

# Evaluability Assessment Report

## **Evaluability Assessment**

### **Bangladesh Skills for Employment and Productivity (B-SEP) & Improving Working Conditions in the Ready-Made Garment Sector (RMG)**

**International Labour Organisation (ILO)**

**November 2014**

## Table of Contents

<b>Acronyms .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Executive Summary.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1. Background to the B-SEP and RMG Programs .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>2. Evaluability Assessment - Theoretical Approach and Rationale .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>3. Evaluability Assessment - Methodology.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4. Goal and Objective Statements for B-SEP and RGM .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>5. Linkage of Programs to Broader Strategic Policies and Documents.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>6. Assessment Criteria.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>6.1 Criteria 1 - Objectives .....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>6.2 Criteria 2 - Indicators .....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>6.3 Criteria 3 - Baseline data and information .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>6.4 Criteria 4 - Milestones.....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>6.5 Criteria 5 - Risks and Assumptions .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>6.6 Criteria 6 - M&amp;E System .....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>7. Analysis of Assessment Criteria Findings.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>8. Program Governance Structures and Systems.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>9. Reporting Systems and Processes .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>10. Evaluation Capacity and Resources .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>11. Proposed Next Steps to Support B-SEP and RMG .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>12. Key Conclusions and Recommendations .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Attachment 1: Terms of Reference .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Attachment 2: Evaluability Assessment Plan .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>Attachment 3: List of People Consulted .....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Attachment 4: List of Documents Reviewed .....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Attachment 5: Proposed Theory of Change Diagrams - B-SEP and RMG .....</b>	<b>51</b>

## Acronyms

B-SEP	Bangladesh Skills for Employment and Productivity
CBT&A	Competency Based Training and Assessment
DWCP	Decent Work Country Program
EA	Evaluability Assessment
EU	European Union
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GoB	Government of Bangladesh
ILO	International Labour Organisation
ISC	Industry Skills Council
IP	Inception Plan
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MIS	Management Information System
MoE	Ministry of Education
MoLE	Ministry of Labour
NTAP	National Tripartite Plan of Action on Fire Safety
NTC	National Tripartite Committee
PAC	Project Advisory Committee
PDD	Project Design Document
PEP	Project Evidence Plan
PMCC	Project Monitoring and Coordination Committee
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RMG	Improving Working Conditions in the Ready-Made Garment Industry
TCPR	Technical Cooperation Progress Report
ToC	Theory of Change
TVET	Technical and Vocational Education Training

## Executive Summary

This report is an Evaluability Assessment (EA) of two high profile and strategically important programs currently being implemented and managed by the International Labour Organisation (ILO).

Both programs are large-scale and support skills development, strengthening support services and supporting legislative improvements. The Bangladesh Skills for Employment and Productivity (B-SEP) Program seeks to achieve a better-trained and qualified workforce in key industry sectors in order to contribute to decent work, sustainable economic development, poverty reduction and social inclusion. The Improving Working Conditions in the Ready-Made Garment Sector (RMG) builds on the momentum generated by the tragic events in the RMG industry to strengthen building safety and direct support to survivors and also to contribute to improved legislation, capacity and overall regulation of the industry.

The EA process is: *'a systematic process that helps identify whether program evaluation is justified, feasible, and likely to provide useful information'*. The EA process does not determine whether the evaluation will occur or not, but rather whether all the conditions (including the operating context) are in place for an evaluation to be effective (i.e. that it is completed following rigorous methodologies; is accountable and transparent and results and recommendations can be utilised). If these conditions are not in place, the EA will identify what action a program should take to establish a situation where the evaluation will be effective. In other words, the EA process is like a needs assessment of a program but prepared through an evaluative lens.

In completing the EA for B-SEP and RMG, the assessment had three main purposes:

- The EA is intended to assess the clarity of the definition of *objectives*, including outcomes that can be comprehended as a major focus of management for results, appropriateness of indicators to provide the types of project management information needed to ensure achievement of the established objectives.
- The EA is expected to guide the development of sound and practical approaches for measuring the progress and effectiveness/impact of the program. The assessment will review the existing M&E system to identify problems in information gathering during implementation that can adversely affect the measurement of management decision-making.
- The findings of the EA assessment will provide robust information for strengthening B-SEP's and RMG's results framework and its monitoring system. The EA is address any serious gaps or shortcomings found with the M&E practice of the programs and contribute to learning and ILO knowledge on M&E on improving working conditions.

The EA for B-SEP and RMG commenced with a document review including respective Program Design Documents (PDD) and associated monitoring and evaluation (M&E) frameworks and technical progress reports. Following the review of program documents, the consultant prepared an Inception Plan (IP) to guide the in-country mission work and propose a methodology to complete the EA. The IP proposed two field missions, the first to collect initial data and information and followed by a later second mission to consolidate findings and present revised M&E systems. The period between the in-country missions was devoted to preparing an initial assessment report.

Both programs demonstrate strong connections and linkages to GoB and ILO policies, legislation and strategies. It is evident in the PDD's that both programs are targeting immediate priority needs and are aligned to existing agreements and governance structures. The strategic intent of both programs is grounded within existing systems and frameworks and demonstrates a strong commitment to working within these arrangements. This is a defining strength of both programs and provides a solid foundation upon which to achieve tangible results.

The EA applied consistent assessment criteria covering an assessment of objectives, indicators, baseline data and information, milestones, risks and assumptions, and M&E systems. The assessment contained specific findings and points for discussion. Scores were also assigned for each criteria leading to an overall score and assessment. . A summary of the scores for each program is provided below.

<b>B-SEP</b>	<b>Raw Score</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>
Objectives Score	3	0.25	0.75
Indicators Score	2.5	0.25	0.63
Baselines Score	2	0.20	0.40
Milestones Score	2	0.10	0.20
Risk Assumptions Score	2.75	0.15	0.41
M&E Plans	2.5	0.05	0.13
<b>Composite Score</b>	<b>2.45</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>2.52</b>
<b>Overall Finding</b>	<b>Evaluability Assessment reached - needs improvement</b>		

<b>RMG</b>	<b>Raw Score</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>
Objectives Score	2.75	0.25	0.69
Indicators Score	2	0.25	0.50
Baselines Score	2	0.20	0.40
Milestones Score	2	0.10	0.20
Risk Assumptions Score	2.5	0.15	0.38
M&E Plans	2.5	0.05	0.13
<b>Composite Score</b>	<b>2.29</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>2.30</b>
<b>Overall Findings</b>	<b>Evaluability Assessment below cut-off score - needs improvement</b>		

At present, both B-SEP and RMG are operating with minimal M&E resources and capacity. The M&E roles on both programs are filled by existing staff members who have other management and implementation responsibilities. This is not an ideal situation given the relative size of both programs (<US\$20million), the complex nature of both programs and expectations from donor agencies of high-level and quality M&E. In moving forward, the EA would strongly recommend devoting more human and technical resources towards M&E. This may involve engaging a short-term international consultant to provide technical oversight and quality assurance to the M&E system of both programs or seek to engage a national consultant full-time to coordinate the M&E activities of both programs.

In moving forward, the EA proposes the following key issues:

- Initial feedback on the EA is received and comments incorporated and narrative text adjusted to address any inconsistency or factual error.

- Second field mission is undertaken to present ToC models and undertake further discussion and consultation.
- The evaluation frameworks for both programs are refined and enhanced in accordance with the key findings of the EA.
- Proposed outcome/impact studies are further elaborated and study designs prepared.
- A strategy for further engagement and support is discussed and agreed.

The EA does see an opportunity for further engagement and support. The EA concludes that both programs are suitable for evaluation purposes. The application of the assessment criteria and scoring of results does indicate that improvements are required in key areas to bring both programs to a higher M&E standard to ensure both programs have the necessary systems, structures and approaches to effectively monitor and evaluate respective interventions. The following recommendations are provided as a guide and for consideration by the management teams for both programs and the ILO Country and Regional M&E Office.

**Recommendation 1:** RMG to clearly define and articulate its goal and objective statements in the Theory of Change as a basis to commence refinement of the M&E framework.

**Recommendation 2:** Additional projects under RMG should be considered and included as part of monitoring but evaluated separately (e.g. BWP)

**Recommendation 3:** Both B-SEP and RMG look to reduce the number and type of indicators included in respective M&E frameworks.

**Recommendation 4:** RMG to separate management and technical indicators into two distinct frameworks.

**Recommendation 5:** B-SEP and RMG define baseline requirements following review of the respective M&E frameworks and theory of change.

**Recommendation 6:** B-SEP and RMG to draft impact study designs for respective studies

**Recommendation 7:** B-SEP and RMG to incorporate timeframes into indicators and to structure M&E Plans to highlight key assessment points in implementation.

**Recommendation 8:** B-SEP and RMG to update respective risk matrices to ensure they are current and relevant and to consider broader contextual risks to both programs.

**Recommendation 9:** B-SEP to update its current M&E Plan to reflect the revised M&E framework and to articulate key reporting templates and timeframes for reviews and evaluations.

**Recommendation 10:** RMG to develop a complete M&E Plan following revision of M&E framework.

**Recommendation 11:** Both B-SEP and RMG consider the option of engaging short-term international assistance or full-time M&E expertise to support to implementation of respective M&E plans and planned activities.

The findings, conclusions and recommendations provided in this EA report will be discussed in detail with technical and management staff for both programs in Dhaka during 23-27 November 2014.

## 1. Background to the B-SEP and RMG Programs

The ILO is currently implementing two large-scale programs supporting skills development, strengthening support services and supporting legislative improvements. The Bangladesh Skills for Employment and Productivity (B-SEP) Program seeks to achieve a better-trained and qualified workforce in key industry sectors in order to contribute to decent work, sustainable economic development, poverty reduction and social inclusion. The Improving Working Conditions in the Ready-Made Garment Sector (RMG) builds on the momentum generated by the tragic events in the RMG industry to strengthen building safety and direct support to survivors and also to contribute to improved legislation, capacity and overall regulation of the industry. An outline of the two programs is detailed below. Both programs maintain a strong focus on gender participation and equity and seek to mainstream activities across both portfolios.

### ***Bangladesh Skills for Employment and Productivity (B-SEP)***

The B-SEP program aims to improve the national enabling environment for industry skills development in the TVET sector. The program has built on the existing ILO Technical and Vocational Education Training (TVET) program funded by the European Union (EU). It includes enhancing the market-relevance & effectiveness of the national TVET and skills system, allowing for better quality, more access and an improved capacity to provide and sustain demand driven services. The program aims to increase the employability of young adult women and men, with a particular focus on disadvantaged groups. The program also helps create a better-trained and qualified workforce with increased economic opportunities in target sectors, which will contribute to sustainable economic development, poverty reduction, and social inclusion in Bangladesh. Target sectors are agro-food processing; tourism and hospitality; pharmaceuticals; ceramics; and furniture manufacturing.

The program will address a number of key challenges facing the TVET system on a policy and institutional level. There are four major components under the B-SEP program.

**Component 1: Skills Funding, Planning & Support Services:** the B-SEP program aims to increase the capacity and effectiveness of the skills system in Bangladesh through:

- Improvements to financial planning, management and sustainability of the skills system.
- Improvements to coordination, planning, monitoring and evaluation of skills policies, strategies and programs.
- Enhancements to employment services through pilots in target sectors.

**Component 2: Competency-Based Training and Assessment (CBT&A) Quality & Relevance:**

This component aims at strengthening TVET programs through the quality and relevance of training delivery in selected priority sectors of Bangladesh. It will involve industry in the development and delivery of new competency based programs to ensure that training offerings are align with employer demands. In return, this will assure increase in employability among graduates of TVET in Bangladesh.

**Component 3: Industry Skills Development:** aims to increase the engagement of industry in the skills system by establishing new Industry Skills Councils (ISC) in the target sectors. Industry demand for skills will be encouraged through:

- Increased workplace performance in target sectors through skills development activities



- Improved apprenticeship and skills recognition systems

**Component 4: Improved Access to Skills:** aims to increase equitable access for specific groups in the skills system in Bangladesh through the development and delivery of technical, supervisory and entrepreneurial skills for women and people with disabilities.

This five-year program started its implementation in March 2013 and will end in March 2018.

***Improving Working Conditions in the Ready Made Garment Sector (RMG)***

The RMG industry, Bangladesh, and the world have been shocked in the past two-years by several major industrial accidents in Bangladesh. This has led to large-scale unrest among thousands of workers resulting in mass demonstrations and disruptions of work in hundreds of factories. A fire at Tazreen Fashions Ltd in November 2012 had 112 casualties and the building Collapse of Rana Plaza in April 2013, which had housed 5 garment factories, had taken 1,127 lives. Bangladesh has acted quickly in response to the tragic accidents in the Ready Made Garment Sector in 2012 and 2013.

Following the tragic accidents, on January 15, 2013 a tripartite statement of commitment on fire safety in the work place was adopted and signed. The Ministry of Labour and Employment and the ILO organized the meeting jointly. In the statement the tripartite partners commit to the development of national plan of action on fire safety.

With the adoption of the Statement, the Tripartite Partners committed to work together to develop a National Tripartite Plan of Action on Fire Safety (NTPA) by the end of February 2013, with a view to taking comprehensive action aimed at preventing any further loss of life and property due to work place fires and fire-related accidents and incidents. To ensure the timely development of the NAP, the MoLE established a Tripartite Committee, which met four times with the assistance of the ILO. Ultimately, the MoLE signed off the NAP on 24 March 2013. The NTPA outlines initiatives covering: policy and legislation; administration; and practical activities. It foresees the establishment of a National Tripartite Committee (NTC) to ensure and monitor implementation of the NTPA. The ILO accepts a formal request to assist in the implementation and coordination of the NTPA.

Following the collapse of Rana Plaza on 24 April 2013, a high-level ILO mission was undertaken to convey the solidarity of the ILO with those affected by these tragic events. The Mission engaged with the tripartite partners and other stakeholders to identify what needs to be done to prevent any such future tragedies. As a result of the mission, the Government and social partners adopted a Joint Statement containing a time-bound six point agenda and commitment to develop an action plan identifying actions to be undertaken in the short and medium term to avoid further incidents. The six point agenda includes:

- Submission of labour law amendments to Parliament during its next session (June/July 2013).
- Assessment of all the active RMG factories for fire safety and structural integrity by end 2013 and initiate remedial measures.
- Recruitment and training of up to 300 inspectors and strengthening the labour inspection system.
- Expanding and fully implementing the Fire Safety Tripartite Action Plan.

- Launching a skills training program for workers rendered disabled and redeployment of workers who were rendered unemployed due to the recent events.
- Consider launching a Better Work Program upon satisfactory completion of labour law reform.

The ILO managed RMG program was developed in response to the tragic events, to support the commitments made in the aftermath of them and with the view to help to translate these commitments into practice. The program has five components:

1. **Building and Fire Safety Assessment:** supports the commitments made by the tripartite partners to complete a fire safety and structural assessment of all active RMG factories/buildings in Bangladesh and initiate remedial action.
2. **Strengthen Labour Inspection & Support Fire and Building Inspection:** supports the government to significantly improve the capacity of its inspection systems.
3. **Build OSH awareness, capacity and systems,** builds the capacity of workers and managers in the RMG sector to improve the safety of their workplaces including the prevention of violence at workplace.
4. **Rehabilitation and skills training for victims** responds to the request of the tripartite partners for the ILO to provide immediate rehabilitation services and to launch skills training programs for workers who sustained injuries or lost employment in the tragic events of Tazreen and Rana Plaza.
5. **Implementation of a Better Work program:** aims to improve both compliance with labour standards and competitiveness in global supply chains.

The program is intended to achieve major results in building and fire safety and support to survivors. It will build foundations for longer term results and sustainable action through improved legislation, enforcement and oversight capacity of regulatory agencies and through implementation of workplace level systems to improve working conditions by employers and workers, initially in the RMG sector, but with potential to expand to other economic sectors in Bangladesh as well. This support is aimed to ensure that the RMG sector remains a thriving export sector and emerges from this current crisis stronger in terms of building, fire and labour conditions. This is essential given the importance of the sector in the economy of Bangladesh (78% of total export earnings and 14% of GDP). 80% of RMG workers are women.

## 2. Evaluability Assessment - Theoretical Approach and Rationale

Evaluators are often confronted with the challenging task of having to evaluate development interventions and their outcomes for which stakeholders have defined unclear outcomes and targets and for which interventions have been poorly defined. Compounding the situation is that stakeholders may possess differing and alternate understanding and appreciation of how a program is/was meant to work and what outcomes and results are/were anticipated. An EA is a useful M&E tool aimed at addressing these challenges.

EA is often defined as *'a systematic process that helps identify whether program evaluation is justified, feasible, and likely to provide useful information'* (e.g. OJJDP, 2003; UNIFEM, 2009). The EA does not determine whether the evaluation will occur or not, but rather whether all the conditions (including the operating context) are in place for an evaluation to be effective. If these conditions are not in place, the EA will identify what action a program should take to establish a situation where the evaluation will be effective.

Completing an EA should precede or be the first step of every evaluation; it is not only completed at the commencement of the program. Prior to implementation of any evaluation, a simple EA should be conducted which would also consider whether B-SEP and RMG serve intended beneficiaries, are being implemented as designed, and have the resources specified in the design.

At the completion of the first year of the implementation for both programs, the EA considers whether: the Program Logic is relevant and appropriate (are goals, objectives and outcomes clear); there is consistency between the Program Logic and Theory of Change; the expected outcomes can be achieved (are they achievable, realistic); and the targets are realistic and the quality of available data is appropriate. The EA would consider whether there are sufficient resources allocated (in broad terms) and whether key stakeholders have the required capacity and commitment to the evaluation. The EA should also articulate the broad evaluation questions that the program is seeking to address during the life of the program.

In completing the EA for B-SEP and RMG, the assessment had three main purposes:

- The EA is intended to assess the clarity of the definition of *objectives*, including outcomes that can be comprehended as a major focus of management for results, appropriateness of indicators to provide the types of project management information needed to ensure achievement of the established objectives.
- The EA is expected to guide the development of sound and practical approaches for measuring the progress and effectiveness/impact of the program. The assessment will review the existing M&E system to identify problems in information gathering during implementation that can adversely affect the measurement of management decision-making.
- The findings of the EA assessment will provide robust information for strengthening B-SEP's and RMG's results framework and its monitoring system. The EA is address any serious gaps or shortcomings found with the M&E practice of the programs and contribute to learning and ILO knowledge on M&E on improving working conditions.

The purpose of the EA is to enable B-SEP and RMG program management to deliver on objectives and targets detailed in the program design documents. The EA is not a tool to re-design and drastically change the approach but rather an opportunity to reflect and constructively appraise, review and refine approaches as necessary.

### 3. Evaluability Assessment - Methodology

The EA for B-SEP and RMG commenced with a document review including respective Program Design Documents (PDD) and associated monitoring and evaluation (M&E) frameworks and technical progress reports. Following the review of program documents, the consultant prepared an Inception Plan to guide the in-country mission work and propose a methodology to complete the EA. The Inception Plan proposed two field missions, the first to collect initial data and information and followed by a later second mission to consolidate findings and present revised M&E systems. The period between the in-country missions was devoted to preparing an initial assessment report.

The first in-country mission was completed from 26-30 October 2014. The mission enabled the consultant to meet with program staff and key stakeholders including donors. The purpose of the meetings was to better understand individual perceptions of the program, current and emergent priorities and relevant contextual factors influencing implementation and management to date. In addition to the interviews, relevant Government of Bangladesh

(GoB) and ILO strategies, legislation, and policies were reviewed and considered in light of the "context" of the garment industry and what type of information is required to demonstrate results and impacts for the longer-term. A full list of people consulted is included as Annex 2. Documents reviewed as part of the EA are included as Annex 3.

The methodology was primarily qualitative with a series of individual and group discussions in country during the first field mission. The results of the meetings were consolidated and analysed to identify key themes and issues. Underpinning the approach was the drafting of initial Theory of Change (ToC) diagrams to help contextualise and detail key components of respective programs and associated outputs and outcomes. The intention of this process was to help consolidate thinking and prioritise result areas to enable better planning and scheduling of indicators against agreed target areas.

A small workshop was facilitated at the end of the mission (30 October 2014) involving key project staff and donors to introduce the concept of ToC and to present draft models. The workshop provided a basis for further discussion and helped confirm the overall approach and provided an opportunity to detail the next steps - this current report and subsequent follow up mission in late November 2014.

The methodology for this report has identified key components for an effective M&E system and approach. Both the B-SEP and RMG programs have been assessed by consistent criteria, which seeks to highlight areas of good practice and areas for improvement and enhancement. The intention is not to compare the projects but rather identify aspects of good practice that can be transferred and also to develop appropriate and individual M&E strategies and approaches and to provide a series of recommendations to guide and support the M&E process moving forward for both programs.

#### 4. Goal and Objective Statements for B-SEP and RMG

The PDD's for both the B-SEP and RMG programs are comprehensive documents providing a strong rationale and grounding for the implementation of direct and tangible support.

Of note is that both programs do not clearly articulate a clear development goal or objectives in the text of the PDD. For B-SEP, the first mention of a development goal is in the logic model on page 24 of the PDD and RMG does not provide a goal statement in the text but rather a statement is contained in the M&E results framework.

The other point of note is the use of consistent terminology. Development programs tend to get confused with the application of varying terms and definitions of results (i.e. goal, objectives, outcomes and outputs). The ILO is strongly encouraged to develop consistent M&E terminology to apply across all programs to ensure consistency and shared understanding of program concepts. The EA is aware that the ILO Technical Cooperation Manual refers to "Development Objective/Impact" as a higher goal statement and also "Immediate Objective/Outcome". Clarification of the terminology will occur during the next field mission.

Both programs would benefit from having clearly articulated goal and objective statements outlined in the Executive Summary or Preambles to ensure the reader is very clear on the intended purposes of the respective programs.

The goal statement (ultimate outcome) for B-SEP is: ***A better-trained, qualified and competent workforce with increased economic opportunities.***

For RMG, no goal statement is identified but rather a development objective is proposed. The objective is: ***Improved working conditions in the ready-made garment sector in Bangladesh with occupational health and safety and decent work in line with international labour standards.***

From an initial assessment viewpoint the B-SEP program has a clear, articulate and succinct goal/objective statement that can be measured and assessed. For RMG, the statement is ambiguous and could be enhanced to better reflect the nature of the program. The draft ToC (included as Attachment 5) has proposed the following statement: ***A RMG industry that is safe, compliant and economically viable.***

## 5. Linkage of Programs to Broader Strategic Policies and Documents

Both programs demonstrate strong connections and linkages to GoB and ILO policies, legislation and strategies. It is evident in the PDD's that both programs are targeting immediate priority needs and are aligned to existing agreements and governance structures. The strategic intent of both programs is grounded within existing systems and frameworks and demonstrates a strong commitment to working within these arrangements. This is a defining strength of both programs and provides a solid foundation upon which to achieve tangible results.

For B-SEP, the program is aligned to national development objectives and intentions developed following the G-20 summit in Seoul (2010) where Bangladesh identified a number of key development and economic growth priorities. B-SEP has been designed not only in response to identified needs but also to complement existing efforts of development partners within Bangladesh.

RMG has been developed in response to requests for technical assistance and support by the GoB, social and development partners, and global fashion buyers. Underpinning the approach is a Tripartite National Plan of Action (NAP). The NAP seeks to employ strategies to take comprehensive action aimed at preventing further loss of life and reduced productivity due to injury and loss of property due to workplace accidents and incidents. The program is also aligned to other key strategic documents such as: ILO Joint Statement, Accord on Fire and Building Safety and the Global Sustainability Compact. These high-level governance agreements align to the ILO Bangladesh Decent Work Country Program (DWCP 2012-2015) through the targeting of specific outcomes: *Working Conditions Improved and Capacities of Labour administration and institutions improved.*

## 6. Assessment Criteria

The following assessment criteria is provided and utilised as a means to assess The M&E strategies and plans of both the B-SEP and RMG programs in a consistent manner and ensure conformity in the overall approach. Scores are assigned for each criteria with the intent of providing an overarching raw score on the ability of both programs to be evaluated, while at the same time identifying specific elements of each program that are of good practice and areas where enhancements are necessary.

The points and issues raised for each criterion are linked to specific interventions and recommendations and are provided to inform further discussion during the proposed second in-country mission in late November 2014. The application of the criteria consists of a scoring process. The following table provides an outline of the scores and associated definitions.

Raw Score	Performance Level	Performance Requirements
4	Very good content	Criteria are <b>fully met</b> with a degree of detail that <b>exceeds criteria requirements.</b>
3	Good content	Criteria are <b>fully met</b>
2	Relatively good content	Corresponds to an identification that <b>partly meets</b> the corresponding criteria and that can be subject to <b>further improvements.</b>
1	Poor Content	Corresponds to <b>an inefficient identification</b> of a criteria
0	No content	Corresponds to the <b>non-identification</b> of the criteria assessed.

Table 1: ILO Assessment Criteria<sup>1</sup>

Both projects will receive a raw score for each criterion, which will then be weighted, and a composite score will be realised. The scoring process requires careful examination of the overall structure, intent and composition of both programs. Where possible, subjective interpretations have been minimised and the professional judgement of the consultant is utilised based on the desk review, in-country consultation process and previous EA experience. The following sections contain findings of the EA and associated scores.

As part of the assessment process, key recommendations are stated under each criteria as a means to guide and assist both B-SEP and RMG to prepare necessary work for the next field mission. The recommendations provide a basis for discussion and engagement.

## 6.1 Criteria 1 - Objectives

### B-SEP

#### ***Clarity of the definition of objectives, including outcomes that can be comprehended as a major focus of management for results***

The objective (ultimate outcome) of the B-SEP is well defined and well structured. The B-SEP design would be best served by having the statement included at the commencement of the PDD with associated outcomes aligned to the statement. This approach would alert the reader immediately to the overall intent and purpose of the program.

B-SEP has defined two intermediate outcomes, which could also act as end of program outcomes and has aligned three immediate outcomes to these. This is a sound logic structure and groups the outcomes into two areas - a policy focus and practical training/system focus. The logic structure on P.24 of the PDD is clear and relies on a small number of key outputs and activities.

Importantly the B-SEP program does align to key GoB and ILO policies, strategies and priorities. It is clear the program does align itself and builds upon the technical capacity and experience of the ILO to deliver the program in a timely, efficient and effective manner. The PDD responds to defined needs and there is evidence that the design process has consulted well with GoB stakeholders.

Partnership is a key focus of the program overall and the design has taken steps to identify national development partners (both government and non-government) to participate and engage in the program. Roles and responsibilities are defined and support is targeted.

The objective and outcome statements are measurable and provide a basis for the

<sup>1</sup> The scoring assessment tool utilises the ILO Evaluation Unit's Guidance Note 11.

---

development of the associated M&E framework and plan

---

**Raw Score: 3**

---

---

## **RMG**

---

### ***Clarity of the definition of objectives, including outcomes that can be comprehended as a major focus of management for results***

The RMG program does not articulate a development goal/objective in the PDD. The overall structure of the PDD appears to have been designed as five separate components without in-depth consideration of how the components align and support each other in a logical framework. The design does highlight individual component objectives and associated outputs however there appears to be no linkage or overarching framework to bring the components together in a coherent manner. The ToC proposed as part of this EA has made an effort to align these components in a coordinated fashion (See Attachment 4)

It is noted that many of the component level objectives tend to be relatively general and not entirely aligned to the outputs that contribute to them. As an example reference is made to the objective for Component III (Page 52 of the PDD), where the objective is not the same as the output that follows it nor is it aligned to the indicator that is attempting to measure it.

The PDD would have been better served with a clear articulation of goal and objective statements and would have assisted in prioritising component level objectives and associated outputs. The current statements are vague, subjective and overtly long.

The RMG is aligned to GoB and ILO strategies, policies and priorities. RMG has a very strong foundation upon which to work with high-level agreements (i.e. National Tripartite Action Plan) and responds to clear and immediate needs and priorities. Strong partnerships have been established and the multi-donor focus also provides an added level of governance and support.

RMG also needs to consider the management of the Better Work Program (BWP) as it also contains its own M&E Framework. The BWP has its own system and structure to complete M&E. At present the ToC and evaluative framework incorporate the BWP as part of the broader RMG program. The RMG program in itself is quite complex with a number of different initiatives being implemented under the banner of RMG. It is the view of this EA that projects outside the formal RMG project should be evaluated separately however RMG could implement a meta-evaluation (i.e. an overarching evaluation) aligned to the high-level research questions discussed later in this report. BWP should report as part of the program but evaluated against its own M&E framework.

---

**Raw Score: 2.75**

---

***Recommendation 1:*** RMG to clearly define and articulate its goal and objective statements in the Theory of Change as a basis to commence refinement of the M&E framework.

***Recommendation 2:*** Additional projects under RMG should be considered and included as part of monitoring but evaluated separately (e.g.BWP)



## 6.2 Criteria 2 - Indicators

Both programs suffer from the common phenomenon in development programs of an overreliance on indicators to justify progress and achievement. Development projects tend to fall into the trap of 'over measurement' whereby anything that can be measured is measured without adequate thought provided as to what is really required and what best serves the information needs and requirements of Government and donors alike.

What is often overlooked in development projects is that the more indicators you have the more time and effort is required to devote time and resources to ensure they are effectively monitored and measured. This is time consuming and often not entirely relevant for programs. Careful selection and strategic use of indicators can significantly enhance the effectiveness of a program, save time and effort and maximise results to inform decision-making and resource allocation.

---

### **B-SEP**

---

***The selection of SMART indicators that are qualitative and quantitative and include comparison points of levels, quality and grade.***

As indicated earlier, the B-SEP program has a clear logic structure as part of the PDD. However when translated to the *Project Evidence Plan (PEP)* the logic structure appeared to dissipate into a series of blended outcome/output and indicators statements. At face value, the PEP appears to only define indicators at the outcome level. However when referring back to the logic model in the PDD, it is clear outputs are also measured.

It is evident that B-SEP is seeking to represent each component of the project under each outcome to ensure all aspects of the program are measured and provide some basis to ensure components are relevant and linked. In moving forward, there is opportunity to merge some indicators and perhaps to drop some elements.

Some indicators are clearly defined where others tend to be a little ambiguous and some are quite process related. Consolidation of indicators into defined groups combined with some restructuring of statements would benefit the overall approach.

Some indicators are measurable and attainable however many have been structured with no defined time period for achievement. Some indicators are more relevant than others and there is an opportunity to merge and incorporate indicators so as to reduce the reporting burden and also articulate a clear strategic approach to M&E generally. Data sources are defined and most indicators can be verified, however further work is required to test these sources, as some appear quite general.

---

**Raw Score: 2.5**

---

### **RMG**

---

***The selection of SMART indicators that are qualitative and quantitative and include comparison points of levels, quality and grade.***

Like B-SEP, RMG has relied too heavily on the use of indicators. The challenge faced here can be extended back to the original design where the component level focus has meant the design team have proposed a range of output and indicators without actually carefully considering the time and resource requirements necessary to effectively measure such information. The lack of an overarching goal statement or definition of program wide outcomes has also limited the ability to link components across defined program areas.

---

An initial count revealed close to 130 indicators, which is excessive, inefficient and

---



---

demonstrates that more thought could have been applied to prioritisation of areas for work.

The *Performance Plan (PP)* also contains a mixture of management and process related outputs/indicators with specific development orientated outputs/indicators. An ideal situation would have seen the PP carefully consider the outputs contained in the PDD and an attempt made at that time to consolidate the number of outputs and indicators.

In general the indicators are not specific and not entirely relevant to the program. Like B-SEP indicators are generally not time bound and not entirely attainable given the available time and resources.

One option for consideration is to look to split the PP into a technical and management logframe that would help simply the approach and clearly outline those indicators, which support the achievement of key technical results. This strategy will reduce the overall number of indicators and help sharpen the focus of the team onto key deliverables. Further discussion of this option will be communicated during the second in-country mission.

---

**Raw Score: 2**

---

***Recommendation 3:*** Both B-SEP and RMG look to reduce the number and type of indicators included in respective M&E frameworks.

***Recommendation 4:*** RMG to separate management and technical indicators into two distinct frameworks.

### 6.3 Criteria 3 - Baseline data and information

Both programs require intensive efforts to collect relevant baseline data. As outlined, both programs have defined M&E frameworks with a significant number of indicators without carefully considering the information needs of respective programs, the government and donors.

The approach proposed moving forward is to define a series of outcome studies for both programs that will focus baseline data collection efforts. These studies will rely on some primary data collection. For lower level output statements, baseline data could be collected from existing secondary data sources. However, prior to baseline data collection, effort needs to be made to consolidate the PEP and PP for both programs and to prioritise information needs.

---

#### B-SEP

---

***The existence of sufficient baseline data to establish a starting point for comparisons and future measurements of outputs and outcomes.***

Baseline data for B-SEP has not been collected to date. A review of the PEP does appear to indicate that data sources are available but data itself is not clear. Once the results frameworks are revised, there is an opportunity to further define data sources and the type of information required.

Consultations with the DFATD indicate a strategy to have baseline data collected for each indicator. This approach provides further justification to streamline and reduce the number of indicators for the program.

To further streamline the baseline process the EA proposes two outcome studies for B-SEP. The first study is at the ultimate outcome level and involves a quasi-experimental mixed

---

---

methods explanatory sequential design. This evaluation design starts with the collection and analysis of quantitative data (i.e. survey), which has the priority for addressing the study's questions. This phase is followed by the design and subsequent collection of qualitative data. The mixing of data enables the qualitative findings to support and confirm the results of the quantitative phase.

The intention of this study would be to assess how effective the program has been in training staff and providing increased economic opportunities. This will involve a sample survey of training participants with a secondary qualitative component-tracing students as they progress towards employment. A corresponding control group will be identified through alternative training facilities and measured against similar criteria.

The second study will be an internally driven study looking at the mechanisms established through the program to support the program. This study will be qualitative in nature and discuss the impact B-SEP has had in strengthening the training delivery and overall quality assurance.

Both studies will require a baseline strategy and the data collection process will be primary. Baseline s for most of the indicators can be drawn from existing secondary sources.

---

**Raw Score: 2**

---

---

#### **RMG**

---

***The existence of sufficient baseline data to establish a starting point for comparisons and future measurements of outputs and outcomes.***

Like the B-SEP program, the RMG program also contains limited baseline information to date. Lack of clarity around agreed outputs and associated indicators has blurred the lines between what can be collected and what needs to be collected.

In line with the approach proposed for the B-SEP program, two impact studies are proposed to measure key results of the program. The first study is an internal study looking at the results of compliance with relevant government legislation. This study can be completed internally and can measure the results of those factories that participate in a program compared with a smaller sample of factories that do not meet compliance standards.

The second impact study is structured in a similar manner to the proposed study under B-SEP where an attempt is made to measure the economic benefits derived from safer factories.

Impact study methodologies will be discussed and refined during the second in-country mission and will form part of the program's M&E Plan.

The RMG program also has two further research areas. Consultations reveal that the program through the BWP will complete an independent study utilising their own individual M&E framework. A study in this area will present useful findings and insights that can be utilised by the RMG program. The second study is a broader research approach utilising internal ILO resources. It is part of a broader research program to assess more country-level results and benefits that have been derived through the program

---

**Raw Score: 2**

---

**Recommendation 5:** B-SEP and RMG define baseline requirements following review of the respective M&E frameworks and theory of change.

**Recommendation 6:** B-SEP and RMG to draft impact study designs for respective studies

## 6.4 Criteria 4 - Milestones

### B-SEP

***A set of time-bound milestones that provide a clear sense of the intended path towards achieving outputs and outcomes***

The completion of the ToC progress has identified the logical pathways towards the achievement of outcomes through defined outputs. Where improvements could be made is in defining the timeframe around outputs and to provide a level of indication as to when these outputs are expected to be delivered. The current results framework doesn't place a timeframe on the achievement of outputs, however this information may be contained in other project documents such as the workplan. The EA has not had access to this information.

It is recommended that once the results framework is defined, that (where relevant) time bound outputs are prepared along with suitable indicators

**Raw Score: 2**

### RMG

***A set of time-bound milestones that provide a clear sense of the intended path towards achieving outputs and outcomes***

Like the B-SEP program, defined milestones are not clear within the project design document. The lack of clarity around defined indicators and number of outputs also do not lend themselves to a defined sequence or structure. The ToC has provided some structure and grounding that supports planning moving forward.

The indicators at present do align to the outputs (although these need to be rationalised), however the logical progression towards defined outcomes is less clear. However there is definite scope and opportunity to rectify this situation quickly through further consultation and discussion.

**Raw Score: 2**

**Recommendation 7:** B-SPE and RMG to incorporate timeframes into indicators and to structure M&E Plans to highlight key assessment points in implementation.

## 6.5 Criteria 5 - Risks and Assumptions

### B-SEP

***Assessment of factors, namely risks and assumptions, likely to affect the achievement of an intervention's objectives, and related contingency measures.***

The B-SEP program contains a risk register as part of the project design, which demonstrates a level of understanding about key risks and assumptions of the program. However the EA has not seen any further evidence of this plan being reviewed or updated.

The EA is aware that B-SEP has a longer implementation history than other programs and that the project team has a sound understanding of risks. The EA would like to see a risk

---

strategy incorporated as part of the overall M&E plan. In addition it is recommended that the program adopt a risk management component as part of future reporting functions.

---

**Raw Score: 2.75**

---

---

#### **RMG**

---

***Assessment of factors, namely risks and assumptions, likely to affect the achievement of an intervention's objectives, and related contingency measures.***

Risks and assumptions have been considered in the program planning process. However greater effort is required to measure the result of external contextual factors that have the potential to influence and impact upon the achievement of results.

The development of a M&E Plan will provide an opportunity to carefully consider current factors influencing the program. The ToC document also highlights key outcomes around which risks can be identified and monitored.

The PDD has carefully considered risks but the EA is of the view that a review of all associated risks should be completed and the risk management plan be updated and enhanced and the M&E strategy aligned to the revised framework.

---

**Raw Score: 2.5**

---

***Recommendation 8: B-SEP and RMG to update respective risk matrices to ensure they are current and relevant and to consider broader contextual risks to both programs.***

---

### **6.6 Criteria 6 - M&E System**

---

#### **B-SEP**

---

***M&E system to identify problems during program and program implementation and facilitate the measurement of progress.***

The B-SEP program has established a simple M&E framework and associated plan. This is a welcomed advancement however additional work is required.

Like the RMG program, B-SEP needs immediate attention to revise the current results framework to clarify indicators and determine information requirements. Effort has already been made to identify data sources.

The M&E Plan also needs to clearly articulate the scheduling of reports and include the forms and templates necessary to collect relevant information.

B-SEP has good relationships with its project partners and an attempt to bring them into M&E discussions is encouraged to ensure systems are aligned and information needs are clearly articulated and agreed.

---

**Raw Score: 2.5**

---

---

#### **RMG**

---

***M&E system to identify problems during program and program implementation and facilitate the measurement of progress.***

The M&E results framework for RMG is still in draft form. At present the results framework is not clearly defined. The current framework does contain outcomes, outputs and indicators but these require significant work and enhancements.

---

A basic monitoring system has been initiated but this is heavily dependent upon a small number of team members recalling information. The program should take steps to establish a more formalised data collection system, preferably a MIS system to assist with the tracking of key outputs. Staff capacity exists within the RMG program to complete and manage this process.

The EA believes a significant effort is required to enhance the M&E approach. Once a clear strategy is realised, then RMG can better identify key data requirements and define data collection tools and methodologies.

Further work is also required to engage at a higher level with key stakeholders (both government and donors) to ensure that their information needs and priorities are also considered and incorporated.

**Raw Score: 2.5**

**Recommendation 9:** B-SEP to update its current M&E Plan to reflect the revised M&E framework and to articulate key reporting templates and timeframes for reviews and evaluations.

**Recommendation 10:** RMG to develop a complete M&E Plan following revision of M&E framework.

## 7. Analysis of Assessment Criteria Findings

The application of the assessment criteria has revealed that both programs are suitable for evaluation. As a general guide, a score of 2.50 and above is deemed suitable and appropriate. B-SEP is slightly higher and RMG is slightly below. However both programs demonstrate significant potential with appropriate levels of support to strengthen key components and elements.

The analysis occurs with the provision of raw scores, which criteria weighted according to importance. The weighted scores are added to produce a composite score. A summary of the scores for each program is provided below.

<b>B-SEP</b>	<b>Raw Score</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Weighted Score</b>
Objectives Score	3	0.25	0.75
Indicators Score	2.5	0.25	0.63
Baselines Score	2	0.20	0.40
Milestones Score	2	0.10	0.20
Risk Assumptions Score	2.75	0.15	0.41
M&E Plans	2.5	0.05	0.13
<b>Composite Score</b>	<b>2.45</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>2.52</b>
<b>Overall Finding</b>	<b>Evaluability Assessment reached - needs improvement</b>		

RMG	Raw Score	Weight	Weighted Score
Objectives Score	2.75	0.25	0.69
Indicators Score	2	0.25	0.50
Baselines Score	2	0.20	0.40
Milestones Score	2	0.10	0.20
Risk Assumptions Score	2.5	0.15	0.38
M&E Plans	2.5	0.05	0.13
<b>Composite Score</b>	<b>2.29</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>2.30</b>
<b>Overall Findings</b>	<b>Evaluability Assessment below cut-off score - needs improvement</b>		

## 8. Program Governance Structures and Systems

Both program exhibit clearly defined governance structures. It could be argued that respective governance structures place an excessive burden upon programs in terms of the hierarchical and bureaucratic nature of each system in terms of the level of reporting and approvals required to implement the program. Compounding this situation is evidence that some governance committees are yet to be formed or have not met to date.

For B-SEP the program does have a strong governance and coordinating mechanisms in place. Reporting structures appear a little onerous at present and the EA would prefer to see the level of reporting reduced and consolidated into more detailed and structured reporting rather than continuous reporting. However this is a conversation that is needed with the donor and key stakeholders. At the time of writing, it apparent that current governance systems has not been operationalised with the PSC and PMCC not meeting.

Meeting	Frequency	Participants
Project Steering Committee (PSC)	Quarterly	DFATD, ILO Dhaka, MOE, NPD, DTE BEF, NCCWE
Project Monitoring & Coordination Committee (PMCC)	Monthly	DFATD, NPD (DTE), CTA, BSEP Project Key counterpart agencies (BMET, BTEB)
Project Internal Evaluation Committee	Yearly	MOE, DTE (MOE), ERD (MOF), IMED (MOP), Education Wing, Planning Commission (MOP)
ILO Project Management Committee	As required	ILO Dhaka, Project CTA, ILO DWT-South Asia and ILO Geneva
Report	Frequency	Key Audience
Monthly Report	Monthly	PSC (Out of session), ILO Dhaka ILO DWT-South Asia and ILO Geneva
Monthly Report (Statutory)	Monthly	MOE, MoPlanning, PSC (Out of session) [ILO Dhaka]
Quarterly Report	Quarterly	PSC, ILO DWT-South Asia, DFATD, ILO Geneva
Annual Report	Annual	PSC, ILO DWT-South Asia and ILO Geneva DFATD
Annual Evaluation Report	Annual (July)	MOE, MOF, MOP, PSC, ILO Dhaka ILO DWT-South Asia, DFATD

For RMG, there is a strong institutional framework in terms of the national Tripartite Committee and Program Advisory Committee (PAC). However like B-SEP it is unclear if the governance system has commenced operations.

## 9. Reporting Systems and Processes

Both B-SEP and RMG are in the relatively early stages of program implementation. To date both programs have prepared and distributed a Technical Cooperation Progress Report (TCPR). The content the TCPR for each program is relatively light on information given the early stage of implementations and due to limited baseline data availability and clear definition of M&E systems and structures.

Reporting is anticipated to improve with clearly defined frameworks. The EA also recommends that each program seek to quantify the "output status" provided in each report. To state that an output or target is 'on target' provides no formal indication of how the output is progressing or at what stage of implementation the result is at.

At first glance, both programs appear to have detailed comprehensive reporting structures. Care must be taken so as to not overburden technical specialists with onerous amounts of information gathering and long, complex reports. Where possible, reporting should be minimised and strategically aligned to the information needs of key stakeholders (i.e. government and donors).

The reduction in the number and quantity of outputs and indicators should assist in streamlining reporting requirements. Where possible both programs should seek to provide more 'summary style' or 'snapshot' style of reporting, particularly for high-level governance meetings (i.e. Project Steering Committee). This type of reporting appeals to high level governance and board level structures as it provides a very quick overview of program progress and provides quick interpretation which enables further questions to be asked.

The EA also recommends that both programs quickly establish the reporting format/templates for this reporting. Ideally the structure and content of these reports should be articulated in respective M&E strategies. However due to lack of RMG having an M&E plan means that these templates are not defined. B-SEP does have a M&E plan but contains no guidance on reporting templates.

## 10. Evaluation Capacity and Resources

A present, both B-SEP and RMG are operating with minimal M&E resources and capacity. The M&E roles on both programs are filled by existing staff members who have other management and implementation responsibilities. This is not an ideal situation given the relative size of both programs (<US\$20million), the complex nature of both programs and expectations from donor agencies of high-level and quality M&E.

The EA is aware that RMG for instance has significant M&E resources available to undertake a range of M&E activities and research interventions. This situation is unique to development programs generally given that resources tend to be provided to alternative activities and M&E is viewed as an "add-on" or secondary activity.

Consultations with both staff members who are responsible for M&E presently reveal that both would prefer to focus on their primary responsibilities and that M&E functions are primarily a 'stop-gap' measure until a more formalised solution is found.

In moving forward, the EA would strongly recommend devoting more human and technical resources towards M&E. This may involve engaging a short-term international consultant to provide technical oversight and quality assurance to the M&E system of both programs or seek to engage a national consultant full-time to coordinate the M&E activities of both

programs. Ideally you would see some form of M&E Unit that could operate covering both programs. This 'shared approach' would make efficient use of existing resources while providing the necessary oversight and confidence in the quality of data being produced and distributed.

The EA also strongly recommends that an appropriate Management Information System (MIS) is established for both programs. This task is quite critical given the significant numbers of people being trained and engaged through the program. It also assists in the tracking and monitoring of relevant activities.

The MIS could also act as a document store for key legislation, policies, strategies and relevant program documents that could be accessed by key stakeholders both within Bangladesh or internationally. The MIS need not be complex or onerous but should be adequately staffed and resourced (particularly with data capture templates and formats) to ensure consistency in collection, storage and presentation.

**Recommendation 11:** *Both B-SEP and RMG consider the option of engaging short-term international assistance or full-time M&E expertise to support to implementation of respective M&E plans and planned activities.*

## 11. Proposed Next Steps to Support B-SEP and RMG

This EA report is a key step in the process to support the development of appropriate M&E for both programs. The first field mission has been completed and the report is a reflection of the consultations, analysis and review of documentation to date and incorporates the professional judgement of the evaluation consultant. This EA provides a foundation for further engagement and the refinement of key M&E plans and products for both programs.

A second field mission is scheduled for late November 2014 where the findings from this report will be presented and refined based on further consultations. In moving forward, the EA proposes the following key issues:

- Initial feedback on the EA is received and comments incorporated and narrative text adjusted to address any inconsistency or factual error.
- Second field mission is undertaken to present ToC models and undertake further discussion and consultation.
- The evaluation frameworks for both programs are refined and enhanced in accordance with the key findings of the EA.
- Proposed outcome/impact studies are further elaborated and study designs prepared.
- A strategy for further engagement and support is discussed and agreed.

The EA does see an opportunity for further engagement and support. Although M&E should ideally be simple and aligned to the information needs of stakeholders, it is a complex process that does require significant time investments and consideration. Both programs have significant technical capacity and skill however defined M&E support appears to be secondary in nature and "mixed" with other key technical and management responsibilities.



## 12. Key Conclusions and Recommendations

The EA concludes that both programs are suitable for evaluation purposes. The application of the assessment criteria and scoring of results does indicate that improvements are required in key areas to bring both programs to a higher M&E standard to ensure both programs have the necessary systems, structures and approaches to effectively monitor and evaluate respective interventions.

Both programs do require support to better articulate M&E strategies and plans. The development of draft ToC diagrams is a key first step in seeking agreement on the key features of each program and has assisted in defining key outcomes, linkage of outputs across components and areas of interest for further evaluation and research/

For B-SEP, due to the longer-term intervention period and experience gained from previous implementation and management experience, has a relatively clear M&E structure. The logic model in the design builds upon the previous experience and does provide a basis for the development of a M&E system and approach. The translation of the logic structure into a performance plan has been lost to some degree with an over-use of indicators and undefined baseline structure.

The B-SEP M&E Plan is a proactive and positive start but further work is required to clearly outline the approach to M&E including a revised framework and the necessary templates and tools to measure and assess progress.

The RMG program, due to the hastily nature to prepare a suitable design, requires further support to clearly define M&E approaches and associated indicators. Consultative work is required to refine the M&E framework (with an intention to split the logframe into a technical and management structure). A M&E Plan needs to be developed and this will logically flow from the series of consultations during the next in-country field mission.

The findings, conclusions and recommendations provided in this EA report will be discussed in detail with technical and management staff for both programs in Dhaka during 23-27 November 2014.

## **Attachment 1: Terms of Reference**

**Terms of Reference (draft as of 6 October 2014)**

**Evaluability Assessment of**

**Multi-donor support Bangladesh Garment Industry Program - Improving Working Conditions in the Ready-Made Garment (RMG) and Bangladesh Skills for Employment and Productivity (B-SEP)**

### **Introduction and justification**

ILO program for improving working conditions in the Ready-Made Garment (RMG) Sector in Bangladesh build on the momentum generated by the tragic events to address serious challenges facing the ready-made garment industry and to secure lasting improvements to working conditions in Bangladesh. The RMG program has been specifically planned to have a comprehensive and robust M&E mechanism and results orientation.

The Bangladesh Skills for Employment and Productivity (B-SEP) Project aims to improve the national enabling environment for industry skills development and the increased employability of young and adult women and men. It targets government agencies and their staff, employers, workers, training institutions, students & trainees with a particular focus on groups disadvantaged in the labour market. It will enhance the market-relevance & effectiveness of the national TVET and skills system, allowing for better quality, more access and an improved capacity to provide and sustain demand driven services. The project will also help create a better-trained and qualified workforce with increased economic opportunities in target sectors, which will contribute to sustainable economic development, poverty reduction, and social inclusion in Bangladesh.

Both projects are highly visible in terms of size, scope and area of focus. Their monitoring and evaluation (M&E) would be best served by conducting an initial evaluability assessment. This is also required by ILO evaluation policy to have the evaluability assessment (EA) conducted within the first year of start-up for projects/programs with budget of larger than US\$ 5 million.

For both projects, it has been about one year of its commencement. The evaluability assessment will help ensure that these two large-scale projects have clear logic and structure, good M&E planning and implement effective M&E designs that generate evidence to document the effectiveness and results of the program.

The EA will thus help identify the gaps in both projects for effective planning, monitoring and evaluation to support correct accounting for results both during and after implementation of the program. This EA will include the analysis of the logic of RMG project and B-SEP project, the design of M&E system, and the review of baseline measure, data collection methodologies, and the M&E capacity of both projects.

A Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) expert will conduct the EA with support from Regional Evaluation Officer (REO) of RO-Bangkok and a Senior Evaluation Officer from EVAL. RMG program team and key partners will provide relevant documentation and inputs to the EA process.

## Background of the RMG and B-SEP:

### RMG

During the past two years, the RMG industry, the country and the world have been shocked by several major industrial accidents in Bangladesh, leading to large-scale unrest among thousands of workers resulting in mass demonstrations and disruptions of work in hundreds of factories. 24 Nov 2012's fire at Tazreen Fashions Ltd had 112 casualties and building Collapse of Rana Plaza, which had housed 5 garment factories, had taken 1,127 lives, on 24 Apr 2013. Bangladesh had acted quickly and effectively in response to the tragic accidents in the Ready Made Garment Sector in 2012 and 2013.

Following the tragic accidents, on January 15, 2013 a tripartite statement of commitment on fire safety in the work place in Bangladesh was adopted and signed after a tripartite meeting. The meeting was organized jointly by the Ministry of Labour and Employment and the ILO. In the statement the tripartite partners commit to the development of national plan of action on fire safety.

With the adoption of the Statement, the Tripartite Partners committed to work together to develop a National Tripartite Plan of Action on Fire Safety (NAP) by the end of February 2013, with a view to taking comprehensive action aimed at preventing any further loss of life, limb and property due to work place fires and fire-related accidents and incidents. To ensure the timely development of the NAP, the MoLE established a Tripartite Committee, which met four times with the assistance of the ILO. Ultimately, the MoLE signed off the NAP on 24 March 2013. The NTPA outlines initiatives covering three areas: 1) Policy and legislation, 2) Administration, 3) Practical activities. It foresees the establishment of a National Tripartite Committee (NTC) to ensure and monitor implementation of the NTPA. The ILO accepts a formal request to assist in the implementation and coordination of the NTPA.

Following the collapse of Rana Plaza on 24 April 2013, a High-level ILO mission was undertaken by the Deputy Director General for Field Operations and Partnerships, Mr. Gilbert Hougbo, to convey the solidarity of the ILO with those affected by these tragic events, the partners from government, labour, and industry, and to the nation as a whole. The Mission engaged with the tripartite partners and other stakeholders to identify what needs to be done to prevent any such future tragedies.

As a result of the mission, the Government and social partners adopted a Joint Statement containing a time-bound six point agenda and commitment to develop an action plan identifying actions to be undertaken in the short and medium term to avoid further incidents. The six point agenda includes: Submission of labour law amendments to Parliament during its next session (June/July 2013) Assessment of all the active RMG factories for fire safety and structural integrity by end 2013 and initiate remedial measures:

- a) Recruitment and training of 200 inspectors and strengthening the labour inspection system
- b) Expanding and fully implementing the Fire Safety Tripartite Action Plan
- c) Launching a skills training program for workers rendered disabled and redeployment of workers who were rendered unemployed due to the recent events
- d) Consider launching a Better Work Program upon satisfactory completion of labour law reform

On 13 May 2013 two global unions (IndustriALL, UNI Global) and international brands and retailers (currently more than 150) sign the Accord on Fire and Building Safety in Bangladesh. This is a five-year program under which companies commit to ensure the implementation of health and safety measures. The ILO acts as neutral Chair of the Accord, which is currently estimated to cover approximately 1,700 factories.

On July 8, 2013 a joint initiative of the European Union, the Government of Bangladesh and the ILO was signed. The “Compact for Continuous Improvements in Labour Rights and Factory Safety in the Ready-Made Garment and Knitwear Industry in Bangladesh”<sup>2</sup> seeks to improve labour, health and safety conditions for workers, as well as to encourage responsible behaviour by businesses in the ready-made garment industry in Bangladesh.

The “Improving Working Conditions in the Ready-Made Garment Industry” was developed in response to the traffic events, to support the commitments made in the aftermath of them and with the view to help to translate these commitment into practice. The program has five components:

- **Building and Fire Safety Assessment:** supports the commitments made by the tripartite partners to complete a fire safety and structural assessment of all active RMG factories in Bangladesh and initiate remedial action.
- **Strengthen Labour Inspection & Support Fire and Building Inspection** supports the government to significantly improve the capacity of its inspection systems.
- **Build OSH awareness, capacity and systems,** builds the capacity of workers, supervisors and managers in the RMG sector to improve the safety of their workplaces including the prevention of violence at workplace.
- **Rehabilitation and skills training for victims** responds to the request of the tripartite partners for the ILO to provide immediate rehabilitation services and to launch skills training programs for workers who sustained injuries or lost employment in the tragic events of Tazreen and Rana Plaza.
- **Implementation of a Better Work Program** aims to improve both compliance with labour standards and competitiveness in global supply chains.

In three and a half years the program is intended to achieve major results on building and fire safety and support to survivors. It will build the foundations for longer term results and sustainable action through improved legislation, enforcement and oversight capacity of regulatory agencies and through implementation of workplace level systems to improve working conditions by employers and workers, initially in the RMG sector, but with potential to expand to other economic sectors in Bangladesh as well.

This support is aimed to ensure that the RMG sector remains a thriving export sector and emerges from this current crisis stronger in terms of building, fire and labour conditions. This is essential given the importance of the sector in the economy of Bangladesh (78% of total export earnings and 14% of GDP). 80% of RMG workers are women.

Key implementing partners of the RMG program are as follows: -National Tripartite Committee on Fire and Building Safety; Ministry of Labour and Employment (and Agencies); Ministry of Housing and Public Works (and Agencies); Ministry of Home Affairs (and agencies); Employers’ and Workers’ Organizations (BGMEA, BKMEA, BEF, NCCWE, IBC); and the Bangladesh University of Engineering and Technology.

## **B-SEP**

The Bangladesh Skills for Employment and Productivity (B-SEP) Project aims to improve the national enabling environment for industry skills development in the TVET sector. The project has built on the existing ILO TVET project funded by the EU. It includes enhancing the market-relevance & effectiveness of the national TVET and skills system, allowing for better quality, more access and an improved capacity to provide and sustain demand driven services. This aimed to increase employability of young and adult women and men, with particular focus on the disadvantaged group. The project will also help create a better-trained and qualified workforce with increased economic opportunities in target sectors, which will contribute to sustainable economic development, poverty reduction, and social inclusion in Bangladesh. Target sectors are agro-food processing; tourism and hospitality; pharmaceuticals; ceramics; and furniture manufacturing.

In particular, the project will address a number of key challenges facing the TVET system on a policy and institutional level. There are four major components under the B-SEP project.

**Component 1: Skills Funding, Planning & Support Services:** the B-SEP project aims to increase the capacity and effectiveness of the skills system in Bangladesh through

- Improvements to financial planning, management and sustainability of the skills system
- Improvements to coordination, planning, monitoring and evaluation of skills policies, strategies and programs
- Enhancements to employment services through pilots in target sectors
- 

**Component 2: Competency-Based Training and Assessment (CBT&A) Quality & Relevance**

This component aims at strengthening TVET programs through quality and relevance of training delivery in selected priority sectors of Bangladesh. It will involve industry in the development and delivery of new competency based programs to ensure that training offerings are align with employer demands. In return, this will assure increase in employability among graduates of TVET in Bangladesh.

**Component 3: Industry Skills Development**

It aims to increase the engagement of industry in the skills system by establishing new Industry Skills Councils (ISC) in the target sectors. Industry demand for skills will be encouraged through:

- Increased workplace performance in target sectors through skills development activities
- Improved apprenticeship and skills recognition systems

**Component 4: Improved Access to Skills** It aims to increase equitable access for specific groups in the skills system in Bangladesh through the development and delivery of technical, supervisory and entrepreneurial skills for women and people with disabilities.

This five-year project started its implementation in March 2013 and will end in March 2018. Key project partners include: Directorate of Technical Education (DTE); Bureau for Manpower Employment and Training (BMET); Bangladesh Technical Education Board (BTEB); The National Skills Development Council (NSDC); Employer Organisations, Industry Bodies and Industry Skills Councils; Workers groups; and National and International NGOs

**Purposes:**

The purpose of the evaluability assessment is to enable RMG and B-SEP project management to deliver on the commitments contained in the program documents. If necessary, the evaluability assessment will support the recalibration of the RMG and B-SEP, with a view to ensuring a clearer results orientation and a clear understanding of monitoring systems that should be developed and/or put in place. The evaluability assessment will strengthen the appreciation of all staff as to what RMG and B-SEP intends to achieve during the projects' period, and they will ensure the availability of adequate evidence to demonstrate such achievements including their synergy.

The evaluability assessment will also constitute a pilot for similar assessments in other large-scale projects, and will yield lessons that could be used to develop an approach to be applied to other programmatic initiatives.

The evaluability assessment is intended to assess the clarity of the definition of *objectives*, including outcomes that can be comprehended as a major focus of management for results, appropriateness of indicators to provide the types of project management information needed to ensure the achievement of the established objectives.

The evaluability assessment is expected to guide the development of sound and practical approaches for measuring the progress and effectiveness/impact of program. The assessment will review the existing M&E system to identify problems in information gathering and during implementation that can adversely affect the measurement of progress management decision-making.

The findings of this assessment will provide robust information for strengthening RMG's and B-SEP's results framework and its monitoring system. The EA will address any serious gaps or shortcomings found with the monitoring and evaluation practice of the program, to be conducted in advance of performance reporting and ILO program evaluations, with the intent of ensuring that the program performance and results will be evaluable. It will also contribute to learning and ILO knowledge on M&E on improving working condition.

The assessment will take into account the following criteria. It should be noted that the criterion questions developed should focus on essential information the M&E framework must contain in order to determine the level of implementation performance. The assessment questions should be mindful that meaningful indicators have to lead to management information and to obtain this management information, a system of data collection, data processing and reporting needs to be set-up.

**Criteria 1: Objectives/Outcomes**

Clarity of the definition of *objectives*, including outcomes that can be comprehended as a major focus of management for results

**Criteria 2: Indicators**

The selection of SMART *indicators* that are quantitative or qualitative and include comparison points of levels, quality and grade. Outcome indicators effectively facilitate the observation of change, while output indicators measure whether the right outputs are produced

**Criteria 3: Baseline**

The existence of sufficient *baseline* data to establish a starting point for comparisons and future measurements of outputs and outcomes

**Criteria 4: Milestones**

A set of time-bound *milestones* that provide a clear sense of the intended path towards achieving established outputs and outcomes

**Criteria 5: Risks and assumptions**

Assessment of factors, namely *risks and assumptions*, likely to affect the achievement of an intervention's objectives, and related contingency measures

**Criteria 6: Monitoring collection data and reporting**

**Assess whether the M&E framework is capable of identifying** progress towards results, precipitate decisions that would increase the likelihood of achieving results, and enhance accountability and learning.

The **specific objectives** of the evaluability assessment are:

1. By using the evaluability assessment process – determine the synergies of two program vis-à-vis M&E whether the two programs could be combined or remain separate from the M&E perspective.
2. To establish whether the RMG and the B-SEP projects have been **designed** in a way that is relevant and results-oriented (*evaluability of project design*)
  - a. To assess the program theory of change and its results framework and identify strength, weaknesses, challenges and lessons learnt in regards to formulation of result and indicators and provide recommendations for strengthening it;
  - b. To assess the extent to which the results and indicators in the logical framework, monitoring plan and performance plan enhance monitoring, reporting and learning by the ILO and Bangladesh tripartite constituents, and provide recommendations on how to strengthen this aspect;
  - c. Outline a possible impact study approach and methodology based on the developed Theory of Change
3. To establish whether the implementation of the RMG and the B-SEP promises to yield credible **information** that will demonstrate progress and effective performance (*availability and quality of relevant information*).
  - a. To assess the monitoring system - its data collection and information system for tracking the program results in terms of their relevance, effectiveness, and coherence and ability to aggregate results from different components to country level and over time and provide recommendation on how they can be improved;
  - b. To provide quality check of the indicators, baselines, targets and incremental milestones and assess their viability, quality of indicators, the baseline information and the data collection that have been collected and track overtime. – provide recommendations for enhance quality and utility

- c. To assess the feasibility and potential sources of bias of information to be collected
4. To establish whether the RMG and B-SEP context are conducive to the establishment and maintenance of an effective monitoring system that will support the conduct of a mid-term review and final evaluation (*capacity and institutional aspects and the practicality and utility of an evaluation, given the nature of the project and the context in which an evaluation could take place*)
  - a. To assess the existing capacity of the RMG and the B-SEP in maintaining the effective monitoring system including assessing the efficiency of organizational arrangement (include assessing the human and financial resources; participation of stakeholders and incorporation of their viewpoint, priorities and concerns
  - b. To assess the extent to which the evaluation can be conducted in a meaningful manner (including impact evaluation) that would provide useful information in terms of the achievement of results or lack thereof, as well as processes that have led to the achievement/non-achievement of results, and that
5. To formulate recommendations on possible RMG and B-SEP actions that would need to be put in place to strengthen the evaluability of the RMG and B-SEP and their possible synergy in regard to M&E

**Supplementary objectives:-**

- To propose refinements to project, program or policy design
- To propose the development and improvement of M&E systems
- To propose options for an evaluation design, including timing, evaluation questions, evaluation methods, resources and expertise

**Scope of the assessment:**

The EA will encompass all components relevant to RMG and to B-SEP and the possible synergy between the two programs. The evaluability assessment is guided by the following overarching framework and issues:

- Bangladesh Decent Work Country Program (2012-2015)
- RMG project documents and its logical framework
- B-SEP project documents and its logical framework
- The ILO interventions targeting RMG sector in Bangladesh (see diagram below)
- Other ILO interventions in the Skill and TVET in Bangladesh
- ILO P&B framework

**Methodology**

The evaluability assessment has **three phases**.

**Phase 1:** (home-based **10 work days**) Desk based Evaluability Assessments - a desk review and analysis of relevant RMG and B-SEP documents focused mainly on the design and information questions (above).



*This phase involves 1) Review of the available documentation; 2) Engagement with some internal stakeholders* Output at the end of phase I – inception report and preliminary inputs to the monitoring plans

**Phase 2:** (on-site visit) the issues raised and recommendations from the Desk based evaluability assessment, and questions about the conduciveness of the RMG and B-SEP context for evaluation will be investigated through key informant interviews with RMG and B-SEP management and staff and also other key stakeholders in Bangladesh. *This phase involves 1) Engagement with broader stakeholders; 2) development of recommendations; 3) Feedback findings to stakeholders.*

Recommendations should cover: (i) Project logic and design, (ii) M&E systems and capacity, (iii) Evaluation questions of concern to stakeholders, (iv) Possible evaluation designs.

Propose 2 in-country missions

First in-country mission (6 work days) during October 25-30, 2014

Final in-country mission and presentation of recommendations and findings (6 work days) during November 22-27, 2014

**Phase 3:** (home-based) write up the final report (10 work days) and finalization of the report (4 work days)

**Management Arrangement:** The management for the conduct of the Evaluability Assessment will be as follows: -

- Regional Evaluation Officer (REO) – will manage and take the responsibility for developing a TOR and the implementation of the EA with the recruitment of the M&E consultant and will liaise with RMG program to facilitate his/her work.
- Senior Evaluation Officer of EVAL – will provide technical backstopping to the EA and will provide oversight to the EA process and report
- RMG and B-SEP CTA/Program Manager and Monitoring and Evaluation Officers – will provide relevant documentations and inputs to the EA during preparatory phase and facilitate the on-site visits of the M&E consultant including the preparation of the mission agenda
- Program staff and the tripartite constituents and national partners – will be engaged at different stages during the process and will contribute inputs to the assessment

### **Deliverables**

The EA shall result into the following concrete results, which are actionable to remedy any flaws in RMG's and in B-SEP's institutional mechanisms, planning process, results framework, and monitoring plan. The following deliverables are expected from the Evaluability Assessment:

1. An inception report (including work plan/design and methodology) for the assessment detailing out the executive plan for the assessment of both RMG and B-SEP
2. A comprehensive Evaluability Assessment Report of both RMG and B-SEP
  - Theory of changes (if the program has not had one)
  - A revised set of M&E plans, including baseline and milestone data, or a clear indication of how the project is collecting these;
  - Short findings reports for each of the program outcomes including specific suggestions for improvements; and

3. A summary overview of issues, with recommendation of systematic improvements for the program and office to make in regard to its evaluability, delivery and accounting for results

<b>Prior to the on-site assignment - preparatory phase</b>		
<b>Key activities /outputs</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Timeline</b>
M&E consultant conducts a desk review of documentation and relevant materials. Submission of Inception report (methodology and detailed workplan for EA) by Oct 31??	M&E consultant	Oct 15-25
<b>On-site assignment – Information gathering</b>		
1 <sup>st</sup> On-site mission - the M&E consultant meets with RMG project team, B-SEP team, and possible partners (TBC).	M&E consultant and RMG and B-SEP team	October 26-30
2 <sup>nd</sup> On-site assignment – the M&E consultant presents the findings and further validation with key stakeholders, ILO staff	M&E consultant and RMG and B-SEP team	November 23-27
<b>Data analysis and preparation of report</b>		
The M&E consultant analyze the data collected from 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> visits and drafts outputs and submits them to REO, RMG and B-SEP teams for review and inputs – by Dec 1	M&E consultant	December 1
Finalize the reports taking into account the comments from ILO and key partners		December 20

#### **Resources and Duration of the contract**

Funding will come from RMG and B-SEP to cover

- 1) the consultant's fee and the Daily Subsistence Allowance (UN rate) and international travel as per ILO rules and regulations
- 2) stakeholders workshop(s)
- 3) transportation during the on-site visit(s)
- 4) interpretation (if need be)

A consultant will be contracted to conduct the evaluability assessment between October to December 2014 for a total work day of 36 days.

### **Proposed Fee schedule for payments:**

Based on an expected input of xx work days and a daily fee of US\$ xx, the value of the total contact is US\$ xx. The fee will be paid as follows:

- first payment - 25% fee + DSA and travel cost– upon submission of the inception report
- second payment - 50% fee upon submission of draft report
- final payment – 25% fee upon submission of the complete final report to the satisfactory of the ILO

### **Qualification and Experience of M&E Consultant**

The M&E consultant should have advanced university degree in development studies, economics. He/she should have a minimum of 15 years experience in planning, monitoring and evaluation of development projects/programs. Has prior experience in developing M&E systems of large development programs and in conducting the evaluability assessments of projects/program. Prior experience in working with UN and ILO will be an advantage.

### **Annexes**

1. Procedure and tools for evaluability review of ILO projects over US\$5 million:  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_239796/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_239796/lang--en/index.htm)
2. Using the evaluability assessment tool:  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165984/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165984/lang--en/index.htm)
3. Dimensions of the evaluability assessment tool:  
[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165985/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165985/lang--en/index.htm)

## **Attachment 2: Evaluability Assessment Plan**

**Draft Evaluability Assessment Plan**

**Bangladesh Skills for Employment and Productivity (B-SEP)**

**&**

**Improving Working Conditions in the Ready-Made Garment Sector  
(RMG)**

**October 2014**

## Abbreviations

B-SEP	Bangladesh Skills for Employment and Productivity
CBT&A	Competency Based Training and Assessment
EA	Evaluability Assessment
EU	European Union
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
ILO	International Labour Organisation
ISC	Industry Skills Council
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NAP	National Tripartite Plan of Action on Fire Safety
NTC	National Tripartite Committee
RMG	Improving Working Conditions in the Ready-Made Garment
TVET	Technical and Vocational Education Training

## 1. Introduction

This Evaluability Assessment (EA) plan outlines the context, approach and methodology to complete an in-depth assessment of current monitoring and evaluation (M&E) arrangements for the Bangladesh Skills for Employment and Productivity (B-SEP) program and the Improving Working Conditions in the Ready-Made Garment (RMG) program.

Both programs are highly visible in terms of size, scope and area of focus. Given the investment of considerable funds and technical expertise, M&E is of critical importance in demonstrating results, progress towards outcomes and in ensuring transparency and accountability. International Labour Organisation (ILO) evaluation policy requires programs, greater than US\$5 million, to complete an EA within the first year of implementation.

The final EA report will cover both the B-SEP and RMG programs and provide guidance, recommendations and technical support to enhance and strengthen current systems where appropriate and relevant.

## 2. Background and Context

The ILO is currently implementing two large-scale programs supporting skills development, strengthening support services and supporting legislative improvements. An outline of the two programs is detailed below.

### ***B-SEP***

The Bangladesh Skills for Employment and Productivity (B-SEP) Program aims to improve the national enabling environment for industry skills development in the TVET sector. The program has built on the existing ILO Technical and Vocational Education Training (TVET) program funded by the European Union (EU). It includes enhancing the market-relevance & effectiveness of the national TVET and skills system, allowing for better quality, more access and an improved capacity to provide and sustain demand driven services. The program aims to increase the employability of young adult women and men, with a particular focus on disadvantaged groups. The program also helps create a better-trained and qualified workforce with increased economic opportunities in target sectors, which will contribute to sustainable economic development, poverty reduction, and social inclusion in Bangladesh. Target sectors are agro-food processing; tourism and hospitality; pharmaceuticals; ceramics; and furniture manufacturing.

The program will address a number of key challenges facing the TVET system on a policy and institutional level. There are four major components under the B-SEP program.

**Component 1: Skills Funding, Planning & Support Services:** the B-SEP program aims to increase the capacity and effectiveness of the skills system in Bangladesh through:

- Improvements to financial planning, management and sustainability of the skills system.
- Improvements to coordination, planning, monitoring and evaluation of skills policies, strategies and programs.
- Enhancements to employment services through pilots in target sectors.

**Component 2: Competency-Based Training and Assessment (CBT&A) Quality & Relevance:**

This component aims at strengthening TVET programs through the quality and relevance of training delivery in selected priority sectors of Bangladesh. It will involve industry in the development and delivery of new competency based programs to ensure that training offerings are align with employer demands. In return, this will assure increase in employability among graduates of TVET in Bangladesh.

**Component 3: Industry Skills Development:** aims to increase the engagement of industry in the skills system by establishing new Industry Skills Councils (ISC) in the target sectors. Industry demand for skills will be encouraged through:

- Increased workplace performance in target sectors through skills development activities
- Improved apprenticeship and skills recognition systems

**Component 4: Improved Access to Skills:** aims to increase equitable access for specific groups in the skills system in Bangladesh through the development and delivery of technical, supervisory and entrepreneurial skills for women and people with disabilities.

This five-year program started its implementation in March 2013 and will end in March 2018.

### **RMG**

The RMG industry, Bangladesh, and the world have been shocked in the past two-years by several major industrial accidents in Bangladesh. This has led to large-scale unrest among thousands of workers resulting in mass demonstrations and disruptions of work in hundreds of factories. A fire at Tazreen Fashions Ltd in November 2012 had 112 casualties and the building Collapse of Rana Plaza in April 2013, which had housed 5 garment factories had taken 1,127 lives. Bangladesh has acted quickly and effectively in response to the tragic accidents in the Ready Made Garment Sector in 2012 and 2013.

Following the tragic accidents, on January 15, 2013 a tripartite statement of commitment on fire safety in the work place was adopted and signed. The Ministry of Labour and Employment and the ILO organized the meeting jointly. In the statement the tripartite partners commit to the development of national plan of action on fire safety.

With the adoption of the Statement, the Tripartite Partners committed to work together to develop a National Tripartite Plan of Action on Fire Safety (NAP) by the end of February 2013, with a view to taking comprehensive action aimed at preventing any further loss of life and property due to work place fires and fire-related accidents and incidents. To ensure the timely development of the NAP, the MoLE established a Tripartite Committee, which met four times with the assistance of the ILO. Ultimately, the MoLE signed off the NAP on 24 March 2013. The NTPA outlines initiatives covering: policy and legislation; administration; and practical activities. It foresees the establishment of a National Tripartite Committee (NTC) to ensure and monitor implementation of the NTPA. The ILO accepts a formal request to assist in the implementation and coordination of the NTPA.

Following the collapse of Rana Plaza on 24 April 2013, a high-level ILO mission was undertaken to convey the solidarity of the ILO with those affected by these tragic events. The Mission engaged with the tripartite partners and other stakeholders to identify what needs to be done to prevent any such future tragedies. As a result of the mission, the Government and social partners adopted a Joint Statement containing a time-bound six point agenda and commitment to develop an action plan identifying actions to be undertaken in the short and medium term to avoid further incidents. The six point agenda includes:

- Submission of labour law amendments to Parliament during its next session (June/July 2013).
- Assessment of all the active RMG factories for fire safety and structural integrity by end 2013 and initiate remedial measures.

- Recruitment and training of 200 inspectors and strengthening the labour inspection system.
- Expanding and fully implementing the Fire Safety Tripartite Action Plan.
- Launching a skills training program for workers rendered disabled and redeployment of workers who were rendered unemployed due to the recent events.
- Consider launching a Better Work Program upon satisfactory completion of labour law reform.

The ILO managed *Improving Working Conditions in the Ready-Made Garment (RMG) Industry* was developed in response to the tragic events, to support the commitments made in the aftermath of them and with the view to help to translate these commitment into practice. The program has five components:

- **Building and Fire Safety Assessment:** supports the commitments made by the tripartite partners to complete a fire safety and structural assessment of all active RMG factories in Bangladesh and initiate remedial action.
- **Strengthen Labour Inspection & Support Fire and Building Inspection:** supports the government to significantly improve the capacity of its inspection systems.
- **Build OSH awareness, capacity and systems,** builds the capacity of workers, supervisors and managers in the RMG sector to improve the safety of their workplaces including the prevention of violence at workplace.
- **Rehabilitation and skills training for victims** responds to the request of the tripartite partners for the ILO to provide immediate rehabilitation services and to launch skills training programs for workers who sustained injuries or lost employment in the tragic events of Tazreen and Rana Plaza.
- **Implementation of a Better Work program:** aims to improve both compliance with labour standards and competitiveness in global supply chains.

The program is intended to achieve major results in building and fire safety and support to survivors. It will build foundations for longer term results and sustainable action through improved legislation, enforcement and oversight capacity of regulatory agencies and through implementation of workplace level systems to improve working conditions by employers and workers, initially in the RMG sector, but with potential to expand to other economic sectors in Bangladesh as well. This support is aimed to ensure that the RMG sector remains a thriving export sector and emerges from this current crisis stronger in terms of building, fire and labour conditions. This is essential given the importance of the sector in the economy of Bangladesh (78% of total export earnings and 14% of GDP). 80% of RMG workers are women.

### 3. Evaluability Assessment Purpose

The purpose of the EA is to enable B-SEP and RMG program management to deliver on objectives and targets detailed in the program design documents. The EA is not a tool to re-design and drastically change the approach but rather an opportunity to reflect and constructively appraise, review and refine approaches as necessary.

Specifically the evaluability assessment will review current objectives and outcomes; associated indicators; assess current baseline approaches; consider the phasing of M&E and consider relevant risks and assumptions.



## 4. Primary Audience

The primary audience for the evaluability assessment are the B-SEP and RMG program teams. The ILO Bangladesh Country Office and the Regional Office in Bangkok are also primary audience members. Secondary audience stakeholders include the Government of Bangladesh and respective donors (e.g. CIDA) who have contributed financial resources to support the program.

## 5. Key Evaluability Assessment Questions

The ToR for the assignment details a number of key questions to be addressed as part of the EA process. Key questions include:

- By using the evaluability assessment process – determine the synergies of the two programs vis-à-vis M&E whether the two programs could be combined or remain separate from the M&E perspective.
- To establish whether the RMG and the B-SEP programs have been **designed** in a way that is relevant and results-oriented (*evaluability of program design*):
  - ✓ To assess the program theory of change and its results framework and identify strength, weaknesses, challenges, and lessons learnt in regards to formulation of result and indicators and provide recommendations for strengthening it.
  - ✓ To assess the extent to which the results and indicators in the logical framework, monitoring plan and performance plan enhance monitoring, reporting and learning by the ILO and Bangladesh tripartite constituents, and provide recommendations on how to strengthen this aspect.
  - ✓ Outline a possible impact study approach and methodology based on the developed Theory of Change.
- To establish whether the implementation of the RMG and the B-SEP promises to yield credible **information** that will demonstrate progress and effective performance (*availability and quality of relevant information*).
  - ✓ To assess the monitoring system - its data collection and information system for tracking the program results in terms of their relevance, effectiveness, and coherence and ability to aggregate results from different components to country level and over time and provide recommendation on how they can be improved.
  - ✓ To provide quality check of the indicators, baselines, targets and incremental milestones and assess their viability, quality of indicators, the baseline information and the data collection that have been collected and track overtime. – Provide recommendations for enhance quality and utility.
  - ✓ To assess the feasibility and potential sources of bias of information to be collected.
- To establish whether the RMG and B-SEP context are conducive to the establishment and maintenance of an effective monitoring system that will support the conduct of a mid-term review and final evaluation (*capacity and institutional aspects and the practicality and utility of an evaluation, given the nature of the program and the context in which an evaluation could take place*)
- To assess the existing capacity of the RMG and the B-SEP in maintaining the effective monitoring system including assessing the efficiency of organizational arrangement

(include assessing the human and financial resources; participation of stakeholders and incorporation of their viewpoint, priorities and concerns.

- To assess the extent to which the evaluation can be conducted in a meaningful manner (including impact evaluation) that would provide useful information in terms of the achievement of results or lack thereof, as well as processes that have led to the achievement/non-achievement of results, and that.
- To formulate recommendations on possible RMG and B-SEP actions that would need to be put in place to strengthen the evaluability of the RMG and B-SEP and their possible synergy in regard to M&E.

## **6. Approach and Methodology**

### **6.1 Desk Review - Preparation of a Plan**

The first component of the EA has been a desk review of all available documents related to both programs. Program designs, M&E plans and associated work plans have been reviewed and initial assessments completed. The review process has also shaped the proposed EA framework and report structure (Attachment 1).

Some initial assessments from the desk review include:

- The programs are highly visible in terms of size, scope and area of focus. M&E would be best served by conducting an initial evaluability assessment.
- Programs have already commenced so there is an urgency to complete an assessment given EA's are traditionally completed 'before' an intervention commences work.
- The EA can act as a useful communication tool to discuss options with key stakeholders and present a clear logic and structure to the program(s).
- It is noted that a Theory of Change (ToC) has not been prepared for either programs (although B-SEP has made a good attempt at a logic model). This would be an immediate planning step and form a critical component of the overall EA.

Additional notes and findings have been documented and will be discussed during the course of Field Visit #1.

### **6.2 Application of ILO Criteria**

In developing the EA framework, the EA plan has considered the ILO guidance notes on a suggested EA instrument and the associated guidelines attached to its application. In addition the EA plan draws upon previous experiences in development EA's and has incorporated relevant aspects into Attachment 1.

The EA design process has also drawn upon other international experience and available literature on the subject.

### **6.3 Field Visit #1**

The purpose of the first field visit is to gain a greater understanding of the context and approach to M&E. This will involve consultations and discussions with key program officers and technical specialists as well as relevant key stakeholders who are involved with the program (i.e. members of PSC's and management committees). Two major results are expected - consultation with stakeholders and the development of a Theory of Change (ToC).

The approach to EA is primarily qualitative through document reviews, semi-structured interviews and group discussions. Due to time limitations not all stakeholders will be consulted or engaged, and the EA process will rely on a sample of key informants to assist in the preparation and completion of the EA.

In completing the EA, the assessment team will apply the ILO's Evaluability Assessment Tool and apply a "scoring" process based on key criteria with associated weightings. The analysis will generate a raw score as well as a weighted score. The following table provides an outline of the assessment process:

Raw Score	Performance Level	Performance Requirements
4	Very good content	Criteria are <b>fully met</b> with a degree of detail that <b>exceeds criteria requirements.</b>
3	Good content	Criteria are <b>fully met</b>
2	Relatively good content	Corresponds to an identification that <b>partly meets</b> the corresponding criteria and that can be subject to <b>further improvements.</b>
1	Poor Content	Corresponds to <b>an inefficient identification</b> of a criteria
0	No content	Corresponds to the <b>non-identification</b> of the criteria assessed.

### 6.3.1 Consultation with stakeholders

Consultations with stakeholders will be prioritised according to availability. Given the short timeframe for the first input, most consultation will be with immediate program staff. However, the EA would benefit from higher-level engagement and the involvement of B-SEP and RMG staff in arranging some high level meetings and consultations would be greatly appreciated.

### 6.3.2 Theory of Change Workshop

The visit will also involved a theory of change workshop where logic models for both programs will be discussed and an attempt made, where relevant and appropriate, to link the two programs. Key questions to discuss in the development of the ToC include:

- What is the desired "end state" for B-SEP and RMG?
- What are the priority outcomes and associated outputs required to achieve that "end-state"
- What information/data is required to demonstrate or provide 'credible evidence' of achievement or results?
- What evaluation methodologies could be considered and employed to achieve results based evidence?
- Do both programs have adequate financial and technical expertise to undertake M&E to a satisfactory standard?
- What aspects of the contextual environment (including risks and assumptions) need to be carefully monitored to ensure programs deliver against respective M&E frameworks?

The ToC workshop will be primarily targeted at key program staff, however additional stakeholders are welcome to attend and their participation will be invaluable in shaping strategic direction moving forward.

At the completion of the workshop, notes and findings will be consolidated to form the basis for further analysis and preparation of the EA report.

## 6.4 Analysis and Report Preparation

Following completion of the first field visit, an analysis report of the EA findings for both programs will be prepared along with a ToC (likely to be two separate models based on desk review findings).

The report will follow the framework included in Attachment 1 and utilise the assessment criteria already utilised by the ILO. This approach is proposed as it aligns with existing policy, utilises language and terms familiar to the ILO and provides a level of consistency across the two programs (i.e. provides a basis for future evaluation missions).

Additional feedback and input may be required from the B-SEP and RMG teams as follow-up questions and points for clarification may be required.

## 6.5 Field Visit #2

The second field visit scheduled for late November 2014 is an opportunity to present key findings from the EA process (Field Visit #1 and Analysis). The visit is also an opportunity to seek clarification on outstanding key points or issues and to clarify initial findings and recommendations.

### 6.5.1 Analysis and presentation of key findings

A presentation will be made to representatives of both programs on the results of the EA analysis. Key findings, suggested recommendations and next steps will be presented, considered and prioritised. There is opportunity for feedback and comment on the findings. At the completion of the presentation, the EA report will be revised to incorporate the feedback and comment of stakeholders.

### 6.5.2 Refinement of M&E plan and associated frameworks

Following submission of the final report, both programs will be responsible for any changes or adjustments to respective M&E plans and frameworks.

## 7. Limitations and Constraints

All EA's, due to their nature and scope, have some form of limitation or constraint. Both the B-SEP and RMG program's have been in operation for 12-months with existing M&E systems. This poses some challenges in that possible adjustments could conflict with current approaches.

The EA also recognises that considerable effort has already been invested into getting the programs operational and that donor expectations are high to demonstrate immediate progress and results. Flexibility needs to be maintained to identify areas and approaches that are positive and add value to the development context. Other limitations for the EA process include:

**Time and Resources:** the rigour of the data gathering analysis will be constrained to some degree by the time available. The EA may not be in a position to meet with all key stakeholders, particularly for follow-up meetings and discussions.

**Scope of the ToR questions:** The ToR contains a significant number of questions and areas of interest that need to be prioritised and ranked. Given the limitation of time, some areas will need to be merged and perhaps considered as secondary.

**Access to work sites:** Engagement with stakeholders may also be impeded by other commitments, availability and time constraints.

**Judgements:** the time limitations mean that professional judgements will need to be employed to interpret stakeholder perspectives and to develop considered and appropriate strategies.

**Attribution:** B-SEP and RMG work in a fluid and dynamic environment and many factors influence performance and operational efficiency. Defining and identifying specific areas of attribution remain challenging at best.

**Measurement of results:** Skills development and associated personal and organisational change remains "open" and challenging to articulate and define. There are no standardised indicators of measurement. This poses a significant challenge in attempting to develop M&E strategies to provide a basis upon which to draw conclusions

## 8. Utilisation of Results

The EA maintains a strong utilisation-focused approach, aimed at providing practical and relevant approaches that support and enhance existing M&E approaches. The development of the ToC will be a joint approach ensuring appropriate levels of consultation and engagement to ensure key stakeholders own the process and the model reflects the current and future strategic and operational direction of the programs.

The EA process will also seek to integrate (where relevant and appropriate) aspects of the ToC between the two programs. The key mandate is simplicity and the EA should not create confusion, duplication or complexity. The staged approach of the EA process provides time for considered reflection and engagement over a longer duration. The phasing of two visits provides opportunity for analysis and preparation of a ToC and a more complete EA.

## 9. Ethical Considerations

The EA will adhere to strict ethical standards during the course of the assessment process. The EA will adhere to the Australasian Evaluation Society's (AES) *Guidelines for the Ethical Conduct of Evaluations*. The EA will also adhere to ILO guidelines and standards for the preparation of EA's.

## 10. Work Schedule

The attached work schedule provides indicative dates for the scheduling of activities and delivery of key EA products. The proposed work plan is flexible and remains open for discussion and consultation.

Key Dates	Action and Deliverable
15-17 & 20-24 October 2014	Desk review and analysis - submission of draft Evaluability Assessment Plan
24 October 2014	Finalisation of Evaluability Assessment Plan
25-30 October 2014	Field Visit #1 - stakeholder consultation and Theory of Change Workshop
3-14 November 2014	Analysis and preparation of draft EA report
17 November 2014	Submit draft EA report for comment and discussion
22-27 November 2014	Field Visit #2
1 December 2014	Incorporation of Comments and Feedback from Field Visits #1 & #2

## Attachment 1: Evaluability Assessment Framework - Draft

Provided below is a suggested Table of Contents for the final report which also contains the key questions that the EA will cover as part of the field missions in October and November. The content is subject to confirmation and agreement with B-SEP and RGM.

### 1. Executive Summary

### 2. Background to the B-SEP and RMG Programs

### 3. Evaluability Assessment - Theoretical Approach and Rationale

### 4. Evaluability Assessment - Methodology

### 5. Goal and Objective Statements for B-SEP and RGM

### 6. Linkage of Programs to Broader Strategic Policies and Documents (Government and ILO)

### 7. Assessment Criteria

**7.1 Criteria 1:** Clarity of the definition of objectives, including outcomes that can be comprehended as a major focus of management for results

Criteria Questions	Elements related to criteria questions
1. Are the long-term ILO priorities and outcomes clearly identified and are the proposals and actions towards achieving outcomes through chosen strategy clearly defined?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognises and addresses tri-partism, social dialogue, and international standards.</li> <li>Contributes towards achieving these priorities.</li> <li>Identifies ILO capacity to carry out the program.</li> </ul>
2. Have the areas of agreement and disagreement with the Constituents' priorities and strategy been clearly identified.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Evidence of consultation with constituents in the process of establishing CP priorities and outcomes.</li> <li>Description of areas of agreements and disagreements on priorities and outcomes among constituents.</li> </ul>
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 MDG strategies and other integrated development plans?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clear alignment to national development framework, UN Country Programs, UNDAF, MDGs or PRS and identify areas in which ILO has a given advantage.</li> </ul>
4. Established partnerships with national and international actors and institutions. Existing relationships or new ones?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides means to collaborate with national and international actors in engaging ILO constituents</li> </ul>

**7.2 Criteria 2:** The selection of SMART indicators that are qualitative and quantitative and include comparison points of levels, quality and grade.

Criteria Questions	Elements related to criteria questions
--------------------	--

1. Are indicators specific?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clear definition of what is being measured.</li> <li>• Indicators measure the intended result.</li> <li>• Data is disaggregated where appropriate</li> <li>• Does it measure the result it is intended to measure; data disaggregated where appropriate.</li> </ul>
2. Are indicators measurable?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to count or otherwise quantify data in accurate manner.</li> <li>• Availability of adequate mechanisms to document verifiable changes.</li> </ul>
3. Are indicators attainable?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicator's target must be feasible with the available resources given a reasonable timescale, and that it is within the program's control and influence.</li> </ul>
4. Are indicators relevant?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is an obvious relationship between the indicator and the objective and goals it is seeking to measure.</li> </ul>
5. Are indicators time bound?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data can be collected frequently enough to inform the progress and influence decisions.</li> </ul>
6. Do indicators have a means of verification?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data sources are known</li> <li>• Data is available at reasonable costs and effort.</li> </ul>

**7.3 Criteria 3:** The existence of sufficient baseline data to establish a starting point for comparisons and future measurements of outputs and outcomes.

Criteria Questions	Elements related to criteria questions
1. Are baselines explicitly stated for each indicator? Are they implicit in the stated objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data is available for performance to be tracked relative to baseline.</li> </ul>
2. Are baselines specific to the program/program?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meet the needs and interests of key stakeholders</li> </ul>
3. Are baselines unambiguous and do they clearly describe the situation prior to the intervention?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The level and quality of primary/secondary data provides reasons for intervention</li> </ul>
4. Will baselines provide an opportunity to compare and measure results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide an adequate basis for judging development results.</li> <li>• Measure the degree and quality of change during implementation</li> </ul>

**7.4 Criteria 4:** A set of time-bound milestones that provide a clear sense of the intended path towards achieving outputs and outcomes.

Criteria Questions	Elements related to criteria questions
1. Do milestones provide a clear sense of the timeframe for the achievement of results?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indicates expected timeframe for deliverables.</li> </ul>
2. Do milestones help identify the path toward outputs and outcomes?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide the means to validate the program is progressing as planned.</li> </ul>

- 
3. Do milestones provide a clear sense of progress towards the development goal? • Indicates completion of a set of deliverables.
- 

**7.5 Criteria 5:** Assessment of factors, namely risks and assumptions, likely to affect the achievement of an intervention's objectives, and related contingency measures.

Criteria Questions	Elements related to criteria questions
1. Have the principal restrictions to achieving outcomes been identified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The quality of the analysis of the identification of the assumptions and risks.</li> <li>• Conditions necessary for the execution of program and its program and the achievement of objectives are identified.</li> </ul>
2. Have risks associated with each strategy been identified?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The presence of adequate risk mitigation.</li> <li>• Articulation of associated risks for each strategy identified and addressed.</li> </ul>
3. Are risk mitigation measures clearly defined and are they supported by theory, logic, empirical evidence and lessons learned.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The adoption or not of risk mitigation or incentive measures including the actions required to complete these strategies.</li> </ul>

**7.6 Criteria 6:** M&E system to identify problems during program and program implementation and facilitate the measurement of progress.

Criteria Questions	Elements related to criteria questions
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?
2. Has a progress monitoring system been defined for objectives and strategy, including actions to be undertaken to record progress?	<p>A data gathering system to generate information on indicators has been defined.</p> <p>Resources have been identified and committed to ensure that predefined data will be collected and analysed.</p> <p>Sources of information are specified for all indicators?</p> <p>Social partners and beneficiaries are expect to participate in M&amp;E</p>
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.

---

## 8. Program Governance Structures and Systems

### 9 Reporting Systems and Process

### 10. Evaluation Capacity and Resources

### 11. Key Conclusions and Recommendations

**Attachment 1: List of People Met**

**Attachment 2: List of Documents Reviewed**

**Attachment 3: Proposed Theory of Change**



### Attachment 3: List of People Consulted

<b>Person Met</b>	<b>Nominated Position</b>
Cezar Dragutan	Chief Technical Adviser (CTA), B-SEP
Tuomo Poutiainen	Program Manager, RMGP
Srinivas B Reddy	Country Director, ILO Bangladesh
Loree Semeluk	Second Secretary (Development) DFATD, High Commission of Canada
Dr. Md. Nurul Islam	Adviser, Skills for Employment, Program Support Unit, DFATD, High Commission of Canada
M Roqibul Islam	Program Manager, DFID
Mahreen Kahn	Adviser, Economic Affairs and Private Sector Development, Kingdom of the Netherlands
Manas Bhattacharyya	Senior Professional Specialist, B-SEP
Francis Dilip De Silva	Senior Specialist, Industry Skills Development (Component 3), B-SEP
Mohammad Nuruzzaman	Program Officer, Improved Access to Skills (Component 4), B-SEP
A N M Tanjel Ahsan	Program Officer, Industry Skills Development (Component 3), B-SEP
Tauvik Muhamad	Workers Education Expert, RMG
Ravi Samithadasa	Project Coordinator, Promoting Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work
Khadija Khondker	Program Officer, Implementation of Bangladesh Compact
Gabriel H Bordado	Technical Adviser, TVET Quality and Relevance, B-SEP
Eng. Md. Babar Ali	Director, Planning and Development, Directorate of Technical Education, Dhaka
Pamornrat Pringsulaka	Evaluation Adviser, ILO Evaluation Unit, Bangkok.

## Attachment 4: List of Documents Reviewed

Project Name	Document
B-SEP	Project Proposal - August 2012
B-SEP	Project Evidence Plan
B-SEP	Monitoring and Inception Plan - July 2014
B-SEP	Project Workplan - October 2013-December 2014
B-SEP	Technical Cooperation Progress Report - April 2013- December 2013
B-SEP	Donor Briefing Presentation - October 2014
B-SEP	CIDA Project Logic Model and M&E Reporting Sections
B-SEP	Implementation Manual: National Technical and Vocational Qualifications Framework (NTVQF), Government of Bangladesh, 2013
MoE	National Skills Development Policy 2011, MoE, Government of Bangladesh
RMG	Project Design Document - RMG (BGD/13/09/MUL)
RMG	Implementation Status of National Tripartite Plan of Action on Fire Safety and Structural Integrity in the Ready Made Garment Sector in Bangladesh
RMG	Performance Plan - August 2014
RMG	Supporting the national action plan for the RMG Sector in Bangladesh (SNAP-B)
RMG	Summary of Programs and Linkages with Government of Bangladesh (GoB) and Compact - Diagram
RMG	Technical Cooperation Progress Report - October 2013-December 2013
ILO	Decent Work Country Program (DWCP) 2012-2015
ILO	Evaluating Lessons Learned and Emerging Good Practices - April 2014
ILO	Towards a safer Ready-Made Garment sector for Bangladesh: Progress made and the way ahead
ILO	Procedure and Tools for Evaluability Review of ILO Projects over US\$5million
ILO	Dimensions of the Evaluability Instrument
ILO	Using to Evaluability Assessment Tool

**Attachment 5: Proposed Theory of Change Diagrams - B-SEP and RMG**



