁷ Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. Improving prospects for forcibly displaced persons and host communities (PROSPECTS). July 2021

- Data collection and analysis methods in the M&E plan are adequately detailed. The plan comprehensively and clearly describes the data sources, collection and analysis processes and tools; it defines the frequency of data collection and allocation of the respective responsibilities. Data gathering system to generate information on all indicators were created and are operational. Moreover, methods should be technically and operationally feasible, if an appropriate allocation of human, technical and financial resources by the partners is made.
- The collection of gender-disaggregated data supports appropriate monitoring and reporting processes that, in turn, support an analysis of whether, and to what extent, the intended and achieved changes are gender responsive. In this regard, the problem- and baseline analysis was found to be sufficiently gender-focused, and as a result, data collection methods can reasonably be expected to inform processes, analysis, and decisions in a gender-responsive manner
- The analysis and use of data and the form and timing of outputs are adequately specified. Storage and analysis software/systems were developed; and the M&E plan clearly defines the reporting processes, tools, roles and responsibilities. In addition, the type, format, frequency and processes related to the circulation of reports/products are clearly stated. Additionally, the plan clearly defines the reporting flows from the countries/partners to central/project level (including frequency of reporting and timelines at each level of reporting) for programmatic results.
- The M&E plan contains adequate tools and guidelines. The plan includes clear references to relevant tools and guidelines that are to be used by individual partners/country teams for implementing the plan. These include: registers, data collection and reporting forms that will be used from the national level to central level; tools/guidelines for data quality assurance, surveys, and specific studies.
- Organizational arrangements for M&E are clearly defined. The M&E plan outlines how M&E activities are coordinated between partners/at the country level/at the global level; and the planned feed-back loop of information on progress into project management decisions and information needs for performance reporting is well identified. Also, reporting mechanisms and products are identified with clear responsibilities. The M&E Plan is used for work planning, implementation and reporting practices at the countries and partners' levels.

However, while the ILO M&E arrangements are clearly specified, the Plan does not reflect specific information on the partners' respective internal M&E provisions and how these relate to their accountability towards the donor, nor does it include relevant processes and needs; which, in turn, hinders a joint understanding and the potential identification of common areas for monitoring.

- Human resources for M&E (ILO team) are so far found to be adequate, although, as the project reaches cruise speed, implementation is likely to intensify, and resources may prove to be insufficient in the near future. An identified good practice is that a member of the HQ project team was hired to be responsible for M&E issues. Moreover, a Technical Officer for Jordan, Lebanon and Iraq (based in Amman) is the designated M&E focal point for these countries; and an M&E Officer was hired in Egypt. ILO also plans to reinforce the M&E staff in Kenya and Uganda. So far, Sudan (although there is strong commitment for M&E activities) and Ethiopia do not have ILO M&E staff.

Whether the partners' M&E staffing at central and national levels is appropriate to implement the M&E plan is unknown to the evaluator.

- ILO financial resources for M&E are considered to be adequate. The monitoring and evaluation budget is largely sufficient for the size and duration of the project, and ILO resources have been identified and committed to ensure the implementation of the ILO-related M&E activities. For that purpose the ILO elaborated a specific M&E budget with specific budget lines for the global and country components. However, the rationale behind how and why the resources were distributed among such components at the country level, in other words, what the funds are for, remains unclear for the ILO project management team.

The partners' M&E financial resources to implement the M&E plan are unknown to the evaluator.

- Regarding the evaluation framework, the M&E Plan superficially describes the purpose and overall objectives of mid-term and final evaluations. However, it does not propose any specific approach regarding such evaluations, as it seems that, except for the ILO, none of the partners has any specified internal or external (donor) requirements/obligations to conduct such evaluations.

The ILO in the "PROSPECTS ILO Development Cooperation Project Document. Global and Regional Component" document states that *given the budget size and time-period, the programme will undergo a mid-term independent evaluation in the first quarter of 2021 and a final independent evaluation in the first quarter of 2024.* Also, the document briefly discusses the purpose, management and budget for such evaluations.

Recommendations

Addressed to:

- The PROSPECT's Partners/M&E Working Group
- 13) Complete the drafting of the M&E Plan, specifically: *Crosscutting Factors: Gender, Disability and Youth* (Section 2, chapter 9); *Communication of Results* (Section 4, chapter 3); Annex 4: *PROSPECTS Risk Register (Global/Regional level)*; Annex 8: *M&E Working Group Governance*; and Annex 9: *Opportunity Fund Requirements*.
 - 14) Support and train PROSPECTS partners and country teams so they can: a) fully understand the partnership's Result Framework; b) PROSPECTS M&E Plan: indicators; data collection and analysis methods; roles and responsibilities; frequency of data collection; tools and guidelines; organizational arrangements for M&E; c) how to operationalize both the RF and the M&E Plan at country level.
 - 15) Develop joint M&E Plans at the country levels. Such plans should be aligned to the overall PROSPECTS M&E Plan, and, at the same time, they should be adapted to the countries' specificities, interventions and MACPs.
- ILO PROSPECTS/ILO HQ
- 16) Jointly discuss and clarify the M&E budget lines and make the necessary adjustments as relevant in order to ensure that the M&E financial resources are distributed adequately among countries/components.
 - 17) To the extent possible, ILO PROSPECTS should ensure that M&E officers/focal points are available in all countries, ideally as soon as possible and, in any case, before the (ILO) mid-term evaluation takes place.

18) Further develop and conceptualize the (ILO) evaluation framework and include it in the relevant M&E Plan section.

- The PROSPECTS’ Partners

19) The Partners’ contribution (e.g. participation in interviews; sharing information) in the ILO’s mid-term evaluation will be important in order to provide “a partnership view” to the evaluation.

20) The Partners are encouraged to agree on whether PROSPECTS will undertake joint evaluations or only Agency-led evaluations.

5.7. Sustainability

Overall rating: Sustainability is rated as **Unsatisfactory**

Question	Rating
7.1. Did the project plan for sustainability of results?	Unsatisfactory

Sustainability and Exit Strategy *sections* have been developed in both the MAGRP and the MACPs. However, it can’t be considered that PROSPECTS planned for sustainability of results.

A key question here is *what is a reasonable timeline?* In this regard, what is debatable is whether the sustainability plan could have been designed at the project’s inception or halfway through the project implementation, as the PROSPECTS partners only knew halfway through what could be realistically achieved and it might not have been possible to design a detailed sustainability and exit plan earlier on in the lifecycle of the project. However, *now* that the project is in stage of implementation, it seems to be the right moment to initiate the joint development of such a strategy.

There is yet ample room for improvement and further clarification about the specific strategic choices that will need to be made by project management and project partners, as to how to contribute towards the overall sustainability of outcomes and results, as well as to how to gradually and effectively hand over the project to national partners. There is also plenty of room for the ILO to reflect on what specifically the organization wants to achieve, in terms of sustainability, with regard to the contexts in which refugees/forcibly displaced persons live and work.

Recommendations

Addressed to:

- The PROSPECTS’ Partners

21) PROSPECTS must develop a systematic and detailed Sustainability Plan. The plan ought to take into account the results achieved thus far, as well as the expected challenges and the status of the “enabling environment” at the global/regional/country levels, including institutional capacities, available resources and political commitment. It should also clearly identify underlying assumptions, risks and mitigation strategies.

It is important that the PROSPECTS Partners reflect, define and agree on “*what we want to achieve together*” as well as on “*what is next*” or the “*what we need to put in place*” in order to achieve the expected results. In this regards, the plan should describe what is expected to be sustained with a well-defined timeline. This includes specific project interventions/partners and

their expected results, systems or procedures that are to be developed and implemented during project implementation; and an identification of which specific institutions will be expected to be responsible for sustaining such results; as well as an explanation as to where the financial and human resources that are required to ensure sustainability will be expected to be coming from.

Also important in this regard as part of the sustainability plan, is the development of a clear *exit strategy*, which identifies the gradual transfer of specific responsibilities from PROSPECTS to national/local institutions.

- The ILO HQ/PROSPECTS

22) Internally, the ILO should reflect on the “*what we want to achieve*” with regard to the enabling contexts for refugees and displaced persons to live and work and also to decide as an organization the “*what is next*” or the “*what we specifically need to achieve*”.

Moreover, the ILO should systematize the knowledge related to the achievement of results by the project, obstacles and challenges, as well as lessons learned and good practices generated through the PROSPECTS project. The ILO could then use and disseminate such knowledge within the organization for it to benefit other countries, regions, situations in which the ILO may implement similar or comparable interventions with refugees, forcibly displaced persons and host community members.

8. SOME CONSIDERATIONS ON THE ILO/PROSPECTS MID-TERM EVALUATION

ILO contemplates evaluation as an integral part of the implementation of technical cooperation activities. The ILO/PROSPECTS project will go through two evaluations, a mid-term evaluation and a final independent evaluation. The mid-term evaluation will be carried-out in accordance with the project work-plan and in line with the ILO Evaluation Policy (November 2005) and ILO policy guidelines for evaluation¹ (2020, 4th edition) which provide for systematic evaluation of programmes and projects in order to improve quality, accountability, transparency of the ILO's work, strengthen the decision-making process and support constituents in promoting decent work. The mid-term evaluation will likely be conducted by the second quarter of 2022.

Overall, PROSPECTS evaluability review findings indicate that ILO/PROSPECTS is deemed evaluable and should, with some adjustments (please refer to the Recommendations sections above) be ready to undertake the upcoming Mid-Term evaluation. In addition, through document review and interviews with key informants, the consultant identified some challenges that may negatively affect the ILO/PROSPECTS Mid-term evaluation process. Such challenges are listed below and remedial measures are proposed at the end of this section in the form of recommendations.

- PROSPECTS complex architecture

PROSPECTS is jointly implemented by ILO, UNICEF, UNHCR, IFC and the World Bank. Each project partner implements activities under one or several of the three programmatic pillars (Pillars 1, 2 and 3) in order to achieve the expected programme and country-level results in the eight countries where the Partnership operates: Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Egypt, Sudan, Ethiopia, Kenya and Uganda. Additionally, the partners jointly develop regional and global activities under Pillar 4, which seeks to transform the way that the partners work with each other and influence other humanitarian and development actors working on forced displacement.

In this regard, a key feature of PROSPECTS was the development of strategic programme documents for the Partnership at two levels: eight Multi-Annual Country Programmes (MACPs) and Multi-Annual Global and Regional Programme (MAGRP)

The MACPs documents form the cornerstone of PROSPECTS planning process, showcasing expected results, activities, and budget at the country level. The MAGRP, which was formulated on the basis of the MACPs, is similar to the country programmes, but specific to global and regional activities, and jointly written by all partners at the global HQ level.

Further, the eight MACPs (one per country) are updated on a yearly basis by the relevant Country Teams. In addition, the MAGRP is updated every year, about a month after the MACPs, in order to reflect any contextual changes, lessons learned, joint policy work, as well as any adaptations to the budget table, the activity plan, and the DCS.

Additionally, the revised and agreed-on Results Framework, along with key tools, data, and information on the project's progress is contained in the M&E Plan.

This complex architecture and the fact that key information is scattered among many different documents may hinder the ability of an evaluator/evaluation team to properly understand the PROSPECTS Partnership Programme as well as the ILO's role, interventions and responsibilities in the project (at the global, regional and countries' levels). Moreover, the evaluator/evaluation team may find it difficult to rapidly gain an understanding of the linkages and complementarities/dependence on each partner's interventions at all levels.

- Lack of an ILO Project Document that serves as reference for the evaluation

As previously explained, all PROSPECTS programming documents (MAGRP and MACPs) refer to, and were elaborated for the partnership, thus, the ILO did not elaborate a unique “ProDoc” which will prevent the upcoming Mid-term evaluation from having access to an ILO-specific Project Document that serves as a clear reference for the evaluation.

Following the ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation, the reference point for evaluation should be the relevant strategy, programme or project document (PRODOC). Such a document should provide the background and rationale of the programme/project, including its planned activities, outputs, objectives, outcomes, corresponding outcome indicators and assumptions. In this regard, the ILO underlines that *an appropriate programme/project design and a well written programming document are important for setting a strong foundation for an evaluation.*

The ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation also specify that Programming documents should specify links between different levels of results frameworks such as Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs), Programme and Budget (P&B) outcomes, Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and projects. These should also be considered integral to the rationale and design of an evaluation. Additionally, ILO’s guidelines define that the ILO Programmes and strategies are to be based on an intervention logic, or a theory of change often expressed in a log frame (Results Framework).

- Defining the scope of the ILO/PROSPECTS Mid-term evaluation

Usually, the main purpose of an ILO project mid-term independent evaluation is to provide an external assessment of the progress through an analysis of its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability orientations.

However, in this case, the mid-term evaluation will not address a “usual” ILO Project, but a rather complex *Partnership*. While the mid-term ILO/PROSPECTS evaluation must focus on the ILO components of the PROSPECTS partnership project, it also has to consider its linkages with the implementation of the project by the project partners at the global and regional levels, in addition to implementation in the eight target countries (Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda, Sudan, Jordan, Lebanon, Iraq and Egypt). In terms of programmatic coverage, the ILO’s mid-term evaluation also has to be able to address ILO’s contribution to the achievement of the four immediate outcomes corresponding to the four Partnership Pillars.

Recommendations

Addressed to:

- The ILO/PROSPECTS Team

23) The ILO/PROSPECTS team, with the contribution of the project partners must carefully and clearly define the framework and the scope of the ILO/PROSPECTS Mid-term evaluation. This is, the timeframe of the evaluation; its geographical and/or thematic coverage; the target groups to be considered; the ILO interventions at the different levels global/regional/countries, as well as the interactions and linkages with the project partners at these different levels. Additionally, it should specify which aspects of the intervention will be or not be covered in the evaluation.

9. LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES

9.1. Lessons Learned

1. While the project's pillars are interlinked, the coordination among partners may prove challenging

The 4 pillars that provide the framework for PROSPECTS are interlinked and complementary. This implies that the five organisations are required to coordinate closely and to collaborate, to ensure coherence and synergies. Regarding monitoring, this means that they collect, analyse and share information related to the implementation of their respective activities, as well as to the achieved outputs and expected outcomes.

However, the collaboration among the ILO, UNICEF, UNHCR, IFC and the World Bank in the implementation and monitoring of the project is complex and at times challenging. The five agencies are guided by their respective mandates, relevant instruments and tools, structure, field presence, and expertise in working with forcibly displaced persons. Moreover, each organization has a project implementing team and is fully responsible for its own activities, reporting bilaterally to the donor.

2. A sound M&E framework to be effective needs shared ownership

The M&E Plan and RF provide for a very sound framework that would allow assessing the common programmatic outputs and outcomes around the eight countries that are a part of PROSPECTS, using a common set of performance measurement indicators and data collection tools.

The designed processes and systems are expected to be effective, sufficient and reliable for decision making; work planning; implementation; and sharing of results; as well as to make available a framework for global performance reporting to the Donor (MFA); on the condition that:

- There are shared monitoring arrangements for PROSPECTS in use across the ILO/PROSPECTS Staff, as well as across the Project partners.
- Adequate workflows are in place to ensure information and monitoring data from the ILO Project teams in each country is shared with the ILO team at HQ level as well as with PROSPECTS M&E Officer (ILO). Likewise, such processes allow for information and monitoring data to adequately flow from the PROSPECTS partners to the M&E working group/M&E Officer.
- The ILO/PROSPECTS M&E team and the PROSPECTS partners, are sufficiently staffed, and adequate technical and financial resources are dedicated to carry out monitoring and evaluation.

3. Data Quality Assurance (DQA) processes would help the partnership to assess "how good the data is".

PROSPECTS' M&E Plan facilitates the aggregation of the common programmatic outputs and outcomes across the eight countries and five partners that are a part of PROSPECTS, using a common set of performance measurement indicators and data collection tools. However, what appear yet to be currently absent are processes to ensure the quality of the data that is collected.

DQA is a process for defining the appropriate dimensions and criteria of data quality, and procedures to ensure that data quality criteria are met over time. It involves a process of data

profiling to unearth inconsistencies, outliers, missing data interpolation and other anomalies in the data⁸.

Conducting DQA periodic reviews would help the partners, the donor and the implementing agencies (at the country level) to assess "how good the data is". Such reviews would also provide an opportunity for capacity-building of implementing partners. Appropriate quality assurance processes should be created and implemented in close collaboration between partners

4. Effective M&E processes would demand joint reporting

Effective M&E processes provide useful information to inform programme managers about planned and actual developments. To be meaningful, monitoring should go beyond the mandatory reports that are required by the donor. However, the PROSPECTS Partners' monitoring is currently implemented with an emphasis on (bilaterally) reporting to the MFA. In order to meet the information needs of the project and the project's stakeholders, the focus should be placed on their needs.

The key questions to address in monitoring and evaluation reporting are *whether the planned results were indeed achieved and why*; and *what/which results can be attributed to the project*. In this regard, there is a need to better align the current monitoring and reporting system, so as to be able to properly answer such questions. The elaboration of "joint progress reports" at country and programmatic levels for instance could significantly contribute to doing this.

9.2. Good Practices

1. Development of a sound M&E Plan

PROSPECTS M&E plan describes/includes comprehensively and clearly the data collection and analysis methods; the frequency of data collection; relevant and useful tools and guidelines; as well as organizational arrangements for M&E. Roles and distribution of responsibilities for data collection, evaluation and reporting are clearly specified, both within ILO/PROSPECTS and the Project Partners. The Results Framework, as developed in the M&E Plan, provides a global and common results framework for the Partnership.

2. ILO's commitment to PROSPECTS management, monitoring and evaluation.

The ILO has shown a high level of commitment to PROSPECTS management, monitoring and evaluation. ILO/PROSPECTS is well anchored within the Organization's technical cooperation portfolio and it's managed by a rather large full-time dedicated staff. The PROSPECTS Global Programme Team consists of a Global Programme Manager, supported by a Programme Technical Officer, M&E Officer, Communications Officer, and a Finance and Programme Support Assistant (FCO), all based in ILO HQ, Geneva. At the countries level, the ILO is staffed with a Country Programme Manager and an M&E Officer in Egypt as well as a with a Technical Officer for Jordan, Lebanon and Iraq. The ILO is also in the process of selecting M&E staff in Kenya and Uganda. Moreover, four technical specialists also work with the global team and country teams. These specialists provide technical backstopping to ILO PROSPECTS country teams on issues such as social health protection, employment and skills, enterprise development and employment-intensive investment programmes (EIIP). In addition, several ILO Branches and Specialists at HQ provide technical support the ILO/PROSPECTS interventions when needed.

⁸ Data Quality Assessment Handbook. United Nations Global Marketplace (UNGM). Undated

Annex 1: Terms of Reference



PROSPECTS ER TOR

Annex 2: ER Work-Plan



ER WORKPLAN

Annex 3: ER Checklist

1. Situation Analysis		
Question	Quality assessment criteria	Rating
1.1. Has the context been properly analysed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pre-operational situation is well described (precise, relevant and up-to date information on socio-economic, political, cultural context etc.) The context analysis clearly identifies the problems the project seeks to address, their causes and why these issues need to be addressed. 	Highly satisfactory
1.2. Have the problems been appropriately identified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A problem statement has been formulated through a situation analysis, baseline study or other evidence Stakeholders have been identified The target population has been differentiated (e.g. gender, age, economic or ethnic groups) 	Highly satisfactory
2. Intervention Logic and assumptions		
Question	Quality assessment criteria	Rating
2.1. Does the project strategy logically match the problem analysis?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Project is clearly focused to address the need of target groups, and concentrates on dealing with root causes (causal logic established). There is a strong causal argument put forward between outputs and outcomes. The logic is based on sound assumptions and problem analysis. 	Highly Satisfactory
2.2. Is the project's external logic clearly defined?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The intervention specifies its contribution to the long-term ILO priorities and outcomes The intervention specifies its linkage with DWCP objectives, CPOs, national strategies and the international development frameworks, including SDG targets. The intervention is linked to specific topics of the ILO's mandate (e.g. cross-cutting policy drivers) as well as pro-poor focus and inclusion of people with disabilities 	Unsatisfactory
2.3. Are assumptions, risks and mitigations adequately identified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The principal challenges, obstacles or limitations to achieving outcomes have been identified The risks associated with each strategy for achieving project outcomes have been identified The risk mitigation measures are clearly defined, and are supported by theory, logic, empirical evidence and/or past ILO experience Assumptions have explicitly been presented for the project logic to hold true 	Satisfactory

3. Theory of Change		
Question	Quality assessment criteria	Rating
3.1. Is there a strategy or Theory of Change for dealing with the problem?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has a Theory of Change/intervention model that reflects the logical connection between the project's situation analysis and its objectives and outcomes The intervention model explains the what, how and why of the intended change process, specifying causal links, mechanisms for change and assumptions. The intervention concentrates on dealing with root causes (causal logic established) The intervention is relevant to the needs of the target group(s) 	<p>MACPs: Highly Satisfactory</p> <p>MAGRP: Unsatisfactory</p>
3.2. Is the Theory of Change clearly expressed and explicitly laid in the narrative, and/or as a graph?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The causal links, mechanisms for change and assumptions between outputs and outcomes as well as between outcomes and impact are clearly and convincingly explained. The focus of the explanation is on the achievement of outcomes (rather than the delivery of activities, and the achievement of outputs). Outputs appear sufficient for the likely achievement of outcomes. The expected contribution of outcomes to impact is also clear. It is clear from the Theory of Change which actors are expected to benefit from capacity development and how capacity development is expected to lead to outcome results such as enhanced performance or changed behaviour etc. Key assumptions are identified 	<p>MACPs: Highly Satisfactory</p> <p>MAGRP: Unsatisfactory</p>

4. Objectives/Outcomes		
Question	Quality assessment criteria	Rating
4.1. Is the Development Objective clearly defined	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the DO clearly defined as the primary condition the project will address? 	Satisfactory
4.2. Is the immediate objective adequately formulated?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Immediate objectives (IOs) clearly state the final situation to be achieved and the target groups that will benefit Are the IO's formulated as a desired state, not a process? Are the IO's precisely and verifiably defined? Are the IO's realistic (likely to occur once the project outcomes have been produced)? Have (at least two) precise and reliable indicators been defined for each IO? Do the IO's contribute significantly to the fulfillment of the DO 	Highly Satisfactory
4.3. Are outcomes relevant, precise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcomes clearly state the final situation to be achieved. 	Highly Satisfactory

and verifiable?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have all essential outcomes necessary for achieving the IO's been included? • Can each outcome be seen as a necessary means to achieving the related IO? • Are the outcomes precisely and verifiably defined? • Have (at least two) precise and reliable indicators been defined for each outcome? 	
-----------------	---	--

5. Quality of indicators, baselines, targets and milestones		
Question	Quality assessment criteria	Rating
5.1. Are indicators appropriate proxies for the objectives/outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a logical fit between indicators and objectives/outcomes, meaning that the indicators measure the intended result. 	Highly Satisfactory
5.2. Are indicators of quality?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicators include a clear definition of what is being measured • Indicators measured intended results • Indicators are SMART • Indicators allow to capture gender equality, non-discrimination and the concerns of people with disabilities concerns 	Highly Satisfactory
5.3. Does Baseline information exist for each indicator?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A baseline exists for each indicator • Baselines clearly describe the situation prior to the intervention • Data is available to track the baseline • Baselines permit comparison of results 	Highly Satisfactory
5.4. Are targets established for each indicator?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Targets are specified for all indicators • Targets were computed by adding amount of change desired to baselines 	Highly Satisfactory
5.5. Are milestones identified for each indicator?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Milestones provide a clear sense of the time frame for achieving results • Milestones are identified for all indicators • Milestones provide a clear sense of progress made for achieving goals 	Highly Satisfactory
5.6. Can data be disaggregated to support performance reporting on areas of special interest for the ILO?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicators, baselines, targets and milestones will permit gender disaggregation and disaggregated data on other relevant concerns for the project 	Highly Satisfactory

6. M&E Plan		
Question	Quality assessment criteria	Rating
6.1. Does an M&E plan exist to conduct monitoring and evaluation in a systematic manner?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A monitoring and evaluation plan has been developed The Plan includes actions to achieve appropriate M&E results Information needs for performance reporting are well identified Roles and responsibilities for data collection, evaluation and reporting are specified Risks for the monitoring and evaluation system have been defined with identified mitigation strategies 	Highly Satisfactory
6.2. The M&E plan describes comprehensively and clearly the routine data collection, analysis and reporting processes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The M&E Plan clearly defines the reporting flows from the countries to central/project level (including frequency of reporting and timeline at each level of reporting) for programmatic results. 	Highly Satisfactory
6.3. Are the data collection and analysis methods in the M&E plan adequate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The M&E plan describes comprehensively and clearly the data sources, collection and analysis processes and tools. The M&E plan defines the frequency of data collection and responsibilities. A data gathering system to generate information on all indicators has been created and is operational. Methods are technically and operationally feasible with appropriate levels of efforts and cost for value added by the information. 	Highly Satisfactory
6.4. Do data collection methods support gender disaggregated monitoring and reporting?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient gender-focused problem and baseline analysis is in place. Data collection methods can inform gender equality related matters 	Highly Satisfactory
6.5. Is analysis and use of data and the form and timing of outputs adequately specified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Storage and analysis software/systems are developed. The M&E plan clearly defines the reporting processes and tools Roles and responsibilities are clearly specified Type, form, frequency and circulation of reports/products are clearly stated. The M&E Plan clearly defines the reporting flows from the countries to central/project level (including frequency of reporting and timeline at each level of reporting) for programmatic results. 	Highly Satisfactory
6.6. Are there adequate tools and guidelines?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The M&E plan makes clear reference to relevant tools and guidelines that will be used for implementing the plan. These include: registers, data collection and reporting forms that will be used from the national level to central level; tools/guidelines 	Highly Satisfactory

		for data quality assurance, surveys, and program evaluation.	
6.7.	Are organizational arrangements for M&E effective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The M&E plan clearly outlines how M&E activities will be coordinated The planned feed-back loop of information on progress into project management decisions is outlined and information needs for performance reporting is well identified. The M&E Plan is used for work planning, implementation and reporting practices. Tripartite partners engage in M&E and use information 	Highly Satisfactory
6.8.	Are there adequate human resources for M&E?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A member of project management has been designated to be responsible for M&E issues The adequacy of M&E staffing at central and national levels is appropriate to implement the M&E plan. Social partners and beneficiaries participate in monitoring and evaluation Reporting mechanisms and products are identified with clear responsibilities 	Satisfactory
6.9.	Are there adequate financial resources for M&E?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The monitoring and evaluation budget is adequate for the size and duration of the project Resources have been identified and committed to ensure that predefined data will be collected and analysed 	Highly Satisfactory
6.10.	Does the M&E Plan propose the appropriate combination of annual reviews, mid-term and final evaluations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The M&E Plan conforms with ILO evaluation policy guidelines by including the appropriate amount of annual reviews, mid-term and final evaluations 	Satisfactory
6.11.	Is there a plan for evaluation reporting and dissemination?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project has an adequate communication strategy for evaluation results Evaluation results are intended to be communicated to constituents and stakeholders in a timely fashion 	Unsatisfactory
6.12.	Is the budget for the evaluation properly expressed in the project budget?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The evaluation budget is on a separate line of the project budget 	Satisfactory

7. Sustainability		
Question	Quality assessment criteria	Rating
7.1. Did the project plan for sustainability of results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project formulated an exit or sustainability strategy. Plans exist to gradually and effectively hand over the project to national partners The project established a knowledge management strategy with national partners and civil society, as appropriate 	Unsatisfactory