Evaluability Assessment Report

Skills 21 Project
International Labour Organization (ILO)

Prepared by

Bhabatosh Nath
Consultant, Development Programme.
Executive Director, RIDS.

February 2018

Table of Contents

Acronyms

ADB	Asian Development Bank
BANBEIS	Bangladesh Bureau of Educational Information and Statistics
BBS	Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics
BEF	Bangladesh Employers' Federation
BIBB	Bundesinstitut für Berufsbildung - Germany
BMET	Bureau of Manpower, Employment and Training
BTEB	Bangladesh Technical Education Board
CEDEFOP	Centre for the Development of Vocational Training
CHT	Chittagong Hill Tracts
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CSE	Centres of Skills Excellence
CTA	Chief Technical Adviser
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
DTE	Directorate of Technical Education
EA	Evaluability Assessment
EfVET	European Forum for TVET
ELCG	Education Local Consultative Group
ETF	European Training Foundation
EU	European Union
GOB	Government of Bangladesh
HCDP21	Human Capital Development Programme 21
ILO	International Labour Organization
ISC	Industry Skills Council
MoCHTA	Ministry of Chittagong Hill Tracts Affairs
MoE	Ministry of Education
MOEWOE	Ministry of Expatriates' Welfare and Overseas Employment
MoLE	Ministry of Labour and Employment
MoSW	Ministry of Social Welfare
MoWC	Ministry of Women and Child Affairs
MoYS	Ministry of Youth and Sports
MRA	Mutual Recognition Agreement
NQF	National Qualifications Framework
NSDA	National Skills Development Authority
NSDP	National Skills Development Policy
NSDS	National Skills Development System
NPO	National Programme Officer
PMCC	Project Monitoring and Coordination Committee
PSC	Project Steering Committee
SDG	Sustainability Development Goal
SDWG	Skills Development Working Group
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Attainable Realistic and Time-bound
TAPP	Technical Appraisal of Project Pro-forma
TMED	Technical and Madrasah Education Department
TTTC	Technical Teachers' Training Institute
TVET	Technical and Vocational Education and Training
UNESCO	United Nations Education, Science and Cultural Organization
UNEVOC	United Nations Education, Science and Vocational Education
VOCTECH	Vocational and Technical Education and Training
VTTI	Vocational Teachers Training Institute

1. Skills 21 Project Brief

ILO in Bangladesh has been implementing **'Skills 21 Project' with the purpose of** empowering citizens for inclusive and sustainable growth. This project, funded by the European Union (EU), will build on the achievements of earlier EU/ILO initiatives to modernize the Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVET) system in Bangladesh. The Goal (Development Objectives) of the project is defined as: "Increased productivity and better employment opportunities through an environmentally conscious, inclusive, demand-driven, and interlinked skills development system responding to the needs of the labour market".

The earlier EU-funded TVET Reform Project which ended in December 2015 has successfully established the foundation for the new, demand-driven, competency-based system for skills development in Bangladesh including reforms in the formal TVET system – a reform initiative that has been widely acknowledged and rated as highly successful by the professional community in the region as well as at global level. Skills 21 Project will strengthen the National Skills Development System (NSDS) by continuing earlier reforms and developing a National Qualifications Framework (NQF). It will work with the Government to improve the governance aspects within the skills development sector, and directly with TVET institutions.

The duration of project has been fixed as January 2017 to December 2020. As per Skills 21 project document, one of the preconditions was to conduct an Evaluability Assessment with the help of an individual consultant in the first year of the project. The objective of the assignment was to conduct the Assessment to determine the overall readiness of a project or programme to be evaluated. The study took place during the months of January and February of 2018. This is to be mentioned that during review of project documents it was found that the implementation of interventions under three outcomes was supposed to be started by the time of this Evaluability Assessment. However, it was delayed and could not get the full extent till date (writing of the report) because of delay in the approval of TAPP (Technical Appraisal of the Project Pro-forma) by the concerned ministry. The project is awaiting the TAPP approval. It is the lack of this that has hampered the launch of the project.

2. Evaluability Assessment: Definition, Scopes and Methodology

An Evaluability Assessment (EA) is a systematic process that helps to identify whether a programme is in a condition to be evaluated, and whether an evaluation is justified, feasible and likely to provide useful information. Its purpose is not only to conclude if the evaluation is to be undertaken or not, but also to prepare the programme to generate all the necessary conditions to be evaluated.

Evaluability Assessment provides recommendations on how the programme could be improved to make it ready for an evaluation, or it reaches conclusion that the programme is not ready for an evaluation. Frequently, the shortcomings of the programme are connected to three major areas: programme design; availability of relevant information; and conduciveness of the context. The evaluability checklist generally indicates what conditions should be met for an effective evaluation. These conditions usually constitute the key parameters for an evaluability assessment.

2.1 Scopes

As per the Terms of Reference (ToR) provided by ILO for evaluability assessment, the EA for the Skills 21 project would explore its evaluability and provide a comprehensive and evidence-based answer, an overarching question, namely, *to what extent does the Skills 21 project have the technical and strategic elements in place to manage effectively towards results, and to credibly demonstrate such results in future evaluations?*

Within this context, the assessment has determined the evaluability of the project as currently represented through its Project Document signed in Dec 2016. In doing so, it has followed the scope:

1. Confirm or adjust expectations about the scope of the project, project results, and what is realistically achievable (changes in indicators: both output and outcome level) within the remaining project timeframe
2. Recommend sharpening the project's logic as embodied in the logical framework
3. Recommend sharpening the definitions of indicators
4. Identify the information and data requirements to track changes\ to measure progress against the indicators
5. Identify the potential sources of information for M&E activities
6. Identify likely gaps in information and suggest ways in which those gaps may be filled
7. Recommend concrete steps to improve project's Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) activities: Indicators and Methodology for Baseline, Tracer Study/Impact Assessment
8. Review the management aspects of the project by assessing management structure and capacities, with particular attention to the approach, methods and capacities for monitoring and evaluation; and recommend remedial action. In this way the EA will help to set the project on the right path by building shared understanding of the project among key stakeholders.
9. Facilitate reflection and learning among project staff and key stakeholders, leading to increase project coherence and improved management.

2.2 Methodology

The study has given special focus to which a programme can be evaluated in a reliable and credible fashion. An EA calls for the early review of a project or Programme in order to ascertain whether its objectives, indicators are adequately defined and its results are verifiable. Keeping this in mind, the methodologies of this study was designed which are as follows:

▪ Review of key documents including the project document, project logical framework/result matrix; detail implementation plan, M&E Plan, Performance Indicator Tracking Table, situation analysis report, access to technology survey and other relevant documents.
▪ Meetings with project management personnel; implementing staff and other stakeholders
▪ Face to Face and One to One meetings with individuals and small groups, as well as participating in an on-going workshop (M&E Training and Assessment Workshop organized during January 2018)
▪ Sharing preliminary findings, queries (if any) with the respective project staff/ stakeholders in a debriefing session.
▪ Presentation of draft report, sharing, incorporating feedback from ILO/ Project management,
· Submission of Final Report.

In this Evaluability Assessment, the "ILO Evaluability Assessment Guidance Note" has been used, especially to assess fulfilment of Evaluability Assessment Criteria. To this effect, it has formed a core methodological approach in assessing the evaluability of Skills 21 Project. This report has been prepared according to the format suggested by the project. However, for the convenience of reading and internalizing the document relevant recommendations were mentioned within the respective sections of analysis by underlining the text.

3. Review of Project Design

It is understood that during project design, country strategies, international standards and policies of relevant agencies such as EU, ILO and the Bangladesh Government have been thoroughly reviewed, considered and followed accordingly. Most outcomes of the project are policy focused. The project has importantly considered the evolution of policy (e.g. NSDP 2011) and the political push to link it all with SDGs which necessitated the project to take it into consideration in its intervention. All relevant issues e.g. related areas of action plan like identification of destination countries for potential MRA and linking with national qualification system that will be developed by the Skills 21 project to achieve certification of international standard have been reflected in the design document. According to the design, it would appropriately complement and fit with the overall policies of the donor (EU), implementing agency (ILO) as well as of the government. Following issues are particularly notable:

- As per Project document, the project is expected to establish a clear pathway for EU's Human Capital Development Programme 21 (HCDP21) initiative that envisages providing budget support over four years to Bangladesh for strengthening the education sector (including TVET).
- This project builds on its predecessor TVET reform project (2007- 2015) to strengthen Bangladesh National Skills Development System (NSDS)
- ILO continues to lead the ELCG SDWG forum in Bangladesh. The project will leverage this forum to drive the development of SWAP (output 3) and NSDA. (activity 3.1.1. & 3.1.5)

3.1 Development Objective:

Increased productivity and better employment opportunities through an environmentally conscious, inclusive, demand-driven, and interlinked skills development system responding to the needs of the labour market.

Development Objective of the project is structured with extensive coverage particularly of the economic aspects of Bangladesh. However, it includes many criteria which lack clarity in achieving the results. For example, 'environmentally conscious' or 'demand-driven' is not easy to measure & also its link with 'employment' and 'productivity'. Therefore, the development objective could have been articulated as, "Increase Productivity and Employment interlinked with improved skilled development system".

One of the indicators under this objective is "Increased Gross National Income per Capita (GNI per capita)". To measure GNI per capita, it needs a wider field i.e. nation-wide survey to measure/ calculate it. How the contribution of this project could be specified to achieve this GNI per capita covering only 17,500 Programme participants/completers? It could happen that the project is very much successful in generating standard TVET system and developing 7 model institutions. In that case

if, for any reason (unfortunately), GNI has decreased, it would be a challenge to measure the benefit derived from this project. <u>Indicators need to be practical and measurable</u>.

3.2 Outcomes and Outputs

The outcomes are logically linked with the development objective (DO). The outputs are also well articulated and realistic to achieve the outcome. Three outcomes under this objective express to improve TVET/skills development system; improve access and equity within these systems; and to enable environment through improved governance and management of these systems. All these are so related with the issues of the DO like 'productivity, 'better employment opportunities', 'inclusiveness' and 'skills development system'. Under 3 outcomes, there are **7 outputs** (outcome 1 with 3 outputs, outcome 2 with 2 outputs and outcome 3 with 2 outputs).

These outputs are also well defined and linked with the respective outcomes. For example, establishment of NQF, delivery of competency-based training and assessment (CBT&A), better quality learning programme, employment in decent and environment-friendly jobs (fulfill the issues under outcome- 1); establishment of model TVET institution and TVET institutions serve as benchmark for industry driven, inclusive and environmentally conscious institution-level governance and management (fulfill the issues of outcome- 2); mechanisms and elements for a SWAP in the TVET and increased capacity within the key TVET institutions for dialogue, implementation, monitoring and review of TVET policies (fulfill the issues of outcome-3). However, it is to be mentioned here that there is no indicator for any of the outputs through which the issues of outputs to be directly linked with the issues of outcomes. <u>This is a missing point of the Logframe as well. If this is done up to output, the Log frame is workable. It is also important to develop the definition of each of the indicators to make it clear to all related staff and stakeholders.</u> Particularly, this will help to monitor the programme activities efficiently.

Also, there are some inadequacies of linking indicators with outcomes and outputs. These are described below. More observations related to indicators have been furnished in the matrices below.

Outcome-1 tells about **"Improved Quality of the TVET / skills development system"**. Out of two indicators under this outcome, one has specified 'enrollment' in the skill development system and another on 'employment' of the target beneficiaries (here as 'indirect beneficiaries'). Under this outcome, there are 3 outputs. All these outputs are properly linked with the outcome. <u>However, there is no indicator against any output, which is needed to be incorporated and well defined.</u>

Outcome-2 states **"Improved Access to and Equity within the TVET / skills development system through TVET model institutions".** Only indicator under this outcome is mentioned as "Increase (absolute and proportional) in employment of skilled personnel (of which employment in "green jobs"). This indicator appears unclear and ambiguous. <u>This indicator can be revised as "% (absolute and proportional) in employment of skilled personnel (of which employment in "green jobs").</u> Two outputs under this outcome are specifically defined. But as mentioned several times, there is no indicator under these two outputs. And so, it would be difficult to 'monitor' and assess the interventions under these outputs and to measure the outcome, exclusively.

Outcome- 3 defines "**An enabled environment through improved Governance and Management of the TVET / skills development system".** The original indicator of this outcome has been set in the Logframe as 'Perception of employers of trainees under project on links between skills development

and productivity gains'. <u>It has been suggested to be revised as ''Coordination mechanism and management capacity within the governance structure improved and functional''. Here the criteria for 'Improved coordination mechanism' should be defined first.</u> There are two outputs against this outcome. The first output (3.1) is specifically defined, however, the second output (3.2) needs more clarification. This has been shown in the following matrix.

3.3 Logframe Review

Through thorough review of the Logframe following matrix is proposed which includes development objective, outcomes, outputs and associated indicators.

Matrix- 1: Review of Indicators under Development Objectives and Outcomes

Indicators		Observations on indicators* & Proposed revised indicator as per Evaluability Assessment	Possible Baseline/ Benchmark	Milestone
As per Logframe	Revised by ILO Project Team,			
Development Objective				
Increased Gross National Income per Capita (GNI per capita)	----	Measuring GNI per capita through this project covering 17,500 program completers is not rational. It needs a wider field i.e. nation-wide survey	Data on GNI per capita is available with BBS and World Bank /ADB report	Not applicable
Increased labour productivity	----	There is potentiality to increasing productivity. However, appropriate methodology needs to apply to measure it. Revised indicator: Productivity increased in the industries through employment of completed trainees. Productivity increased in priority sectors as contribution of skills training	Current data is not available. As per 2009-2010 data, it was estimated as Taka 140,000 per employed person.	Not applicable
Outcome- 1: Improved Quality of the TVET / skills development system				
NA	NA	'Satisfaction of course completers with TVET/skills development system' (qualitative indicator)	NA	NA
NA	NA	Another 'Proxy' indicator could be: 'Demand of course completers increased in nationally recognized sector specific industries'. (quantitative indicator)	NA	NA

Indicators		Observations on indicators* & Proposed revised indicator as per Evaluability Assessment	Possible Baseline/ Benchmark	Milestone
As per Logframe	Revised by ILO Project Team,			
Enrolment increase in the reformed skills development system	NQF design/ structure is finalized and approved	The ILO Team 'proposed' indicator is measurable.	Depends on the progress of the project work/ activity. One-time work	Not applicable
Employment and environmentally conscious productivity gains through skill development	CSEs are operational	The ILO Team 'proposed' indicator is measurable	Data would be available through secondary source at organization level	Not applicable
	IMDC is operational	The ILO Team 'proposed' indicator is measurable	Data would be available through secondary source at organization level	Not applicable
	Employment through skill development	Revised Indicator: NA	Data available from secondary source & also through baseline survey for collecting primary data	Milestone should be set immediately after starting of project activities
	Environmentally Conscious productivity gains through skill development	Measuring "Environmentally conscious productivity gains" will be difficult. Revised indicator: Increase number of environment-friendly products in the industries where the course completers have employed.	Baseline needs to be conducted.	Not applicable
Outcome- 2: Improved Access to and Equity within the TVET / skills development system through TVET model institutions				
Increase (absolute and proportional) in employment of skilled personnel (of which employment in "green jobs")	Number of enrolment in the reformed skills development system (gender and PWD segregated)	Revised indicator: 'Increased number of enrolment in 7 model institutions (gender and PWD segregated) resulting from improved system'	Data to be collected through baseline survey.	Milestone should be set immediately after starting of project activities
	% (absolute and proportional) in employment of skilled personnel (of	This indicator could be rearticulated like- Revised indicator: Increased number of employment for the course	Data to be collected through baseline survey.	Milestone should be set immediately after starting of project

Indicators		Observations on indicators* & Proposed revised indicator as per Evaluability Assessment	Possible Baseline/ Benchmark	Milestone
As per Logframe	**Revised by ILO Project Team,**			
	which employment in "green jobs")	completers of skill training "Increased (absolute and proportional) in employment of skilled personnel with % in 'Green Jobs' ".		activities
Outcome- 3: An enabled environment through improved Governance and Management of the TVET / skills development system				
Perception of employers of trainees under project on links between skills development and productivity gains	Improved coordination mechanism and management capacity are in place within the governance structure	Indicator is perhaps right. But criteria for 'Improved coordination mechanism' should be defined first. However, the indicator could be rephrased as follows: 'Coordination mechanism and management capacity within the governance structure improved and functional'.	Data will be available through secondary source at organization level	Not applicable

Matrix- 2: Review of Outputs and Indicators

	Indicators as per Logframe	Proposed Indicators*	Remarks
Outputs			
Output 1.1 A National Qualification Framework (NQF) ensuring harmonization of the qualification pathways across primary, secondary, technical and higher education is established	Nothing mentioned	National Qualification Framework is in place for adaptation	The terms 'harmonization', 'qualification pathways' needs to be simplified/ easily understandable (not to be too 'academic')
Output 1.2 Expanded delivery of Competency-Based Training and Assessment (CBT&A) for trainers, assessors and managers in education and training institutions	Nothing mentioned	Quality of training and assessment improved based on predefined criteria	At output level, the term 'Expanded delivery' needs to be defined clearly to measure it exclusively.
Output 1.3 Better quality learning programmes and materials for participants available	Nothing mentioned	Quality learning programmes and materials improved compared to existing one	Specified, measurable
Output 2.1 Seven existing TVET institutions (including one in CHT) have	Nothing mentioned	Seven selected institutions functioned as 'Model	This output is too long and not specific, what exactly it

	Indicators as per Logframe	Proposed Indicators*	Remarks
become model institutions for inclusive, environmentally conscious, quality and labour market		TVET Institutions' following criteria.	likes to say. Rather it could be articulated as: 'Seven existing TVET institutions (including one in CHT) have become model institutions following standard criteria'. Rest of the terms used in the output are the criteria of the institution to become as a 'model institution'. These should be included in the project implementation guideline
Output 2.2 Seven inclusive Model TVET institutions serve as benchmark for industry driven, inclusive and environmentally conscious institution-level governance and management	Nothing mentioned	Selected TVET Institutions set benchmark by establishing IMAB	Specified, Measurable
Output 3.1 The mechanisms and elements for a SWAP in the TVET / skills development sector are developed	Nothing mentioned	Relevant policy guidelines for mechanism for SWAP are in place.	Specified, Measurable
Output 3.2 Increased capacity within the key TVET / skills development institutions and bodies for the dialogue, implementation, monitoring and review of TVET / skills development policies.	Nothing mentioned	No. of dialogues, meetings, trainings, workshops, exposure visits etc. conducted. Number of policy/strategy documents developed/reviewed/ revised	The mentioned 'institutions' and 'bodies' should be specified. This output could be rearticulated as: 'Capacity developed within the key TVET / skills development institutions for the dialogue, implementation, monitoring and review of TVET/skills development policies'.

*Note: Gender & Disability desegregation are applicable for all relevant indicators. Based on that, development objective, outcomes and outputs are rephrased and proposed where felt necessary. It seems that in some cases additional indicators could have been developed. In reviewing the Logframe described in the Project document of December 2016 was taken into account.

3.4 Activities

In the project document and in the Logframe, some issues are not adequately clear and specific. For example, in activity 3.2.1 "Advise MoE and other Government institutions on the establishment of a SWAP coordination committee that will include key development partners". There are some points to note as (a) it is not customary to write "Advice" for the government agencies, instead it would be "support, or assist. (b) though the "Other government agencies" and "Key development partners" are not specified at this stage, however, it is expected that once the design and consultations proceed, it will become clearer which agencies are relevant and which Development Partners will join the SWAP coordination committee.

In Activity 3.2.2. "Support the MoE and other Government institutions, as required, in updating relevant TVET / skills development policies and instruments including Vision 21, 7th Five Year Plan, NSDP 2011, NEP 2010, APAs, to enhance coherence". (a) Similarly, as mentioned above "other Government institution" needs to be specific and clear. Nevertheless, as discussed with the ILO Project team members, it has been revealed that when the updating exercise begins and the policies are reviewed, at that stage it becomes clearer. (b) It is very impressive that the project would support skills development policies and instrument including Vision 21, 7th Five Year Plan, NSDP 2011, NEP 2010, APAs etc. When this support will be provided, coherence will obviously be enhanced. Support will be in the form of technical guidance, and this will take the form of a couple of joint meetings with participation of relevant agencies and a number of bilateral consultations and sharing technical notes and recommendations for improving coherence. This will help different ministries and agencies to have informed consultations while they congregate in their inter-ministerial meetings for policy decisions etc.

In total, there are 60 activities under 7 outputs. Against 60 activities a total of 76 indicators were set during project design and later on the Project Team proposed for 88 indicators (Table 2). Although it is not always necessary to set indicators against activity.

Table- 2: Number of activities and indicators against the output

Output	No. of Activities	No. of Indicators	
		As per Pro-doc	Proposed
1.1	9	10	11
1.2	10	16	16
1.3	3	4	4
2.1	13	21	24
2.2	8	9	10
3.1	5	4	6
3.2	12	12	17
Total 7 outputs	**60**	**76**	**88**

Again, there are certain activities, which could be reduced further. Under the output 2.1, there are highest 13 activities followed by output 3.2 with 12 activities. It is really needed to review these thoroughly and to make those 'workable' and understandable. Otherwise it would be very difficult to implement and monitor those activities in time. Description of activity is ambiguous and too much narrative. Some descriptions are not exactly related to 'activities' rather could be categorized as 'outputs', leading to loses of its real (direct) meaning. It has been tried to show the ambiguities of

some activities. Following matrix depicts some proposals to rearticulate those activities. These are just examples of some activities under each output. Nevertheless, it is needed to further review all the activities to make those realistic.

Matrix- 3: Activities and Remarks

Activities (as per Logframe)	Remarks of evaluability Assessment
1.1.4 Define qualifications related to green economy to be included in NQF	**1.1.4.** could be rearticulated as: 'Develop criteria for green economy to be included in NQF'.
1.2.2 Establish a system for training assessment and certification of trainers and assessors including use of inclusion strategies for Persons with Disabilities (PWDs) and women and ethnic minorities.	'Establish a system for training assessment and certification of trainers and assessors' does not reflect the actual work to be done. Rather, to establish the system, what would have to be done, that could be the activity. If it is considered as an output then activities should be defined, for example, 'review existing system and gaps'. If it is considered as an activity, then the phrasing might be- 'Identify gaps for training assessment, certification of trainers and assessors'.
1.3.2 Develop capacity of IMDC for making materials available on-line and operate distance learning programmes with a strong focus on multimedia.	It could be an activity, provided to also follow the 'sub-activities' under this main activity.
2.1.2 Establish Model TVET institutions incorporating Dual System of training modality and incubation centers for entrepreneurs.	This is a 'broad' activity and it covers other 'sub-activities' mentioned the M&E Plan.
2.2.6 Build capacity of IMAB to advice peer institutions and policy makers on inclusive and environmental sustainable industry driven training programmes and on inclusive dual system operation.	It would be difficult to find out a person to be engaged in implementation, monitoring and evaluation altogether, at a time. Again, which part of the narrative is the 'real activity', it needs to be specified. The activity could be like 'Conduct training for relevant personnel of IMAB to enable them on identified issues'.
3.1.3 Define institutional responsibilities and key actions of participating organizations for SWAP formation, implementation and monitoring.	One of the activities regarding this activity could be as follows: 'define needs of participating organizations in formation of SWAP '.
3.2.12 Facilitate knowledge sharing and partnership with key international networks in TVET like BIBB (Bundesinstitut für Berufsbildung - Germany), other European TVET organizations such as ETF (European Training Foundation), CEDEFOP (European	This activity is so narrative. At last it has really lost its real meaning. 'Facilitate knowledge sharing and partnership' need to be well-defined. How 'knowledge sharing and partnership' would be facilitated, that should also specified.

Activities (as per Logframe)	Remarks of evaluability Assessment
Centre for the Development of Vocational Training), EfVET (European Forum for TVET), and related networks in the region/other countries (like the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization - VOCTECH & UNESCO-UNEVOC.	Keeping the essence of the mentioned activity, following could be the precise form of activity. "Create a platform for knowledge sharing and partnership with national and international networks in TVET". The specific tasks would be like study tours and knowledge sharing on policies with key international TVET networks.

4. Existing M&E System

4.1 Existing Monitoring & Evaluation System

Skills -21 project activities have not yet started effectively until February 2018. Monitoring activities are generally done as soon as the activities are performed to oversee the quality of performance of activities and whether they are in line to generate the outputs as planned. At the later stage, outcome monitoring could also be done by the monitoring team, if assigned.

At this stage of the project, a team of qualified officials were engaged to look after the issues of monitoring and evaluation. An M&E plan as well as an M&E Framework have been developed by the team. Sometime in development field, the terms M&E framework and M&E plan do not give clear definition. However, in this case of Skills 21 project, Team has developed both the M&E Plan and the Framework consistently. Following most popular and common design, the M&E framework has been developed. In addition to the top level, there are total 7 sheets one for each output in the M&E framework. Some columns such as assumption and means of verification need not be a part of M&E framework. For monitoring risks, separate plan may have to develop.

In general, there is no need to include activities in the M&E framework. In the Logframe the activities are too narrative, so missed specification and clarity. There is a missing column in the M&E framework which is "Definition of indicator". If that is done, indicator itself would become clearer and functional.

A monitoring plan has also been developed by the project. This is a large document (Manual) mainly deals with theoretical issues and some issues what would be done. Specific Plan for monitoring of Skills–21 project needs to be a part of the document. At least the plan would mention **when** and **how** to start the monitoring activities as well as the reporting plan.

Although as per project document, the project period started in January 2017, but the amount of monitoring activities and database is still behind and effective. Delay in the approval of TAPP of the project also delayed implementation of interventions. For which the project could not design its required M&E Tools. Although M&E Plan (Project M&E manual, Results Chain and M&E ramework) has been drafted, it needs to finalize immediately.

5. Fulfillment of Evaluability Assessment Criteria

For measuring 'Evaluability', ILO Evaluability Assessment Guidance Note 11 has been followed. Criteria questions against respective elements of this section of the guidance note are about the SMART characteristics of indicator of a project. In the project document, particularly in the Logframe indicators have been defined against development objective and outcomes, however, there is no indicator against the outputs. It is understood that the target groups of the project are the actors with whom the project has planned to work such as relevant Ministries and Institution and the secondary target group is the youths who are the seekers of skills training through the target institutions.

There are six criteria to measure the evaluability. The six key criteria outlined in the evaluability assessment matrix one by one. Again, for each criterion there are some specific questions. In total, there are 23 questions under these 6 criteria. The 23 questions each have a specific weight[1] based on the priority given to each. The Evaluability Assessment (EA) scores have been computed against each question under each criterion, and finally the EA score has been aligned for each of six criteria. Following Scoring criteria has been used to compute the scores for respective criteria (as mentioned in the ILO-Evaluation Guidance note 11):

Raw Score	Performance level	Performance requirements
4	Very good content	Criteria are **fully met** with a degree of details that **outmatches the criteria requirements**.
3	Good content	Criteria are **fully met.**
2	Relatively good content	**Partially fulfills** the corresponding criteria but can be **improved.**
1	Poor content	**Insufficient evidence** of fulfilling criteria
0	No content	**Absence** of any evidence related to criteria

---

[1] The weight/ratio defined by the tool is based on the expertise, experiences, and best practices of EVAL.

Following six matrixes represent the Evaluability Assessment Scores of six criteria as per ILO Policy Guideline.

5.1 Criteria 1: Objectives

Criteria questions	Elements related to criteria question	Weight	Raw Score	EA Score	Remarks
1. Linkage to long-term ILO priorities is clear along with the programme/ projects action plan for achieving these.	• Recognizes and addresses tripartism, social dialogue, and international standards. • Describes contribution towards achieving priorities. • Identifies ILO capacity to carry out programme objectives.	0.09	3	**0.27**	Project outcomes and outputs address tripartism, social dialogue, and international standards. However, there is no indicator against any output levels. If the indicators could be shown, it would have been easy to identify the 'priorities'. ILO capacity to carry out Programme objectives has properly been identified
2. Areas where programme/project outcomes or objectives coincide or diverge from constituent priorities are identified?	• Evidence of consultation with constituents for establishing CP priorities and outcomes. • Description of agreement and disagreement among constituent on programmatic priorities and outcomes.	0.09	3	**0.27**	The project priorities are aligned with the country priorities. During designing of the project, consultation with the constituents was in place, however, issues of agreement and disagreement among the constituents on programmatic priorities and outcomes has not been clearly been described.
3. Is there consistency with the objectives of the international development frameworks, such as poverty reduction strategies, the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), national SDG strategies and other integrated development plans?	• Clear alignment to national development framework, UN country programmes, UNDAF, SDGs, or PRS, and identify areas in which ILO has a given advantage.	0.05	3	**0.15**	The project has been designed with full consideration of most international and GoB development frameworks as mentioned in the criteria and relevant indicators
4. Are there established partnerships with national and international actors and institutions to engage with ILO constituents?	• Describes process for collaborating with national and international actors and institutions in order to engage with ILO constituents.	0.02	2	**0.04**	Although the process for collaborating with national and international actors and institutions has been described in the ProDoc, however, in the description it could more be specified regarding engagement of these actors with ILO constituents.
Total		**0.25**	**2.75**	**0.73**	

5.2 Criteria 2: Indicators

Criteria questions	Elements related to criteria question	Weight	Raw Score	EA Score	Remarks
1. Are indicators specific?	• Clearly define what is being measured. • Directly, or as a proxy, provide measurement of the intended result • Provides ability to disaggregated data where appropriate	0.05	2	**0.10**	Indicators at the development objective and outcome levels are well defined and somewhat SMART. The major limitation is at the output level as there is no indicator under any of the seven outputs. At the activity level too, many indicators have been mentioned. In terms of "Specific", the development objective and outcome level indicators are well-articulated and there is scope to disaggregate. Most of the indicators at activity level are too descriptive and need to be rearticulated or clearly defined.
2. Are indicators measurable?	• Data is available for the indicator or can be collected within the scope of the evaluation.	0.05	2	**0.10**	At this stage of project, data related to evaluation is just /yet to be available
3. Are indicators attainable?	• Indicator's target must be feasible with the available resources given a reasonable timescale, and that it is within the project's control and influence.	0.04	2	**0.08**	Targets of the indicators are achievable with the available resources. As per Logframe, there is a limitation to specify 'timescale' against each of the targets. With so many activities and indicators as mentioned in the Logframe, it seems that there is enormous demand of resources from ILO end to collect and manage database.
4. Are indicators relevant?	• There is documentable relationship between the indicator and the objective and goals it is seeking to measure. • The indicator addresses the questions of the evaluation.	0.04	2	**0.08**	Provided indicators at the overall development objective and outcomes level are appropriately defined, relevant and measurable. Considering the project implementation status, it is a bit early to measure whether the indicators address the question of evaluation to undertake
5. Are indicators time-bound?	• Data can be collected frequently enough to inform the progress and influence the decisions.	0.02	1	**0.02**	M&E framework and plan have been developed for the project, but without the project implementation practice it is early to respond. Regarding the 'time-bound' issue of the indicators, in the Logframe and in the M&E Plan there is a limitation to specify the 'time' against each indicator.

Criteria questions	Elements related to criteria question	Weight	Raw Score	EA Score	Remarks
6. Do indicators have a means of verification?	• Data sources are known. • Data is available at reasonable cost and effort.	0.05	3	**0.15**	Generally, data sources are defined at outcome and development objective levels. In most cases source of activity level data is internal i.e. of ILO or project implementing agency. With so many activities and their indicators there are risks of high cost involvement for collection and management of required data.
Total		**0.25**	**2**	**0.53**	

5.3. Criteria 3: Baseline data and information

Criteria questions	Elements related to criteria question	Weight	Raw Score	EA Score	Remarks
1. Are baselines explicitly stated for each indicator? Are they implicit in the stated objectives?	• Data is available, or descriptions for how it will be collected, to track performance relative to baseline is described. • Each indicator has an appropriate baseline	0.06	2	0.12	Baseline and milestone are not yet clearly set for relevant indicators. These need to be set preferably prior to start of project implementation at its full scale. After setting the baseline, the milestones may have to be updated time to time based on implementation experience. Review and setting of criteria on baseline and milestone would be ambiguous and too early for evaluability assessment.
2. Are baselines relevant to the programme/project?	• Meet the needs and interests of key stakeholders • Does the baseline align with the outcome indicators?	0.06	2	0.12	
3. Are baselines unambiguous and do they clearly describe the situation prior to the intervention?	• The data proposed for use to establish baseline provides a clear description of the situation prior to the intervention • The timeframe of the baseline proposed is clearly described	0.04	2	0.08	
4. Will baselines permit comparison with future data collection to permit the measurement of results?	• Provide an adequate basis for judging development results • Measure the degree and quality of change during implementation	0.04	2	.08	
Total		**0.2**	**2**	**0.40**	

5.4. Criteria 4: Milestones

Criteria questions	Elements related to criteria question	Weight	Raw Score	EA Score	Remarks
1. Do milestones provide clear sense of the time frame for achievement of results?	• Indicates expected time frame for deliverables including key outputs related to outcomes.	0.04	2	0.08	Milestones have not yet been specified in the Logframe matrix, in the project description or during setting baselines.
2. Do milestones help provide a way to monitor the progress of the programme towards its intended outcomes?	• Milestones should reflect key programmatic components • Milestone should build upon one another in a logical manner.	0.03	2	0.06	Milestone are not also clearly set for relevant indicators. These need to be set preferably prior to start of project implementation at its full scale. After setting the baseline, the milestones may have to be updated time to time based on implementation experience. Review and setting of criteria on baseline and milestone would be ambiguous and too early for evaluability assessment. Milestones need to be built upon one another in a logical manner.
3. Do milestones provide a clear sense of progress towards development goal?	• Indicates completion of a set of deliverables.	0.03	1	0.03	
Total		**0.1**	**1.7**	**0.17**	

5.5. Criteria 5: Risks and Assumption

Criteria questions	Elements related to criteria question	Weight	Raw Score	EA Score	Remarks
1. Have the principal restrictions to achieving outcomes been identified?	• The quality of the analysis of the identification of the assumptions and risks. • Conditions necessary for the execution of programme and its project and the achievement of the objectives are identified.	0.05	3	0.15	It is clear that with involvement of numbers of Ministries and other government agencies as implementing partners, the level of risk is minimum. In this context risks at outcome level is properly identified. At activity level it is not common practice to set risks because the activities are issues of the implementing agency. Even if there is any risk to perform an activity, there should have proper mitigation measure or the activity would be dropped taking alternative measure.
2. Have the risks associated with each strategy option /with achieving project outcomes been identified?	• The presence or not of risk evaluation, meaning the quantification and gradation of the risks • Articulate for each strategy/ outcome fundamental risks that will pose a threat to overall programme success.	0.05	3	0.15	
3. Are the risk mitigation measures clearly defined, and are they supported by theory, logic, empirical evidence and/or past ILO experience?	• The adoption or not of risk mitigation or incentive measures including the action that are required to carry this out.	0.05	2	0.10	
Total		**0.15**	**2.7**	**0.40**	

5.6. Criteria 6: M&E System

Criteria questions	Elements related to criteria question	Weight	Raw Score	EA Score	Remarks
1. Is the results framework clearly defined (complete with objectives, indicators, baselines and targets), including actions to be undertaken to achieve appropriate evaluation and monitoring?	• Logical framework complete with all key elements	0.02	2	0.04	For Skills-21 project the Logframe is incomplete (absent of output indicators and clearly defined target group)
2. Has a progress monitoring system been defined for objectives and strategy, including actions to be undertaken to record progress?	• A data gathering system to generate information on indicators has been defined • Resources have been identified and committed to ensure that predefined data will be collected and analyzed • Sources of information are specified for all indicators • Social partners and beneficiaries are expected to participate in monitoring and evaluation	0.02	2	0.04	An M&E framework has been developed for the project. Output indicators are the key for M&E framework which is missing perhaps because these are not mentioned in the Logframe. It is customary and required that the M&E framework would give some idea about monitoring of outcome indicators
3. Risks monitoring system defined, including actions to be undertaken to achieve this. Has a risk, monitoring system been defined, including the actions to be undertaken to achieve this?	• Follow-up actions for mitigating the impact of the risks and for monitoring the validity of the assumptions and risks are identified	0.01	1	0.01	The monitoring system has not yet been finalized
Total		**0.05**	**1.7**	**0.09**	

5.7 Consolidation of EA Criteria Scores and Findings

Following table depicts summary of scores calculated and set by the Evaluability Assessor against total weight for each of six criteria. The analysis has been done with the provision of raw scores as per ILO Guidance Note 11 on Evaluation Assessment. The weighted scores are added to generate a composite score. As a general guide, a composite score of **2.50** and above is counted as relevant for a project/programme to evaluate. Here, in case of Skills 21 Project, the composite score as per evaluability assessment stands at **2.32**. Though this score is slightly below of the standard value (2.50), however, the project reveals important aspects with right levels of support to strengthen key components and elements. EA criteria have portrayed that the Skills 21 Project is suitable for evaluation. Overall, raw score stands at **'2.14'**, which indicates the performance level of the project as 'Relatively Good Content'. The project illustrates meaningful prospects with required level of services/supports to reinforce programme components.

Table- 3: Evaluability Assessment Criteria and Scoring

Criteria	Total Weight (according to EA Guideline)	Raw Score (as EA)	Weighted Score
1. Objectives Score	0.25	2.75	0.73
2. Indicators Score	0.25	2.00	0.53
3. Baseline Score	0.20	2.00	0.40
4. Milestones Score	0.10	1.70	0.17
5. Risks & Assumptions Score	0.15	2.70	0.40
6. Monitoring and Evaluation Score	0.05	1.70	0.09
Composite Score	**1.00**	**2.14**	**2.32**

The Evaluability Assessment criteria and scoring of results reveal that further improvements are required in some basic areas to bring the project to a higher M&E standard. In order to effectively monitor and evaluate respective interventions, it is equally important to ensure that the project has the necessary systems, structures and approaches including adequate human resource, in terms of quality and quantity. Some relevant recommendations are provided in the section-8 (Way Forward) of this report as a guide and for consideration by the project management team.

6. Project Governance

6.1 Project Team

As per management structure, the Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) is the chief of this project. Under the CTA there are two specialists namely TVET and Skills Development specialist and Policy Development, Governance and SWAP specialist. The former is accountable for the delivery of outcome 1 & 2 and the latter is for the delivery of outcome 3. In the team, three National Programme Officers (NPOs) are specifically responsible to work with three defined outcomes. Each of them is assisted by a PA (Project Assistants). Within this team, a National Programme Officer- M&E is working under the direct supervision of CTA who is responsible for periodic review of Logframe and M&E system, draft and submit report based on data to ILO management, Donor and Govt. level as well as other stakeholders. However, it is also important to take over responsibility by each of three NPOs to become the in-charge of database and data collection, and each of them will also assist the NPO-M&E on reporting and feedback. The Team is based in the ILO project office.

It appears that the project is operating with minimal resources and capacity. The M&E roles on the program is also filled by existing project staff members like NPOs and PAs who have their management and implementation responsibilities as core duty.

Considering the relative size of the project (with the budget Euro 20 million) the number of ministries, government departments, TVET institutions involved with this project and the workload, the complex nature of the program and expectations from donor agency of high level and quality M&E, it would be difficult for this team to actually coordinate, monitor, follow-up the on-going activities and cover those within this project period. Action Plans, Monitoring Plan, etc. need to be developed considering the facts of existing human resources, the key stakeholders and institutions to be coordinated and monitored.

6.2 Governance

The Skills 21 Project exhibits clearly defined governance structures. The governance of the project is to be ensured through setting up of two distinct bodies, viz. the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and the Project Management and Coordination Committee (PMCC). These bodies include members from various important relevant ministries. This includes the proposed membership of both bodies and details about the chair and co-chair so that the line of accountability is clearly established. However, these bodies and other committees are yet to be formed or have to meet to date, suggesting that the committees/bodies are to be formed as soonest as possible. The PSC is envisaged as the body that will act as a forum that provides overall strategic guidance, assesses all aspects of Project progress against targeted results, including examination of lessons learned and service delivery, reviews and endorses annual work plans, while the PMCC is s a platform to provide day to day over sight of the implementation of the project. It will also help ensure the ownership of the project on part of the larger government apparatus going beyond the nodal ministry. This is very important to follow as it is related to 'ownership' of the stakeholders in the long run.

6.3 Main Implementing Partners

Technical and Madrasah Education Division (TMED) of the ministry of education and Directorate of Technical Education (DTE) are the main implementing partners of Skills 21 Project. The Director General of DTE is the nominated Project Director for Skills 21. TMED will also lead on developing a SWAP on skills. In this regard, the ability of the TMED to manage and govern the TVET and Skills Development system is crucial. At the same time, proper capacity development supports also need to be provided.

6.4 Stakeholders

In accordance with the project design, the stakeholders of the project are: TMED, DTE, BTEB, BMET, MoEWOE, NSDC/NSDA, VTTI and TTTC, TVET Model Institutions, Private Sector (BEF, ISCs, Chambers of Commerce and Industry Association), Ministry of Finance, Planning Commission, Other major skills (development) ministries like Youth and Sports, Women and Children Affairs etc., Ministry of Chittagong Hill Tracts Affairs, DPs/Donors (EU, World Bank, ADB, SDC, DFID, CIDA and if any others join the SWAP), BANBEIS, BBS, NCCWE and any other workers' organizations.

Ministry of Education is the main ministry for Skills 21, and under this ministry, Technical and Madrasah Education Division (TMED) will be instrumental in developing the NQF. Discussions are already taking place to explore how different elements of the education system in Bangladesh can be linked. TMED will also lead on developing a SWAP on skills. The ability of the TMED to manage and govern the TVET and Skills Development system will need to be evaluated and the appropriate capacity development support will be provided.

Existing TVET/ Skills development system is multifaceted, and spread over a number of ministries. The prime role of NSDCS is to coordinate among these ministries. Lack of capacity on their part to do that on time will interrupt the on-going project activities.

7. Organizational readiness for Evaluation

Based on the review and consultation with the ILO Project Management Team as shown in the following table, couples of criteria have been selected by the consultant to have a view about the readiness status for evaluation. Although the criteria are qualitative, a summary vie (?) can be obtained based on the total and individual score.

Support for Evaluation: The program leadership and staff have a learning agenda for the implementation and effectiveness of the program so as to inform the evaluation.

Table- 4: Leadership Commitment on Evaluation

Sl.	Leadership Commitment	Not at all True	Somewhat True	True
1	There is support for the evaluation and evaluation capacity building, as needed, at the leadership level (CTA, ILO Country Representative)			√
2	Leadership demonstrates commitment to evaluation and evidence-based or data-driven decision making			√
3	Leadership supports staff positions/activities that focus on evaluation, learning, and improvement			√
4	Organization demonstrate interest in learning about the effectiveness of the program by rigorously evaluating program effectiveness			√

Following are some points revealed from review of the existing status on evaluability of Skills 21 Project.

- **Tools and Structures:** The systems, structures, tools, and processes are yet to be in place for data collection, storage, processing, analysis, and reporting.

- **Systems, structures, tools** are yet to be finalized.

- **Past Evidence/Evaluation Work:** The staff team has past experiences/evidences of the monitoring process and evaluation of other projects. There is a shared understanding regarding the existing evidence behind the interventions/model by program stakeholders and evaluation partner(s).

- **Logistics and finance**: Required logistics and fund for M&E and MIS activities are available. There is commitment from all necessary program staff and stakeholders regarding the collection and use of data that is needed for evaluation purposes, including data relating to participant/beneficiary satisfaction, outcomes and impacts.

- **Project Implementation Status:** Although the project has officially been signed in June 2017, still the project activities have not effectively been taken place due to delay in the Technical approval on the project proposal.

- **Involvement and role of key stakeholders**: The key stakeholders (7 TVET institutes) are yet to be formally selected and their roles defined. Involvement and active participation of them in project issues particularly for review of project status, M&E reports etc. are mandatory for success of the project as well as important precondition for evaluation.

8. Way Forward

8.1 Project Implementation

- The project has not yet started in full swing. As mentioned in the beginning as well delay in TAPP approval hampered the launch of the project. However, the process should it into higher consideration and implementation activities should immediately be started. Because of this delay in starting the activities the time frame of the project including M&E milestones like Mid Term Evaluation should be revisited.
- It is expected that by 2020, a total of 17,500 trainees shall have been successfully trained, assessed and certified in various demand-driven programs. Of them, at least 20% are women and 5% belong to the disabled groups as per the national policy. In doing that, the skill training courses should be selected and designed in line with 'women-friendly' and 'Disability-friendly' issues and likewise, training materials should be developed.
- Process for selection of proposed seven Model Institutions should start because this is one of the important components of the project.

8.2 Logframe

- It has been found through evaluability assessment that the Logframe should be revised prior to start of project activities. 'Logframe' is the basic document for a development project. It has been found that this document has so many limitations. Without finalization of this document, no activities should be started.
- In fact, an activity should be shorter, simpler and easy understandable. Indicators and Assumptions are not necessary to put against all the activities.

8.3 M&E System

- Finalize Framework for Monitoring and Evaluation in line with the final Logframe.
- Develop monitoring tools.
- There should have a plan for Baseline survey to be held at the beginning of 2018 (Detail mentioned in Annex 1),
- Maintain a structured data collection and data management system.
- Development of MIS for 'Trainee monitoring system' should be in place.
- Develop a Reporting Plan with Feedback and sharing Mechanism for Monitoring.

8.4 Project Management

- An adequate and effective project management structure need to be developed covering all components of the project considering respective roles. It appears that there lacks in persons such as for information collection; information management; report sharing; facilitating workshops, meeting and training.

8.5 SWAP Coordination Committee

- Establishment of SWAP Coordination Committee is very crucial. A careful effort should be taken into account to finalize the criteria as a starting point for SWAP formation.

8.6 Selection of Stakeholders

- Indications/names of many stakeholders are mentioned in the project document. In fact, as capacity building is the focus of the project, 'stakeholders' are the keys with whom activities (like formation of SWAP, selection of seven Model Institutions, development of their own capacity etc.) will be performed. In fact, the whole implementation activities will be performed with/by these stakeholders. So, appropriate selection of stakeholders (followed by their needs assessment) should one of the startup activities of the project.

9. Conclusion

"Skills -21: Empowering Citizens for Inclusive and Sustainable Growth" is an interesting, useful and target oriented project. This assignment focusses on status of evaluability of the project. The project has not yet been started in full swing. Theoretically, findings from status review would be same as pre-project findings in the project design document. Due to couple of limitations in the design in particular in the logical framework matrix, findings at this stage of evaluability assessment would differ. However, the project needs changes in the design including in the logical framework matrix prior to initiating any type of evaluation. It may happen that in designing the project and constructing the logical framework matrix, Logical Framework Approach involving the target group and other important stakeholders have not been involved. It also appears that proper local expertise with adequate expertise on government and other country context and in project design including Logframe have not been involved with project design process. In this regard, couple of issues felt important by the consultant have been reviewed and proposed for fine tuning the design of project and make the expected results and indicators SMART and the logical framework workable. The issues proposed in this report needs to be reviewed and actions taken prior to start of project implementation. The project management may find the findings and proposals useful for further actions.

Actions need to be taken to minimize the gaps identified and highlighted in this report, especially under the section 8 (Way Forward) and to implement activities. After fulfilling all these conditions, allowing some times (for example, at the middle of the project period) the project would be ready for some sorts of evaluation.

ANNEXURE

ANNEX 1: Output, Activities and Baseline to be in place

Activities	Baseline Data Source Secondary/ Primary	Remarks
Output 1.1. A National Qualification Framework (NQF) ensuring harmonization of the qualification pathways across primary, secondary, technical and higher education is established.		
1.1.1. Develop the NQF with National Technical and Vocational Qualifications Framework (NTVQF) as a basis.	---	Baseline not required
1.1.2. Create the NQF Program Steering committee involving MoE, MoPME, NSDC, MoEF and other stakeholders, including from the private sector.	---	Baseline not required
1.1.3. Create technical panels / committees for harmonization of basic, technical and higher education sectors, also involving industry sector representatives.	---	Baseline not required
1.1.4. Define qualifications related to green economy to be included in NQF.	---	Baseline not required
1.1.5. Use the European Qualifications Framework and frameworks of the relevant countries in the region as a reference for the NQF.	---	Baseline not required
1.1.6. Develop and distribute the NQF Implementing Guidelines.	---	Baseline not required
1.1.7. Establish comparability of competencies and mutual recognition of skills and qualifications with other countries.	---	Baseline not required
1.1.8. Support Government in proposing legislation and/or amendments to the relevant law to ensure the embedding of NQF in the education and skills development system following the Quality Assurance Framework of 2012.	---	Baseline not required
1.1.9. Develop an advocacy and capacity development programme for the implementation of NQF targeting key implementing partners, tripartite constituents, and other stakeholders.	**Primary** (Field Study, Spot visit)	

Activities	Baseline Data Source	Remarks
	Secondary/ Primary	
Output 1.2. Expanded delivery of Competency-Based Training and Assessment (CBT&A) for trainers, assessors and managers in education and training institutions		
1.2.1. Support the VTTI and TTTC (MoE) to become and act, in cooperation with other public and private TVET teachers training institutions, as Centres of Skills Excellence (CSEs) for trainers, assessors and managers of education and training institutions	---	Baseline not required
1.2.2. Establish a system for training assessment and certification of trainers and assessors including use of inclusion strategies for Persons with Disabilities (PWDs) and women and ethnic minorities.	---	This activity could be an Output Baseline not required
1.2.3. Promote involvement of private sector in advising CSEs and engaging in their operations.	**Secondary** (Review of available Docs)	
1.2.4. Support BTEB to review, develop and validate competency standards, qualification standards curricula for trainers, assessors and managers of training institutions.	---	Baseline not required
1.2.5. Support BTEB to develop learning materials and assessment tools based on the validated environmentally conscious competency standards and curricula.	---	Baseline not required
1.2.6. Support CSEs in training and assessment of trainers, assessors and managers of training institutions for obtaining BTEB certification.	---	Baseline not required
1.2.7. Support CSEs in training of BTEB-certified trainers and assessors capable of implementing industry-driven training programmes on environmentally conscious productivity improvement, entrepreneurship and apprenticeship.	---	Baseline not required
1.2.8. Establish at least four laboratories for CBT technical skills training and assessment.	---	Baseline not required
1.2.9. Support CSEs in devising economically and environmentally sustainable business models, offering contracted services to the Government and the private sector.	---	Baseline not required
1.2.10. Establish partnerships between CSEs and various European agencies for mutual exchange of knowledge and experience, including on environmental sustainability, involving workers' and employers' groups.	---	Baseline not required
Output 1.3. Better quality learning programmes and materials for participants available		
1.3.1. Establish Instructional Materials Development Centre (IMDC) within the Centres of Skills Excellence including the provision of a modern computer laboratory.	---	Baseline not required
1.3.2. Develop capacity of IMDC for making materials available on-line and operate distance learning programmes with a strong focus on multimedia.	---	Baseline not required

Activities	Baseline Data Source	Remarks
	Secondary/ Primary	
1.3.3. Support IMDC in developing environmentally conscious, quality learning materials in line with the competency standards.	---	Baseline not required
Output 2.1. Seven existing TVET institutions (including one in CHT) have become model institutions for inclusive, environmentally conscious, quality and labour market - responsive skills development, holding the RTO designation and performing as BTEB assessment centres.		
2.1.1. Select Model TVET institutions through established criteria during inception phase including at least one institution from CHT.	---	Baseline not required
2.1.2. Establish Model TVET institutions incorporating Dual System of training modality and incubation centers for entrepreneurs.	---	Baseline not required
2.1.3. Carry out skills needs assessment studies, including for green industries, in catchment areas of the Model institutions.	**Primary** (Field Survey, Spot visit)	
2.1.4. Encourage and support local enterprises to engage with the Model institutions for, among others, apprenticeships, provision of instructors, equipment or raw material, PPPs, etc.	**Primary** (Field Survey, Spot visit)	
2.1.5. Support model institutions in implementation of provisions of the NSDP with respect to an inclusive skills development.	---	Baseline not required
2.1.6. Advise Government on adopting physical infrastructure of the Model institutions to become more eco-friendly.	---	Baseline not required
2.1.7. Provide facilities and secure provision of services for people with hearing, visual and other impairments.	**Secondary** (Review of available Docs)	
2.1.8. Assist Model institutions in implementing green standards and developing green jobs curricula.	**Secondary** (Review of available Docs)	
2.1.9. Assist Model institutions in providing entrepreneurship and management training programmes for potential and existing entrepreneurs, using global training tools such as Know About Business (KAB), and Start and Improve your Business (SIYB) and their Green extensions.	---	Baseline not required
2.1.10. Assist Model institutions in setting up incubation centres.	---	Baseline not required
2.1.11. Support Model institutions in setting up career guidance and job placement cells modelling best practice covering also migrant workers, women, persons with disabilities, ethnic minorities and other disadvantaged groups.	**Secondary** (Review of available Docs)	
2.1.12. Support two model institutions on up-training (skilling) practices for potential and returning migrant workers.	---	Baseline not required
2.1.13. Assist the Model institutions in raising awareness among financial and non-financial business service providers to cater for women, persons with disabilities, ethnic minorities and migrant workers graduating from the institutions	**Primary** (Field Survey, Spot visit)	

Activities	Baseline Data Source	
	Secondary/ Primary	Remarks
Output 2.2. Seven inclusive Model TVET institutions serve as benchmark for industry driven, inclusive and environmentally conscious institution-level governance and management		
2.2.1. Establish institutional management advisory boards (IMAB) within the Model institutions capable of promoting environmentally conscious, industry driven policies and providing advice on Dual System operations.	**Secondary** (Review of available Docs)	Baseline not required
2.2.2. Identify and provide capacity building programmes for partner industry associations which will co-manage the Model institutions.	**Primary** (Field Survey, Spot visit)	
2.2.3. Advise IMAB on ensuring due representation of women, persons with disabilities, and representatives of the Environment authorities in their boards.	---	Baseline not required
2.2.4. Assist IMAB in dialogue and engagement with employers' and workers' organizations.	---	Baseline not required
2.2.5. Assist IMAB in developing measurable and results-oriented action plan for the implementation of the National strategy for promotion of gender equality in TVET (2012) and the National Strategy for inclusion of persons with disabilities in skills development (2013).	---	Baseline not required
2.2.6. Build capacity of IMAB to advice peer institutions and policy makers on inclusive and environmental sustainable industry driven training programmes and on inclusive dual system operation.	---	Baseline not required
2.2.7. Assist IMAB in devising a business model for offering contracted services to local enterprises.	**Primary** (Field Survey, Spot visit)	
2.2.8. Assist IMAB in ensuring compliance with the NSQAS requirements for an RTO as well as becoming BTEB recognized assessment centres.	---	Baseline not required
Output 3.1. The mechanisms and elements for a SWAP in the TVET / skills development sector are developed		
3.1.1. Advise MoE and other Government institutions on the establishment of a SWAP committee that will include key development partners.	---	Baseline not required
3.1.2. Prepare design and structure of the building blocks of SWAP intervention.	---	Baseline not required
3.1.3. Define institutional responsibilities and key actions of participating organizations for SWAP formation, implementation and monitoring.	---	Baseline not required
3.1.4. Support and advise Government for introduction of SWAP.	---	Baseline not required
3.1.5. Strengthen mechanisms and procedures for Government-led donor coordination involving NSDC, ELCG sub-group on skills development, concerned line ministries.	---	Baseline not required

Activities	Baseline Data Source	Remarks
	Secondary/ Primary	
Output 3.2. Increased capacity within the key TVET / skills development institutions and bodies for the dialogue, implementation, monitoring and review of TVET / skills development policies		
3.2.1. Support MoE and other institutions in development of a SWAP strategy and environmentally conscious action plans for implementation of their TVET / skills development policies.	---	Baseline not required
3.2.2. Support MoE and other Government institutions in updating relevant TVET / skills development policies and instruments including Vision 21, 7th Five Year Plan, NSDP 2011, NEP 2010, APAs, to enhance coherence.	---	Baseline not required
3.2.3. Assist Government in developing and operationalizing TVET/skills development sector performance monitoring frameworks and reporting mechanisms (e.g. Annual Sector Performance Reports, Public Expenditure Reviews, and data on TVET/skills development financing).	---	Baseline not required
3.2.4. Support MoE (including BANBEIS and BTEB) and other Government institutions (BBS) in generating quality statistical data of the TVET / Skills development sector and advise on establishing a TVET/Skills Management Information System (MIS).	---	Baseline not required
3.2.5. Support and strengthen MoE and other Government institutions in policy dialogue about TVET / skills development policies through regular meetings, workshops, events, newsletters, publications showcasing achievements and lessons learned.	---	Baseline not required
3.2.6. Support MoE (including DTE, BANBEIS, BTEB, TTTC, VTTI) and other Government institutions in the assessment of their institutional capacity (to implement SWAP and national TVET policies	---	Conduct Needs Assessment
3.2.7. Support MoE and other Government institutions in the design and implementation of capacity building plans related to the skills development sector.	**Primary** (Field Survey, Spot visit)	
3.2.8. Build capacity of MoE on sector financing including: policy costing, linkages to budget and Mid-Term Budgetary Framework, budget comprehensiveness and analysis, and financial sustainability.	---	Baseline not required
3.2.9. Advise MoE on the implementation of skills related aspects in the EU's Human Capital Development Programme 21 in Bangladesh.	---	Baseline not required
3.2.10. Strengthen capacity of BTEB and NSDC in identifying and engaging with EU member states with whom Mutual Recognition Agreements (MRA) could be established on comparability of trainers' and assessors' competencies and qualifications.	---	Baseline not required
3.2.11. Strengthen the capacity of BMET and MOEWOE in identifying and engaging with countries of destination with whom a MRA could be established for comparability of qualifications.	---	Baseline not required
3.2.12. Facilitate knowledge sharing and partnership with key international networks in TVET like BIBB (Bundesinstitut für Berufsbildung - Germany), other European TVET organizations such as ETF (European Training Foundation), CEDEFOP (European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training), EfVET (European Forum for TVET), and related networks in the region/other countries (like the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization - VOCTECH and UNESCO-UNEVOC).	---	Baseline not required

ANNEX 2: Work Plan

Sl.	Dates	No. of working days	Tasks/ deliverables
1	14th – 16th January 2017	2.5 days	Participation in workshop organized by Skills 21 Project Team and internalization of the project design and tasks to be accomplished
2	18th – 23rd January	2 days	Desk Review and Triangulation of the findings from desk review and from the workshop
3	24th – 25th January	1 day	Develop Checklists for consultation with the relevant project stakeholders
4	28th – 31st January	3 days	Consultation with Skills 21 Project personnel in ILO and key stakeholders from respective govt. depts., institutions; Sharing initial findings with relevant Project/ ILO officials and convening inputs.
6	1st – 5th February	4 days	Analysis and preparation of draft report; Submission of Draft Report to Skills 21 /ILO personnel
7	12th February	0.5 days	Presentation/ sharing draft report with Skills 21 Project personnel/ ILO officials, other stakeholders
8	13th February	1 day	Incorporate feedback/comments/inputs and submit Final report
Total		14 days	

ANNEX-3: List of Persons Consulted

Sl.	Name	Designation
1	Mr. Snehal V Soneji	Chief Technical Adviser
2	Mr. Manas Bhattacharyya	Policy Development, Governance and SWAP Specialist
3	Ms. Ligaya Dumaoang	TVET and Skills Development Specialist
4	Md. Serajul Islam	NPO- NQF
5	Md. Anisuzzaman	NPO- CSE and TVET
6	Ms. Laila Farhana Apnan Banu	NPO- Policy and Governance
7	Md. Harun Or Rashid Rana	Programme Assistant
8	Md. Aminul Islam	Programme Assistant
9	Mr. Tahmid Arif	NPO, Monitoring and Evaluation
10	Mr. Jatan Barua	Procurement Officer
11	Mr. Mehbub ur Rahman Khan	National Finance and Administration Officer
12	Md. Mizanur Rahman	Additional Secretary and Director (Planning), DTE
13	Mr. SM Shahjahan	Deputy Director, BTEB
14	Mr. Nepal Chandra Karmaker	Deputy Director, NSDC Secretariat
15	Mr. Santosh Kumar Dutta	Joint Secretary, BEF
16	Ms. Shamsun Nahar	Senior Instructor, BMET, Dhaka
17	Mr. Jahedul Haque Milon	President, Socialist Labour Front, NCCWE

ANNEX- 4: List of Documents Reviewed

1. Project Document of Skills 21 project

2. Inception report Skills 21 final_23 October 2017

3. Original Logframe

4. ILO (2011). Applying Results-Based Management in the International Labour Organization.

5. Guidebook, version ILO results framework 2010-15

6. ILO Strategic Plan 2016-2017

7. Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

8. Skills 21_ME Plan_Text (draft for discussion)

9. Skills 21_ME_Framework_All output Task-wise- Combined

10. Evaluability Assessment - BSEP&RMG - Final Draft

11. ILO Evaluability Assessment- Guidance Note 11

12. Evaluability Assessment Report SDIR Project. January 2017

13. GN 16 Evaluability Review. International Labour Organization – Evaluation Unit Guidance Note 16

14. ILO Policy Guideline for Results Based Evaluation

15. Conducting_an_evaluability_assessment_june2017: CONDUCTING AN EVALUABILITY ASSESSMENT FOR USAID EVALUATIONS

16. CSO Evaluability Assessment Checklist_March 15.2017- USAID

17. Adam Kessler and Jim Tanburn, August 20141: Why Evaluations Fail: The Importance of Good Monitoring. DCED

18. National Community Service. Social Innovation Fund. Introducing the Impact Evaluability Assessment Tool

19. Planning Evaluability Assessment. Report of a study commissioned by the Department for International Development

20. Greet Peersman, Irene Guijt & Tiina Pasanen. Evaluability Assessment for Impact Evaluation Guidance, Checklists and Decision Support- A Methods LAB Publication: ODI. ORG /Methods