



Accelerating Progress towards an Integrated and Modernized Social Protection System for All in Thailand (United Nations Joint Programme on Social Protection for All in Thailand) - EVALUATION INCEPTION REPORT

1 ILO DC/SYMBOL: [MPTFO Project Reference Number: PSP 2019 THA]

Type of Evaluation: Joint

Evaluation timing: Final

Evaluation nature: Independent

2 Project countries: [Thailand]

3 P&B Outcome(s): [ILO-P&B 2020-21 Outcome 8; Thailand UNPAF Outcome Strategy 1.]

4 SDG(s): [SDG's 1.3, 10.1 and 2.2]

5 Date when the evaluation was completed by the evaluator: 30 June 2022

6 Date when evaluation was approved by EVAL: 30 June 2022

7 ILO Administrative Office: [ILO ROAP, Bangkok]

8 ILO Technical Office(s): [ILO DWT - Bangkok]

9 Joint evaluation agencies: [ILO, IOM, UNICEF, and UN Women.]

10 Project duration: [1 January 2020 – 30 June 2022]

11 Donor and budget: [United Nations Joint SDG Fund, Total Budget: US \$ 2,661,815 (including co-funding by four Partner UN Organisations, PUNOs)]

12 Name of consultant(s): [Theo van der Loop (Team Leader/International) and Napapan der Kinderen (National)]

13 Name of Evaluation Manager: [Ms. Rattaporn Pongpattana, M&E Officer, ILO ROAP, Bangkok]

14 Evaluation Office oversight: [Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka, Senior Evaluation Officer, ILO ROAP; oversight is also provided by the Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC) and the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG).]

15 Evaluation budget: US\$

Key Words: Social Protection, Social Security, Integrated policy solutions, Child Support, Domestic workers, including women and migrants; Thailand; Asia [Use the ILO Thesaurus](#)

Table of Contents

- Table of Contents ii**
- List of Abbreviations..... iii**
- 1 Introduction and Country Context 1**
 - 1.1 Purpose of the Country Programme Evaluation 1
 - 1.2 Scope of the evaluation..... 2
 - 1.3 Country context 3
 - 1.4 Contents of Inception Report..... 4
- 2 UN Joint Programme..... 5**
- 3 Stakeholder analysis..... 9**
- 4 Evaluation Approach and Methodology..... 10**
 - 4.1 Evaluation Approach 10
 - 4.2 Methodology..... 12
 - 4.3 Management Arrangements..... 15
 - 4.4 Quality assurance 16
 - 4.5 Limitations 16
- 5 Work Plan..... 18**
- ANNEXES 19**
- Annex 1: Terms of Reference (TOR)..... 20**
- Annex 2: List of Stakeholders to be interviewed..... 50**
- Annex 3: Results as per JP Programmatic Results Framework 52**
- Annex 4: Documents Consulted 55**

List of Abbreviations

AA	Administrative Agent
ABND	Assessment-Based National Dialogue
ACT/EMP	(ILO) Bureau on Employers' Activities
ACTRAV	(ILO) Bureau on Workers' Activities
ADB	Asian Development Bank
APEC	Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
BAAC	Bank for Agriculture and Agricultural Cooperatives
BB	Budget Bureau
BKK	Bangkok
CCA	Common Country Assessment
CO	Country Office
CODI	Community Organisations Development Institute
CPO	Country Program Outcome
CSG	Child Support Grant
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
CTA	Chief Technical Adviser
CWF	Community Welfare Fund
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DCY	Department of Children and Youth (MSDHS)
DG	Directorate General
DLA	Department of Local Administration
DOP	Department of Older Persons
DOPA	Department of Provincial Administration
DPM	Deputy Prime Minister
DW	Domestic Workers
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
DWT	ILO Decent Work Team
EA	Evaluability Assessment
EC	European Commission
ECOT	Employers Federation of Thailand
EEF	Equitable Education Fund
EM	Evaluation Manager
EO	Employers' Organisation
ERG	Evaluation Reference Group
ESCAP	Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific Foreign Policy Instrument
EU	European Union
FCD	Foundation for Children Development
FPO	Fiscal Policy Office (MoF)
FPRW	Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work
FSCC	Foundation for Slum Child Care
GCDIMC	Government Central Database Integration and Mobilization Committee
GPF	Government Pension Fund
GSB	Government Savings Bank
HQ	Headquarters
HRDF	Human Rights and Development Foundation
ILO	International Labour Organization
ILS	International Labour Standards
IOM	International Organization for Migration
ITC	International Training Center (ILO)
JEC	Joint Evaluation Committee

JP	Joint Programme
KII	Key informant interview
LCT	Labour Congress of Thailand
LEC	Local Education Center
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDES	Ministry of Digital Economy and Society
MIS	Management Information System
MoE	Ministry of Education
MoF	Ministry of Finance
Mol	Ministry of Interior
MoJ	Ministry of Justice
MoL	Ministry of Labour
MoPH	Ministry of Public Health
MoT	Ministry of Transport
MPTF	Multi-Partner Trust Fund
MSDHS	Ministry of Social Development and Human Security
MWG	Migrant Working Group
NCPE	National Congress Private Industrial of Employees
NESDC	Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NHSO	National Health Security Office
NSC	National Steering Committee
NSF	National Savings Fund
NSO	National Statistical Office
NSWC	National Social Welfare Committee
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OPM	Oxford Policy Management
OSH	Occupational Safety and Health
P&B	Programme & Budget
PARDEV	Partnerships and Field Support
PIER	Puey Ungphakorn Institute of Economic Research
PRODOC	Project Document
PUNO	Partner UN Organizations
PWDs	People with disabilities
QA	Quality Assurance
RCO	UN Resident Coordinator's Office
ROAP	Regional Office for Asia and Pacific
RTG	Royal Thai Government
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SERC	State Enterprises Workers' Relations Confederation
SES	Socio-Economic Survey
SP	Social Protection
SPF	Social Protection Floor
SPDR	Social Protection Diagnostic Review
SPSR	Social Protection System Review
SSF	Social Security Fund
SSO	Social Security Office (MoL)
SWC	State Welfare Card
TDRl	Thailand Development Research Institute
THB	Thai Baht
THPF	Thai Health Promotion Foundation
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
TTUC	Thai Trade Union Congress
TWC	Technical Working Committee
UN	United Nations
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks
UNDG	United Nations Development Group

UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNJP	United Nations Joint Programme
UNPAF	United Nations Partnership Agreement Framework
UNSDCF	United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework
UN Women	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women
USD	United States Dollars
WB	World Bank
WEP	Women Empowerment Principles (UN Women)
WHO	World Health Organization

1 Introduction and Country Context

The present Inception Report describes the understanding of the evaluators of the scope of the Final Joint Independent Evaluation of the programme entitled “*Accelerating Progress towards an Integrated and Modernized Social Protection System for All in Thailand (United Nations Joint Programme on Social Protection for All in Thailand)*”. This evaluation is based on the Terms of Reference for this evaluation, which prescribes a Table of Contents for the present Inception Report which has been followed closely (see Annex 1, pages 18-19).

1.1 Purpose of the ~~Country~~-Joint Programme Evaluation

The main purpose of this final joint independent evaluation is to promote accountability to key stakeholders, including the Government of Thailand and the donor, the UN joint SDG fund, and to enhance learning within the four Partner UN Organizations (PUNO), i.e. ILO, IOM, UNICEF and UN Women, and key stakeholders. Knowledge and information (including lessons learned, good practices, challenges, etc.) obtained from this evaluation, will be used to help inform the design and implementation of similar interventions in the area.

The ToR has specified the following specific objectives for the evaluation:

- Assess the coherence, relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness of the project interventions, while identifying the supporting factors and constraints that have led to them, including strategies and implementation modalities chosen, and partnership arrangements;
- Assess the extent to which the project management and coordination mechanisms adequately addressed the needs and implementation challenges and how effectively the project management monitored project performance and results;
- Provide insights on (i) the contribution to improving the situation of vulnerable groups identified in the JP document (ProDoc), with a focus on disability, (ii) contribution to SDG acceleration, and (iii) contribution to UN reforms, including, UNCT coherence;
- Identify lessons learned, good practices, and recommendations on the design and implementation of similar interventions in the area;
- Assess project impact (including where the project’s support has been most/least effective and why), including the extent to which the RTG’s capacity has been strengthened, and the benefits of the project’s contribution to improvement of social protection system;
- Assess contributions and results of the interventions (both expected and unexpected, both positive and negative changes) and examine how and why the changes were caused by the intervention and measure the size of the effect caused by that intervention or tactic;
- Assess the project’s contribution to COVID-19 immediate responses and recovery;
- Assess the extent to which the Project outcomes will be sustainable, and;
- Assess the extent to which the Project promote gender equality and non-discrimination and disability inclusiveness.

This evaluation will apply the OECD/DAC criteria of Relevance, Validity of design, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Impact and Sustainability. The evaluation will also address the relevant cross-cutting issues, such as Gender equality and non-discrimination, disability inclusion, promotion of international labour standards, tripartite processes and constituent capacity development and environmental issues. Overall, the evaluation will comply with the United

Nations Evaluation Guidelines (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016)¹, and with the ILO Evaluation Policy Guidelines (4th edition, 2020).²

1.2 Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation will cover all the three Components/Outcomes of the UN Joint Programme (UNJP) on Social Protection for All in Thailand which will be described in detail in Chapter 2. The evaluation will further cover the entire programme period, from 1 January 2020 to 30 June 2022, including the no-cost extension from January to June 2022. The geographical scope of the programme covers the country of Thailand; the evaluation will be conducted at the national level only. The main clients and users of the joint independent evaluation include the four PUNOs, the Donor, Government Organisations, Social Partners, Civil Society Organizations, and academic organizations. This will be further detailed in Chapter 3.

The main users of this independent evaluation and their intended use of the evaluation are as follows:

User	Intended Use
<u>Partner UN Organizations (PUNOs): ILO, UNICEF, IOM, and UN Women.</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide accountability and learning from the JP, to inform the design and implementation of future SP/JP interventions. • Inform decision-making for the UNCT in terms of programmatic design and resource allocation based on assessment of performance. • Inform UNCT on how to most effectively support the RTG and key stakeholders to improve SP.
<u>Government Counterparts: Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (Permanent Secretary Office, Department of Children and Youth, Department of Women's Affair and Family Development, Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities, Department of Social Welfare and Development), Ministry of Labour (Social Security Office, Bureau of International Coordination, Department of Employment and Department of Labour Protection and Welfare), Ministry of Finance (Fiscal Policy Office), Ministry of Public Health, Ministry of Interior, and Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council (NESDC), and Equitable Education Fund (EEF).</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide accountability on achievements of the initiative • Inform on UNCT's commitment to continue improving its programming in support SP in Thailand • Reflect on evaluation findings in as much as they also relate to jointly implemented interventions • Engage together with UNCT in the response to the evaluation recommendations • Provide the necessary information for potential scale up of the interventions.
<u>Social Partners, Civil Society Organizations, and other organizations: Migrant Working Group (MWG), Employers Confederation of Thailand (ECOT), Labour Congress of Thailand (LCT), Thai Trade Union Congress (TTUC), National Congress Private Industrial of Employees (NCPE), and State Enterprises Workers Relations Confederation (SERC), Thailand Development Research Institute (TDRI), Thai Health Promotion Foundation, Puey Ungphakorn Institute of Economic Research (PIER),</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflect on evaluation findings in as much as they also relate to jointly implemented interventions • Provide accountability on achievements of the initiative • Inform on areas that need support and improvements to better support results for SDGs and SP

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 10 pt

Formatted Table

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 10 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 10 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 10 pt

¹ <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2787>

² See: https://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS_571339/lang--en/index.htm

i.User	i.Intended Use
Foundation for Children Development (FCD), Foundation for Slum Child Care (FSCC), HomeNet Foundation, and Human Rights and Development Foundation (HRDF).	
Joint SDG Fund	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide accountability and learning from the JP • Inform on areas that need support and improvements to better support results for SDGs and SP that can be used in funding decisions • Provide objective evidence on UNCT's commitment to learning and improving social protection in Thailand

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 10 pt

Formatted Table

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 10 pt

The evaluation will integrate gender dimension, disability inclusion and other non-discrimination issues as cross-cutting concerns throughout the methodology, deliverables, and final report of the evaluation. In terms of this evaluation, this implies involving both men and women in the consultation, evaluation analysis and evaluation team. Moreover, the evaluators will review data and information that is disaggregated by sex and gender and assess the relevance and effectiveness of gender related strategies and outcomes to improve the lives of women and men.

1.3 Country context

Thailand has been internationally recognized for its continuous development in the past decades, transitioning from a low-income country to a middle-income country in 2011. This reflects that Thailand's efforts to reduce poverty as part of its policies to improve the quality of life of its people can be considered successful. This success can be partly explained by the Royal Thai Government's (RTG) relatively comprehensive social protection system. There are **44 government welfare programmes** that take care of people in all age ranges. These programs are owned by **11 ministries**, comprised of 27 cash welfare programmes owned by the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (MSDHS), the Ministry of Interior, the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, and the Ministry of Education, and 17 non-cash welfare programs, such as subsidies for utilities cost, supports of land use rights, moratorium of loan repayment, provision of loans, and trainings. The non-contributory welfare programmes are complemented by a comprehensive social insurance scheme managed by the Social Security Office, including several branches such as pension; invalidity; working injury; family, health, sickness and maternity benefits.³

However, Thailand's economic growth has **not been inclusive**. Growth has been concentrated only in some areas, giving rise to geographical inequality and income inequality. Even though the government has continuously attempted to resolve these issues, circumstances have not significantly changed for the better as reflected in a slight decrease in the Gini Coefficient from 0.487 in 1988 to 0.445 in 2015. The joint Programme Document (PRODOC) identified four significant "last mile" **challenges**:

- 1) Policies are not integrated as there is no comprehensive programmatic approach to social protection.
- 2) There are gaps in coverage for vulnerable groups, particularly migrant and domestic workers.

³ Based on the Joint Programme Document (PRODOC) for the United Nations Joint Programme on Social Protection for All in Thailand (Revised, 27 August 2021).

- 3) The poverty reduction impact of existing social protection benefits is limited.
- 4) Ensuring the financial sustainability of the welfare system, in particular because Thailand is going through a quick process of *ageing*.

In terms of **Gender analysis**, Thailand has an increasingly progressive society when it comes to gender roles. Nevertheless, women are still under-represented in public and private sectors, including in the parliament, government, judiciary and administration both at national and local levels. In addition, protection from gender-based violence against women leaves much to be desired and so does equal pay to men with the same work. The challenges impact particularly on certain groups including domestic workers and migrant women, and in certain geographical regions e.g. the southern border provinces of Thailand.

During the period being covered by the evaluation two **key changes** can be identified in the context. Firstly, the COVID-19 Pandemic starting in March 2020 impacted on the planned activities resulting in delays and necessitated a complete review in planning and implementation modalities. Secondly, the political crisis in Myanmar may have an impact in terms of the number of Migrant Workers and/or displaced persons entering Thailand.

1.4 Contents of Inception Report

The present Inception Report outlines in the next chapter the UN context, the Results Framework and the Theory of Change of the UN Joint Programme, followed in Chapter 3 by the stakeholder analysis. Chapter 4 provides an overview of the evaluation approach and methodology, including the deliverables, the management arrangements, quality assurance, as well as the limitations identified in the inception phase. The last chapter describes the work plan.

2 UN Joint Programme

Context of UN response

The United Nations Joint Programme (UNJP) on Social Protection for All in Thailand is a joint ILO, IOM, UNICEF and UN Women project. It is funded by the **Joint SDG Fund** which is an innovative instrument to incentivize the transformative policy shifts and stimulate the strategic investments required to get the world *back on track* to meet the SDGs. The UN Secretary-General sees the Joint SDG Fund as a key part of the reform of the UN's development work by providing the “muscle” for a new generation of Resident Coordinators (RCs) and UN Country Teams (UNCTs) to really *accelerate SDG implementation*. The UNJP targets two relevant Outcomes of the Joint SDG Fund:

- Outcome 1: Integrated multi-sectoral policies to accelerate SDG achievement implemented with greater scope and scale; and
- Outcome 2: Additional financing leveraged to accelerate SDG achievement.

The Joint Programme directly addresses the following **SDG Targets**:

- The proportion of the population covered by social protection benefits, particularly for families with children (SDG 1.3)
- Reducing malnutrition (SDG 2.2)
- Increasing the income of the bottom 40% of the population (SDG 10.1)

The Joint Programme (JP) is further aligned to the Thailand **United Nations Partnership Agreement Framework (UNPAF)**, in particular its Outcome Strategy 1: “Collaborate at national and sub-national levels to strengthen systems, structures and processes for effective, inclusive and sustainable policymaking and implementation”. It is also aligned to the new **United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) 2022 – 2025**, especially to Outcome 2 to improve human capital needed for social and inclusive development through strengthening institutions, partnerships and the empowerment of people, and to Outcome 3 to enable people living in Thailand, especially those at risk of being left furthest behind, to participate in and benefit from development, free from all forms of discrimination.

With regards to the **National SDG Framework**, the 20-year national strategy (2018–2037) is Thailand's first national long-term strategy developed pursuant to the Constitution. Social protection relates to two of the six key strategies: (i) Development of human capital and (ii) Social equality and equity.

Programme strategy, objectives, goals, reach and achievements

The UNJP **aims** to enhance and integrate Thailand's social protection system, and reach those being left behind, especially for the more vulnerable groups, such as children, elders, informal workers, migrant workers, and people with disabilities. Under this project, the Child Support Grant will be scaled up from supporting 700,000 children to 2 million by the end of 2021, as a result of the strengthened integrated social protection systems. Policy changes to the existing social security schemes will be designed and tested, to allow for more effective coverage of domestic workers, including women and migrants. The **long-term vision** of the JP is to increase the social protection coverage towards **universality**, including for children and specific vulnerable groups (including domestic workers and migrant workers), through sustainable social protection systems, including floors, contributing to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda in Thailand. The overall

intended **result** of the JP is that the government's social protection system is reformed in a way to ensure effective and efficient implementation of policies for all populations, including migrants and children.

The **Intervention Logic** of the JP is given in the Results Framework (cf. PRODOC 2021: 40-44) which includes the outcome statement, indicators, targets and means of verification. The JP outcome statement identified **3 Outcomes** and **10 Outputs** which are listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Outcome, Outputs and Responsible PUNOs of the UNJP.

Outcome statement	Responsible PUNO
<p>Outcome 1: Integrated policy solutions developed following a review of the social protection system</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Output 1.1:</u> Policy dialogue to foster dialogue on strategic directions for social protection in Thailand <u>Output 1.2:</u> Public Advocacy on the importance of social protection is increased, including among the public opinion and decision makers <u>Output 1.3:</u> A comprehensive review of the social protection system developed and followed by policy recommendations for a more inclusive, integrated and coherent system <u>Output 1.4:</u> National Social Protection Policy Framework and a National Social Protection Monitoring Framework 	ILO, UNICEF, IOM, UN WOMEN
<p>Outcome 2: Scale up of coverage of the Child Support Grant from 700,000 children to 2 million by end of 2021 because of strengthened integrated social protection systems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Output 2.1:</u> Improved capacity of the national identification system to register and monitor through the MIS the registration of new beneficiaries <u>Output 2.2:</u> National policy consultations on integration of the cash/non-cash under the Child support grant with transformative programs for ECD in place for maximizing the potential of the grant to all children <u>Output 2.3:</u> Evidence generation for the impact of the grant on young children in Thailand to inform further policy expansions towards UCSG <u>Output 2.4:</u> Improved public and programme communication 	UNICEF
<p>Outcome 3: Provide policy options to ensure a more effective coverage of domestic workers, including migrants, within the existing social security schemes, are designed and tested</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Output 3.1:</u> Policy assessment and design of innovative program solutions to eliminate the barriers for the coverage of domestic workers developed and discussed <u>Output 3.2:</u> Pre-test of suggested policy options with targeted domestic workers completed, and assessed 	ILO, IOM, UN WOMEN

The **Theory of Change** (ToC) consists of three straightforward "If...then ..." statements, one for each of the three outcomes, and these are included in the ToR (page 5; see Annex 1).

At this point in time only a very preliminary assessment of the program's logic/ToC can be provided since only very few interviews have been done in which this could be discussed in depth. As mentioned, the three statements in the ToC are straightforward and are logical in itself. Similarly, the ten outputs are logically deduced from the three respective Outcomes. However, the three Outcomes themselves seem, at first sight, rather diverse. While Outcome 1 is fully directed at the national policy level targeting Universality of social protection, Outcome 2 targets in particular the Monitoring Information System (MIS) of the Child Support Grant (CSG). Outcome 3 has again a different focus targeting domestic workers (Migrants and Thai nationals, in particular women). The logic behind having such a three-pronged approach and its effectiveness will be further investigated during the present evaluation.

Formatted: Font: Italic

The total **Budget** of the programme is USD 2,661,815 of which 75% is provided by the Joint SDG Fund while the remaining part is provided through co-funding by the four PUNOs with

contributions in the form of staff expertise (see Table 2). The size of the allocations between PUNOs reflect the requirements per output.

Table 2: Funding and Co-Funding of the UNJP Thailand.

Funding	Funding in USD	%
Joint SDG Fund	1,999,815	75.1
Co-funding ILO	240,000	9.0
Co-funding UNICEF	230,000	8.6
Co-funding UN Women	100,000	3.8
Co-funding IOM	92,000	3.5
TOTAL	2,661,815	100.0

The joint programme is using a pass-through fund management modality where the UNDP Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) Office acts as the Administrative Agent (AA) under which the funds are channelled through the AA. Each PUNO receiving funds through the pass-through has signed a standard MoU with the AA. Each PUNO shall assume full programmatic and financial accountability for the funds disbursed to it by the AA, and funds will thus be administered by each UN Agency in accordance with its own regulations, rules, directives and procedures.

The **Target groups** of the project include children and informal and migrant workers (often women who are domestic workers) and the elder. This joint programme aims to address geographical and age coverage, improvement of the governance system for social protection, including implementation and improved fiscal space, and improved methods for capturing the poor and invisible such as migrants, preferably through a better focus on universal schemes and specific provisions for groups hard to cover such as migrant and domestic workers. Beyond the traditional life-cycle approach, particular attention will be given to groups such as homeless people and people with disabilities.

An overview of most of the **Achievements** until January 2022 are listed in the Annual Progress Report for 2021 in terms of results against the JP Programmatic Results Framework and these results are summarized in Annex 3. These results as well as the expected *final* targets will be discussed with the stakeholders during the interviews, and analysed in comparison to the planned outcomes, outputs and indicators.

Programme Implementation

The **National Social Welfare Committee (NSWC)**, chaired by the Deputy Prime Minister (DPM), is the main decision-making body engaged at the policy level, with key government agencies participating and led by the National Economic and Social Development Council (NESDC) and Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (MSDHS). The Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO) engages at this level representing the PUNOs. With the Secretariat to the Committee based within MSDHS, this provides the main channel for ongoing engagement with the Committee. The **Technical Working Committee (TWC)** was convened to supervise and develop the overall Social Protection Review (the Diagnostic Review) and specific background papers as required, conducting quality assurance. Comprehensive policy recommendations will be developed by the Technical Working Committee and put forward to the NSWC.

In the implementation arrangements between partner UN organizations the **RCO** plays a central role in coordinating the work of the UN Agencies and leading the political dialogue, ensuring the

UN delivers a harmonized message at different policy levels, including the high-level policy dialogue. **ILO** is the lead UN entity on the overall system diagnostic due to their active technical and advisory role on social protection in Thailand, as well as global role and expertise. **UNICEF** will take the lead role on the component associated with the Child Support Grant whilst **IOM and UN Women** will jointly co-lead the development of solutions for the extension of coverage for domestic workers and for the inclusion of migrant workers, in technical collaboration with the ILO.

A joint, annual **Project Steering Committee (PSC)** has been established co-chaired by the Permanent Secretary of the MSDHS and the UNRC in Thailand. The PSC members include high-level representatives of relevant ministries and government agencies (i.e., MSDHS, MOL, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Public Health, NESDC, etc.) as well as members of the academia. The objective of the PSC is to ensure that all related government agencies are aware of the project's objectives and implementation, and to review the programme's progress and activities.

3 Stakeholder analysis

The evaluation will adopt a **participatory** process and will consult with RCO, all PUNOs, RCO, tripartite constituents, donor and other key stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. These stakeholders are expected to participate actively in the evaluation process, and they were invited to provide inputs to the TOR and the composition of the evaluation team; they will furthermore be invited to participate in the online stakeholders' workshop as well as to review the draft evaluation report.

The key stakeholders to be **interviewed** for the present independent joint evaluation were identified jointly with the Evaluation Manager, the Joint Evaluation Committee (JEC) and the PUNOs on the basis of the list provided in the ToR (Annex 1), and they include the following:

- A. UN Organizations:
 - The PUNOs: ILO, UNICEF, IOM and UN Women,
 - RCO,
- B. Government Counterparts:
 - Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (Permanent Secretary Office, Department of Children and Youth, and Department of Policy Development and Social Innovation),
 - Ministry of Labour (Permanent Secretary Office, and Social Security Office),
 - Ministry of Finance (Fiscal Policy Office),
 - Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council,
- C. Social Partners, Civil Society Organizations, and academic organizations:
 - Employers Confederation of Thailand (ECOT),
 - State Enterprises Workers Relations Confederation (SERC),
 - Migrant Working Group (MWG),
 - Foundation for Children Development (FCD),
 - Foundation for Slum Child Care (FSCC),
 - HomeNet Foundation,
 - Thailand Development Research Institute (TDRI),
 - Puey Ungphakorn Institute of Economic Research (PIER),
- D. Donor: Joint SDG Fund.

A list of the respective contact persons to be interviewed is included in Annex 2.

[Through the interviews with these key stakeholders and the other methods used \(cf. Section 4.2\) the present evaluation will investigate the respective roles that these stakeholders have played in the design, in the implementation, and in the monitoring of the Joint Programme.](#)

4 Evaluation Approach and Methodology

4.1 Evaluation Approach

The present evaluation will address the eight OECD/DAC *Evaluation Criteria* including cross-cutting issues, which have been identified in the Terms of Reference (ToR) as follows (cf. Annex 1, p. 8-10):

A. Relevance	B. Validity of Design
C. Coherence	D. Effectiveness, including of the management response
E. Efficiency	F. Impact
G. Sustainability	H. Cross-Cutting Issues

For each of the eight Evaluation Criteria distinguished above, a series of *Evaluation Questions* have been identified in the ToR, and they are provided in the *Evaluation Matrix, or in ILO terminology, Data Collection Worksheet* in Table 3. These questions have been partially changed in the present Inception Report (changes are given in red). The *Data Collection Worksheetmatrix* further describes the way that the identified Sources of Data, Stakeholder Interviews and Specific Methods used will support each of the original 26 evaluation questions. Table 3 will specifically also be used as the interview guide.

Formatted: Font: Bold, Italic

Table 3: *Evaluation Matrix/Data Collection Worksheet: Evaluation Criteria and Questions, and the sources of data, stakeholder interviews and specific methods used.*

Evaluation Criteria and Questions	Sources of Data	Stakeholder Interviews	Specific Methods
A. Relevance			
1) To what extent the JP has responded to the need of the tripartite constituents, beneficiaries and recipients?	Policies of RTG and of Social Partners, PRODOC, Annual Progress Reports (APR), UNPAF/UNSDCF, SDGs, PUNO Country Programmes	RTG & Social Partners, CSOs & Research Institutions (RIs), JP Team/PUNOs (incl. RCO), PUNO country offices	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
2) Do the JP activities (i.e. awareness raising, advocacy, and policy capacity building interventions) meet the needs and priorities of the RTG and other key stakeholders?	Policies of RTG and of Social Partners, PRODOC, Annual Progress Reports (APR)	RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs, JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
3) How important is the JP's intervention for the target beneficiaries and to what extent does it address their needs and interests? <i>Merge with Evaluation Question (EQ) 1, as they address the same needs/interests.</i>	---	---	---
4) How relevant is the JP to the <i>partners</i> : respective country programmes of the four PUNOs in Thailand?	PUNO Country Programmes, PRODOC, APR, UNPAF	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
5) To what extent was the project able to remain relevant and adapt in response to the COVID-19 crisis as well as the local context?	APR, PSC Minutes, No-cost extension request	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews

B. Validity of Design			
6) Is the Theory of Change for programme components adequately described and is there clarity of logic across the results levels?	LogFrame/ ToC, PRODOC, APR	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices, MSDHS, MoL	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
7) To what extent are results, indicators, and activities measurable?	LogFrame/ ToC, PRODOC, APR	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices	
C. Coherence			
8) To what extent does the JP work effectively between the PUNOs agencies, and with other organizations to achieve expected results?	APR, PRODOC, UNPAF/UNSDCF, SDGs, PUNO Country programmes, Joint SDG Fund policy	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices Joint SDG Fund, RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
9) To what extent the JP contributed to UN reforms, including UNCT coherence?	UNPAF/UNSDCF, SDGs, PUNO Country progr.'s, Joint SDG Fund policy, APR, PRODOC	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices Joint SDG Fund	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
10) To what extent does the JP work effectively to promote social protection consistently with other initiatives in this area?	UNPAF/UNSDCF, SDGs, PUNO Country programmes, Joint SDG Fund policy, APR, PRODOC	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices Joint SDG Fund, RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
D. Effectiveness			
11) To what extent have the interventions achieved its expected results and outputs?	PRODOC, LogFrame/ ToC, APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports produced	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices Joint SDG Fund, RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
12) What factors were crucial for the achievement or failure to achieve the expected results? What key challenges have detracted from the effectiveness of activities?	APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices Joint SDG Fund, RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
13) To what extent has the project management, monitoring systems and coordination mechanisms effectively addressed the needs and implementation challenges?	PRODOC, LogFrame/ ToC, APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices Joint SDG Fund	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
14) Were the RTG and partners satisfied with the quality of tools, technical advice, training, and other activities delivered by the project?	APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports, Communication strategy documents	RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs, JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices Joint SDG Fund	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
15) To what extent the JP contribute to acceleration toward the relevant SDGs?	UNPAF/UNSDCF, SDGs, PUNO Country progr.'s, Joint SDG Fund policy, APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices Joint SDG Fund, RTG	Documents review & Stakeholder Interviews
E. Efficiency			
16) Has the allocation of financial, human, institutional and technical resources been optimal for achieving the results?	Financial Reports, APR, PSC Minutes, No-cost extension request	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices Joint SDG Fund, RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs	Review of Financial Reports & Stakeholder Interviews
17) Have the project activities been completed on-time /according to the project document and adjusted to take into account COVID-19? If not, what factors have hindered timely delivery and what counter-measures have been taken to address them?	Financial Reports, APR, PSC Minutes, No-cost extension request	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices Joint SDG Fund, RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs	Review of Financial Reports & Stakeholder Interviews
F. Impact			
18) How has the project impacted on the social protection systems? Has the	APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs,	Documents Review &

JP contributed to improved social protection systems/schemes? How?		JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices	Stakeholder Interviews
19) Have institutional attitudes and mindset been changed as a result of the JP/JP activities? How?	APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs, JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices	Documents Review & Stakeholder Interviews
20) To what extent has the government agencies institutionalized the support provided by the project? Who uses the JP knowledge materials and outputs? Are they likely to be catalysts for change?	APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs, JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices	Documents Review & Stakeholder Interviews
21) What approaches have potential for further upscaling and/or replication through future work by the UN agencies and its partners?	APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices, Joint SDG Fund, RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs	Documents Review & Stakeholder Interviews
G. Sustainability			
22) To what extent will activities, results and effects be expected to continue after project activities have ended? How will this be ensured? What are the strong evidences that they would be continued?	APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices, RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs	Documents Review & Stakeholder Interviews
23) To what extent have constituents/relevant stakeholders been involved in the implementation of the project? To what extent has the project identified and engaged with the right stakeholders to achieve its objectives?	APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs, JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices, Joint SDG Fund	Documents Review & Stakeholder Interviews
H. Cross-Cutting Issues			
24) To what extent did the project facilitate and strengthen social dialogue to achieve its expected results? To what extent are the JP management and implementation guided by tripartite dialogue?	PRODOC, APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs, JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices	Documents Review & Stakeholder Interviews
25) To what extent are the target beneficiaries reached? Did the project ensure gender balance and inclusion of people with disability in the beneficiary outreach? To what extent have persons with disabilities been consulted through their representative organizations?	APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices, RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs, Joint SDG Fund	Documents Review & Stakeholder Interviews
26) To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality and non-discrimination and disability inclusiveness?	APR, PSC Minutes, JP documents & reports	JP Team/PUNOs, PUNO country offices, RTG & Social Partners, CSOs/RIs, Joint SDG Fund	Documents Review & Stakeholder Interviews

4.2 Methodology

Ethical Considerations

The Evaluation Team, consisting of an international and a national evaluator, will conform to guidelines and standards set by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016), UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system (2008), UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (2020), UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator (2018), and UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation (2014).

Formatted: Font: Bold, Italic

Implementation of Methodology in three Phases

The evaluation will apply an appropriate mix of qualitative and quantitative methods to gather data and information in order to offer diverse perspective to the evaluation and to promote engagement of key stakeholders of the project at all levels during the design, field work, validation and reporting stages. The data gathered through those methods will be triangulated to increase the validity and rigor of the evaluation findings. The methodology for the collection of evidences will be implemented in **three phases**:

1) Inception Phase

In this first phase, initial discussions are held with the ILO Evaluation Manager and the ILO JP Team. Upon reviewing several key documents, including the ToR, the PRODOC, Annual Progress Reports (APR), the LogFrame and the Theory of Change, the present **Inception Report** was prepared following the special Checklist in the ToR (Annex 1, p.18-19).

2) Data Collection Phase

In this phase the full list of project support **documents** including correspondence, JP Documents and Reports published, UNPAF/UNSDCF, SDG relevant documents, PUNO Country programmes (incl. ILO-DWCP), Joint SDG Fund policy, communication and awareness campaign materials, financial data, project website, etc., will be further investigated (see Annex 4).

Most primary data will be collected through a series of **Key Informant Interviews** with JP staff and relevant specialists of PUNOs, Government agencies/service providers, tripartite constituents, civil society organizations, research institutions and representatives of the donor and members of the Project Steering Committee. The full list of informants to be interviewed specified by component is provided in Annex 2. This list of **31 stakeholders** was developed by the evaluator with the support of the JP ILO Team and the Evaluation Manager. The criteria for selecting these stakeholders for interviews is based on purposive sampling based on the degree of engagement in the project. The questions to be asked to these stakeholders relate to all of the eight Evaluation Criteria discussed in Section 4.1, whereby the 26 Evaluation Questions listed in Table 3 above will be used as a checklist for these interviews.

The COVID-19 restrictions on travel will prevent the evaluation consultants from traveling to or within Thailand. Therefore, the interviews undertaken will be conducted online jointly by the international and national evaluator, where necessary with the support of simultaneous translation.

Focus Group Discussions (FGD) with beneficiaries and an online survey were also considered and discussed with the Evaluation Manager and the ILO JP Team, but it was decided that their usefulness will be quite limited because the UNJP was implemented more at the macro level involving many discussions and interactions at the *national* policy level, without concrete interventions in the field; therefore, many (potential) beneficiaries and recipients are not aware of the programme and/or have no knowledge about the JP's activities.

The **quantitative** methods employed by the evaluation will include the investigation of the quantitative indicators used in the programme, as well as of the Annual Progress Reports (APR), for example to arrive at a quantification of the achievements (see e.g. Annex 3). Furthermore, it will include a quantitative analysis of the financial data (see e.g. EQ 16 & 17 in Table 3). Lastly,

Formatted: Font: Bold, Italic

when studying the full set of documents (cf. Annex 4), desk reviews will be undertaken of any existing surveys and social protection databases.

At the end of the data collection phase the Evaluation Team will present the *initial, preliminary findings* to the key stakeholders in a virtual **Stakeholders' Workshop** to discuss validate and refine the findings and fill information gaps. The feedback provided at this workshop will subsequently be included in the draft report (see also below under 'Deliverables').

3) Data analysis and reporting phase

The third and final phase includes the data analysis and the preparation of a draft report and ultimately the final report (for details see below under 'Deliverables').

To the extent possible, the data collection, analysis and presentation will be responsive to and include issues relating to gender equality, diversity and non-discrimination, including disability issues. **Gender concerns** will be addressed in accordance with ILO Guidance note 4: "Considering gender in the monitoring and evaluation of programmes". **Disability inclusion** will be addressed in accordance with Annex 4 of the ToR (cf. Annex 1) and in line with the Leaving No One Behind principle and the obligations stemming from the Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities, as well as with the *Joint statement on inclusive social protection system for full and effective participation and inclusion of persons with disabilities*.⁴ It will be investigated in how far the UNJP ensures that persons with disabilities can actually access the program without discrimination.

Main Deliverables

- a) The present **Inception Report** follows the report structure detailed in Annex 1 of the ToR (see Annex 1). This report will be approved by the Evaluation Manager in consultation with the Evaluation Reference Group, ERG (PUNOs).
- b) **PowerPoint Presentation (both in Thai and English)** will provide the preliminary evaluation findings and recommendations at the end of the field work phase, which will be presented at a virtual **Stakeholders' Workshop**. This half day workshop will be technically organized by the Evaluation Team with the logistic support of the UNJP. The comments from stakeholders will be considered in the draft evaluation report.
- c) **First draft of Evaluation Report**. The ToR for this evaluation provides a suggested report structure in its Annex 2 (see Annex 1). Section 4.4 of the present report outlines the measures taken for quality assurance of the report. The draft report will be circulated by the Evaluation Manager to key stakeholders, who will be requested to return their comments within a specified period of time (usually not more than 10 to 14 working days).
- d) **Final version of the evaluation report (both in Thai and English)** will incorporate the comments received (or a specific justification for not integrating a comment). The report will be no longer than 50 pages excluding annexes. The quality of the report will be assessed against the ILO EVAL Checklist 6 taking into account the specific measures for quality assurance taken for this joint programme (cf. Section 4.4). The final version is subjected to final approval by the ILO Evaluation Office (after initial approval by the evaluation manager, ERG and Regional Evaluation Officer). **The joint evaluation report will be translated into Thai.**

⁴ <https://www.social-protection.org/gimi/qess/RessourcePDF.action?ressource.ressourceId=55473>

- e) A stand-alone **Executive Summary** and **Lessons Learned and Good Practices** in the respective ILO templates.

4.3 Management Arrangements

The UNJP programme is subject to a joint independent evaluation with established arrangements for managing it. The evaluation will be led by ILO and managed jointly by the partner agencies (PUNOs) through a joint evaluation management team, the **Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)**. The evaluation report will be submitted to the ILO Evaluation Office for its evaluation repository.⁵ Ms. Rattanaporn Pongpattana, M&E Officer from ILO ROAP, will be the **Evaluation Manager**. The evaluation Team Leader reports to the evaluation manager. The evaluation manager is responsible for completing a series of specific tasks listed in the ToR (see page 12 in Annex 1).

The **ILO**, as lead agency in the JP, will handle administrative and contractual arrangements with the evaluators and provide logistical and other assistance as required.

A **Joint evaluation Committee (JEC)** is set up as the main decision-making structure. It is chaired by RC and composed by in-country PUNO M&E specialists who had no prior involvement in the project implementation. Primary responsibilities of the JEC include:

- Approving ToRs, endorsing the overall evaluation framework and the release of the evaluation products;
- Providing oversight of the evaluation and being accountable for its robustness; and
- Reviewing and approving all deliverables including the evaluation reports.

The **Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)** is set up and comprised of a small group of key UN internal stakeholders, i.e. project staff of ILO, UNICEF, IOM, and UNWOMEN. The ERG provides comments and substantive feedback to ensure the quality – from a technical point of view – of key evaluation deliverables. Its primary responsibilities include:

- Provide comments on the development of the ToRs;
- Providing project documents and materials to the ILO National Project Coordinator and Evaluation Manager;
- Providing list of interviewees and their contact details;
- Helping schedule interviews/consultations when needed;
- Being on hand and available to provide information, written inputs, and face to face interviews as requested;
- Participating in the stakeholders' workshop;
- Contributing to quality assurance through comments and feedback on draft deliverables; reviewing and providing feedback on the terms of reference, inception report, draft and final evaluation report; and
- Develop the Evaluation Management Response in consultation with stakeholders.

The evaluation will be conducted with the support of a team of consultants, an international and a national consultant. This **Evaluation Team** will have the final responsibility for the evaluation report and ensure the quality of data (validity, reliability, consistency, and accuracy) throughout the analytical and reporting phases. The Team reports to ILO's Evaluation Manager.

⁵ See UNEG Resource Pack on Joint evaluation for more details: <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1620>

All **stakeholders**, particularly the four PUNOs, the donor, The Royal Thai Government, the Workers' and Employers' organizations, NGOs/CSOs and other key partners will be consulted throughout the process and will be engaged at different stages during the process. They were given the opportunity to provide inputs to the TOR and will be invited to provide comments to the draft evaluation report.

4.4 Quality assurance

Quality assurance will be undertaken throughout the entire evaluation process by ILO in close consultation with the ERG, which is leading on quality assurance of all deliverables. ILO/ERG will provide quality assurance in line with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines and other relevant procedures checking that the evaluation methodologies, findings and conclusions are relevant, and recommendations are implementable, and contribute to the dissemination of the evaluation findings and follow-up on the management response.

ILO/ERG will review the initial deliverables (such as draft inception report, first draft of the final report) and work with the Evaluation Team on necessary revisions to ensure the deliverables meet minimum quality standards. Once the minimum standards are met, the Evaluation Manager requests feedback from stakeholders, consolidates all comments from the ERG and other key stakeholders on a response matrix and requests the Evaluation Team to indicate actions taken against each comment in the production of the penultimate, and final draft.

ERG provides comments and substantive feedback to ensure the quality – from a technical point of view – of key evaluation deliverables including the inception report and draft report, while ILO is responsible for final quality assurance checking and final sign off on all deliverables of the evaluation

The **Risk Assessment** in the ToR includes the table in its Annex 3 (see Annex 1). This table sets out selected risks based on previous evaluation experiences, and possible mitigation measures. As far as applicable, these have all been addressed in the present inception report, as follows:

- Covid-19 situation: See Section 4.2.
- Over-ambitious scope: Realistic design in methodology (cf. Section 4.2).
- Insufficient time and attention paid to the evaluation at critical points in the process: Well-balanced division of time and attention (see Sections 4.2 and Chapter 5).
- Major crisis in the country: Not applicable.
- Poor performance by the Evaluation Team: Not applicable.

4.5 Limitations

The Evaluation assignment is clearly laid out in the ToR (Annex 1) and the list of stakeholders to be interviewed is quite comprehensive and is representative of the main stakeholders (see Annex 2). The travel restrictions laid out by Thailand as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic will prevent the evaluators from undertaking field missions to/within the country. In this regard, the evaluation draws on internal ILO guidance, in particular the document: *Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO: An internal guide on adapting to the situation*⁶ and its update of 19 August

⁶ See: http://www.ilo.ch/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_741206.pdf, and www.ilo.ch/eval/WCMS_744068/lang--en/index.htm

2021.⁷ The ***mitigation strategy*** will be to focus on conducting virtual and phone interviews with project stakeholders through online means of communication.

Formatted: Font: Bold, Italic

⁷ https://www.ilo.org/eval/WCMS_817079/lang--en/index.htm

5 Work Plan

It is foreseen that the duration of this Joint Final Evaluation will fall in the period March - June 2022. The level of efforts includes 30 working days for the Team Leader/International Evaluator (IE) and 15 working days for the National Evaluator (NE). The workplan was arrived at after consultations with the Evaluation Manager and the JP ILO Team and is provided in Table 4 below. It indicates the timing of the key steps and of the deliverables for the evaluation, and at the same time outlines the responsibilities of each member of the evaluation team and the level of effort for each step.

Table 4: Work Plan by Phase, Deliverables, Timeline and Level of Effort of Evaluators.

Phase	2022	Tentative Timeline	IE/Days	NE/Days
Inception Phase	28 Mar – 8 Apr	Briefings, Develop Inception Report	10	2
	8 – 11 Apr	ERG/JEC review of Inception Report		
Data Collection Phase	11 - 15 Apr	(<i>Songkran/Thai holiday</i>) Revise inception report by IE Interview International Stakeholders	7	7
	18 –29 Apr	Data collection: Interviews		
Two Workshops	2 - 6 May	1) Stakeholders Validation Workshop (to be attended by RCO team lead, Donor, PUNOs, ILO specialists, National Constituents and other key partners.	10	3
	9 – 13 May	2) Present Preliminary Findings at PSC meeting. Validate the Translation of the PowerPoint into Thai		
Draft/Final Report	2 - 16 May	Write Draft report		
	18 May	Share Draft Report with Key Stakeholders for review		
	30 May – 1 June	Send consolidated comments to Evaluators Finalize report & Validate the Translation into Thai	3	3
	5 June	Evaluators submit Final Report		
TOTAL			30	15

ANNEXES

Annex 1: Terms of Reference (TOR)

Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference

Final Joint Independent Evaluation

Joint Programme Title	Accelerating Progress towards an Integrated and Modernized Social Protection System for All in Thailand (United Nations Joint Programme on Social Protection for All in Thailand)
Project Location	Thailand
Type of Evaluation	Joint Evaluation
Evaluation timing	Final
Project Period	1 January 2020 – 30 June 2022
Implementation Agency	ILO, IOM, UNICEF, and UN Women
Funding Agency	United Nations Joint SDG Fund
Total budget	US \$ 2,661,815
Type of contract	External Collaboration Contract
Structure of Evaluation team	A team of evaluation consultants including 1 team leader (Thai or foreigner) and 1 national evaluator
Expected evaluation dates	1 March 2022 – 15 June 2022
Evaluation Manager	Rattanaporn Pongpattana, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
Joint Evaluation Committee	Composed of RC/O and PUNO M&E Specialists or relevant staff who had not prior involvement in the project implementation, the JEC has the approves authority of the evaluation process and report.
Evaluation Reference Group	Comprised by project teams from all the PUNOs, the ERG provides comments and substantive feedback to ensure the quality – from a technical point of view – of key evaluation deliverables including the inception report and draft report.

Contents

Abbreviations	Error! Bookmark not defined.
I. Background of the Joint Programme	22
II. Purpose, objectives and scope of the joint evaluation	24
III. Clients and users of the joint evaluation	25
IV. Evaluation Criteria & Key evaluation questions	27
V. Evaluation Methodology	29
Ethical considerations	30
VI. Main Deliverables	30
VII. Management Arrangements and Duration	31
VIII. Qualifications	34
IX. Evaluation timetable and schedule	35
X. Role of key stakeholders	37
XI. Legal and Ethical Matters	38
XII. Annexes	38
Annex 1: Inception Report structure	38
Annex 2: Evaluation Report Format	41
Annex 3: Assessing Risks and mitigating against these	41
Annex 4 - Disability evaluation and guiding questions on Persons with Disabilities	42
Annex 5: UNEG Ethical Code of Conduct	44
Annex 6 - Other resources for inception and evaluation reports	49

Abbreviations

DWCP	ILO Decent Work Country Programme
DWT	ILO Decent Work Technical Support Team
EM	Evaluation Manager
ERG	Evaluation Reference Group
JEC	Joint Evaluation Committee
JP	Joint Programme
PUNOs	Partner UN Organizations
RCO	UN Resident Coordinator's Office
ROAP	ILO Regional Office of Asia and the Pacific
SP	Social Protection

Background of the Joint Programme

[i-xxiii](#). While Thailand has been internationally recognized for its efforts to reduce poverty and its development from a low-income country to a middle-income country, its economic growth has not been fully inclusive. Growth has been concentrated only in some areas, giving rise to both geographical and income inequality. The government also needs policy support as aging population and an influx of migrants and domestic workers increase demand for social protection.

[ii-xxiv](#). The Accelerating Progress towards an Integrated and Modernized Social Protection System for All in Thailand (United Nations Joint Programme (UNJP) on Social Protection for All in Thailand), funded by the Joint SDG Fund, is a joint ILO, IOM, UNICEF, and UN Women project. The JP aims to enhance and integrate Thailand's social protection system, and reach those being left behind, especially for the more vulnerable groups, such as children, elders, informal workers, migrant workers, and people with disabilities. Under this project, the Child Support Grant will be scaled up from supporting 700,000 children to 2 million by the end of 2021, as a result of the strengthened integrated social protection systems. Policy changes to the existing social security schemes will be designed and tested, to allow for more effective coverage of domestic workers, including women and migrants.

[iii-xxv](#). **The Long-term vision of the JP is** to increase the social protection coverage towards universality, including for children and specific vulnerable groups (including domestic workers and migrant workers), through sustainable social protection systems, including floors, contributing to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda in Thailand.

[iv-xxvi](#). **Overall Result:** The government's social protection system is reformed in a way to ensure effective and efficient implementation of policies for all populations, including migrants and children.

i. Outcome statement	i. Responsible agency
<p>i. Outcome 1: Integrated policy solutions developed following a review of the social protection system</p> <p>xxx. Output 1.1: Policy dialogue to foster dialogue on strategic directions for social protection in Thailand</p> <p>xxxi. Output 1.2: Public Advocacy on the importance of social protection is increased, including among the public opinion and decision makers</p> <p>xxii. Output 1.3: A comprehensive review of the social protection system developed and followed by policy recommendations for a more inclusive, integrated and coherent system</p> <p>xxiii. Output 1.4: National Social Protection Policy Framework and a National Social Protection Monitoring Framework</p>	<p>i. ILO, ii. UNICEF, iii. IOM, iv. UN WOMEN</p>

<p>i. Outcome 2: Scale up of coverage of the Child Support Grant from 700,000 children to 2 million by end of 2021 because of strengthened integrated social protection systems</p> <p>xix. Output 2.1: Improved capacity of the national identification system to register and monitor through the MIS the registration of new beneficiaries</p> <p>ii-xl. Output 2.2: National policy consultations on integration of the cash/non-cash under the Child support grant with transformative programs for ECD in place for maximizing the potential of the grant to all children</p> <p>xli. Output 2.3: Evidence generation for the impact of the grant on young children in Thailand to inform further policy expansions towards UCSG</p> <p>xlii. Output 2.4: Improved public and programme communication</p>	<p>i. UNICEF</p>
<p>i. Outcome 3: Provide policy options to ensure a more effective coverage of domestic workers, including migrants, within the existing social security schemes, are designed and tested</p> <p>xlv. Output 3.1: Policy assessment and design of innovative program solutions to eliminate the barriers for the coverage of domestic workers developed and discussed</p> <p>xlvii. Output 3.2: Pre-test of suggested policy options with targeted domestic workers completed, and assessed</p>	<p>i. ILO, i. IOM, i. UN WOMEN</p>

[xxviii.](#) [i.](#)

[xxix.](#) [ii.](#)

[xxx.](#) [ii.](#) Theory of change

[xxxi.](#) [iii.](#) The causal logic for the change is as follows:

[xxxii.](#) [iv.](#) - **If** the national policies are revised and harmonized to ensure full coverage along the life cycle, based on clear diagnostic evidence on the current status quo and impact; alignment and harmonization of targeting mechanisms; clear projections for fiscal sustainability; and clear policy coordination mechanisms for leadership of design and implementation of reform, **then** the social protection system is likely to function in an effective and efficient manner and contribute to the acceleration of achievement of indicators under SDG 1.3.

[xxxiii.](#) [iv.](#) - **If** the monitoring and registration system for the Child Support Grant is fully upgraded and improved, including infrastructure system and vertical and horizontal human resources capacity; if the policy is revised to include statutory linkages with other existing high quality/impact supply side interventions; and if additional evidence is generated on the longer-term impact of the CSG, **then** the projected 2.4 million children will be able to have access and enjoy the developmental benefits from the policy. This is also likely to lead to the acceleration effects of the Child Support Grant on the achievement of SDG 1.3. and other related indicators such as 2.1. and 2.2. as well as 4.2.

[xxxiv.](#) [vi.](#) - **If** the specific rights of migrants and domestic workers, are reflected in revised and expanded social protection schemes and adequate and sustainable social

protection benefits are also considered for them under the social protection system in Thailand, **then** the social protection system is likely to be more equitable and offer a maximized potential for adopting a life-cycle approach that fully captures the potential current population dynamics in Thailand and the region for influencing prosperity in Thailand, ensure inclusive growth as well as contribute to the achievement of SDGs, namely 5.4 and 10.1.

[xxxv-lvii.](#) The project contributes to the following SDG targets:

[xxxvi-lviii.](#) (SDG 1.3) The proportion of the population covered by social protection benefits is expanded, particularly for families with children

[xxxvii-lix.](#) (SDG 2.2) The expansion of the Child Support Grant and the establishment of further linkages with other Early Childhood Services is expected to contribute to reducing malnutrition

[xxxviii-lx.](#) (SDG 10.1) A more effective social protection system should increase the income of the bottom 40% of the population

[xxxix-lxi.](#)

[xl-lxii.](#) **The Target groups** of the project include: children and informal and migrant workers (often women who are domestic workers) and the elder. This joint programme aims to address geographical and age coverage, improvement of the governance system for social protection, including implementation and improved fiscal space, and improved methods for capturing the poor and invisible such as migrants, preferably through a better focus on universal schemes and specific provisions for groups hard to cover such as migrant and domestic workers. Beyond the traditional life-cycle approach, particular attention will be given to groups such as homeless people and people with disabilities.

[xli-lxiii.](#)

[xlii-lxiv.](#)

[xlii-lxiv.](#) Purpose, objectives and scope of the joint evaluation

[xlili-lxv.](#)

[xliv-lxvi.](#) The main purpose of this final joint independent evaluation is to promote accountability to key stakeholders, including the Government of Thailand and the donor-UN joint SDG fund, and to enhance learning within the PUNOs, and key stakeholders. Knowledge and information (including lessons learned, good practices, challenges, etc.) obtained from this evaluation, will be used to help inform the design and implementation of similar interventions in the area.

[xlv-lxvii.](#) The final joint independent evaluation has the following specific objectives:

- Assess the coherence, relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness of the project interventions, while identifying the supporting factors and constraints that

have led to them, including strategies and implementation modalities chosen, and partnership arrangements;

- Assess the extent to which the project management and coordination mechanisms adequately addressed the needs and implementation challenges and how effectively the project management monitored project performance and results;
- Provide insights on (i) the contribution to improving the situation of vulnerable groups identified in the JP document (ProDoc), with a focus on disability, (ii) contribution to SDG acceleration, and (iii) contribution to UN reforms, including, UNCT coherence;
- Identify lessons learned, good practices, and recommendations on the design and implementation of similar interventions in the area;
- Assess project impact (including where the project’s support has been most/least effective and why), including the extent to which the RTG’s capacity has been strengthened, and the benefits of the project’s contribution to improvement of social protection system;
- Assess contributions and results of the interventions (both expected and unexpected, both positive and negative changes) and examine how and why the changes were caused by the intervention and measure the size of the effect caused by that intervention or tactic;
- Assess the project’s contribution to COVID-19 immediate responses and recovery;
- Assess the extent to which the Project outcomes will be sustainable, and;
- Assess the extent to which the Project promote gender equality and non-discrimination and disability inclusiveness.

xlvi-lxviii.Scope

xlvii-lxix.Operational scope: The evaluation will cover all the three components of the project. Where possible, interviews should be taken with ultimate beneficiaries and recipients. The evaluation will cover the entire project period, from 1 January 2020 to 30 June 2022.

xlviii-lxx.Geographical Scope: Thailand

Clients and users of the joint evaluation

lix-lxxi.The main users of this independent evaluation will include

<u>User</u>	<u>Intended Use</u>
<u>Partner UN Organizations (PUNOs):</u> ILO, UNICEF, IOM, and UN Women.	<u>•</u> Provide accountability and learning from the JP, to inform the design and

User	Intended Use
	<p>implementation of future SP/JP interventions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inform decision-making for the UNCT in terms of programmatic design and resource allocation based on assessment of performance. • Inform UNCT on how to most effectively support the RTG and key stakeholders to improve SP.
<p>Government Counterparts: Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (Permanent Secretary Office, Department of Children and Youth, Department of Women’s Affair and Family Development, Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities, Department of Social Welfare and Development), Ministry of Labour (Social Security Office, Bureau of International Coordination, Department of Employment and Department of Labour Protection and Welfare), Ministry of Finance (Fiscal Policy Office), Ministry of Public Health, Ministry of Interior, and Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council, and Equitable Education Fund (EEF).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide accountability on achievements of the initiative • Inform on UNCT’s commitment to continue improving its programming in support SP in Thailand • Reflect on evaluation findings in as much as they also relate to jointly implemented interventions • Engage together with UNCT in the response to the evaluation recommendations • Provide the necessary information for potential scale up of the interventions.
<p>Social Partners, Civil Society Organizations, and other organizations: Migrant Working Group (MWG), Employers Confederation of Thailand (ECOT), Labour Congress of Thailand (LCT), Thai Trade Union Congress (TTUC), National Congress Private Industrial of Employees (NCPE), and State Enterprises Workers Relations Confederation (SERC), Thailand Development Research Institute (TDRI), Thai Health Promotion Foundation, Puey Ungphakorn Institute of Economic Research (PIER), Foundation for Children Development (FCD), Foundation for Slum Child Care (FSCC), HomeNet Foundation, and Human Rights and Development Foundation (HRDF).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflect on evaluation findings in as much as they also relate to jointly implemented interventions • Provide accountability on achievements of the initiative • Inform on areas that need support and improvements to better support results for SDGs and SP
<p>Joint SDG Fund</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide accountability and learning from the JP • Inform on areas that need support and improvements to better support results for SDGs and SP that can be used in funding decisions • Provide objective evidence on UNCT's commitment to learning and improving social protection in Thailand

Evaluation Criteria & Key evaluation questions

lxiii-xcv. The table below provides the list of evaluation criteria and evaluation questions. It is expected that the evaluation will address all of these questions. Any fundamental changes to the suggested evaluation questions must be agreed upon in advance between the evaluation team and the EM in consultation with the stakeholders.

	Theme	Evaluation Questions
1	Relevance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent the JP has responded to the need of the tripartite constituents, beneficiaries and recipients? Do the JP activities (i.e. awareness raising, advocacy, and policy capacity building interventions) meet the needs and priorities of the RTG and other key stakeholders? How important is the JP’s intervention for the target beneficiaries and to what extent does it address their needs and interests? How relevant is the JP to the partners’ respective country programmes in Thailand? To what extent was the project able to remain relevant and adapt in response to the COVID-19 crisis as well as the local context?
2	Validity of design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the Theory of Change for programme components adequately described and is there clarity of logic across the results levels? To what extent are results, indicators, and activities measurable?
3	Coherence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent does the JP work effectively between the PUNOs agencies, and with other organizations to achieve expected results? To what extent the JP contributed to UN reforms, including UNCT coherence? To what extent does the JP work effectively to promote social protection consistently with other initiatives in this area?
4	Effectiveness (including effectiveness)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent have the interventions achieved its expected results and outputs?

	Theme	Evaluation Questions
	of the management response)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What factors were crucial for the achievement or failure to achieve the expected results? What key challenges have detracted from the effectiveness of activities? • To what extent has the project management, monitoring systems and coordination mechanisms effectively addressed the needs and implementation challenges? • Were the RTG and partners satisfied with the quality of tools, technical advice, training, and other activities delivered by the project? • To what extent the JP contribute to acceleration toward the relevant SDGs?
5	Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the allocation of financial, human, institutional and technical resources been optimal for achieving the results? • Have the project activities been completed on-time /according to the project document and adjusted to take into account COVID-19? If not, what factors have hindered timely delivery and what counter-measures have been taken to address them?
6	Impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How has the project impacted on the social protection systems? Has the JP contributed to improved social protection systems/schemes? How? • Have institutional attitudes and mindset been changed as a result of the JP/JP activities? How? • To what extent has the government agencies institutionalized the support provided by the project? Who uses the JP knowledge materials and outputs? Are they likely to be catalysts for change? • What approaches have potential for further upscaling and/or replication through future work by the UN agencies and its partners?
7	Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent will activities, results and effects be expected to continue after project activities have ended? How will this be ensured? What are the strong evidences that they would be continued?

	Theme	Evaluation Questions
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent have constituents/relevant stakeholders been involved in the implementation of the project? To what extent has the project identified and engaged with the right stakeholders to achieve its objectives?
8	Cross-Cutting Issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent did the project facilitate and strengthen social dialogue to achieve its expected results? To what extent are the JP management and implementation guided by tripartite dialogue? To what extent are the target beneficiaries reached? Did the project ensure gender balance and inclusion of people with disability in the beneficiary outreach? To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality and non-discrimination and disability inclusiveness?
9	Lessons learned and good practices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the good practices from this project which can be adopted/replicated in other similar projects? What should have been different, and should be avoided in similar future projects?

Evaluation Methodology

The Evaluation Team will be expected to conform to guidelines and standards set by the UN the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation (2016), UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN system (2008), UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (2020), UN SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator (2018), and UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation (2014).

The evaluation is an independent evaluation and the final methodology and evaluation questions will be determined by the Evaluation Team in consultation with the Evaluation Manager, and the Evaluation Reference Group.

The evaluation will apply an appropriate mix of qualitative and quantitative methods to gather data and information in order to offer diverse perspective to the evaluation and to promote engagement of key stakeholders of the project at all levels during the design, field work, validation and reporting stages. To collect the data for analysis, the evaluation will make use of the techniques listed below (but not limit to). The data from these sources will be triangulated to increase the validity and rigor of the evaluation findings.

Desk review of project design and strategy documents (PRODOC), progress reports, activity documents, communications, research, and publications, ILO DWCP Thailand, UNPAF, SDG relevant documents.

Key informant interviews/Focus Groups/Survey with project staff and relevant specialists of PUNOs, Government agencies/service providers, tripartite constituents, civil society organizations and other stakeholders and partners, and FGDs with beneficiaries, i.e. informal and migrant workers. A survey may be undertaken, if deemed necessary.

Evaluation approach and method should be determined by the evaluator in consultation with the Evaluation Manager on the basis of what is appropriate and feasible to meet the evaluation purpose and objectives, and answer to evaluation questions. Selection of the field visits locations should be based on criteria to be defined by the evaluation team, and to be approved by the Evaluation Manager.

Due to the current COVID19 situation, the methodology may need to be flexible and field visits to the project sites may face some challenges. The Evaluation Team once on board will review relevant documents and will discuss with the project management to prepare a detailed inception report. The inception report will elaborate in detail proposed methods of data collection (face-to face or remotely etc.) and that they must be reliable, most practical, and sensitive to the situation faced by different key stakeholders whom to be interviewed etc.

At the end of the field work the Evaluation Team will present preliminary findings to the project key stakeholders in a workshop to discuss validate and refine the findings and fill information gaps.

Ethical considerations

The bidder will set out how they expect the evaluation process to be designed and undertaken in accordance with ethical guidelines as set out in UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (2020). During the evaluation process, full compliance with all UNEG ethical guidelines will be required. All informants should be offered the option of confidentiality for all methods used. Dissemination or exposure of results and any interim products must follow the rules agreed upon in the contract. In general, unauthorized disclosure is prohibited. Any sensitive issues or concerns should be raised, as soon as they are identified, with the evaluation management team.

Main Deliverables

~~lxiv~~.xcvi.a) **An inception report** - upon the review of available documents and an initial discussion with the project management team of ILO and PUNOs, and the donor, the inception report will follow the report structure detailed in Annex 1.

The Evaluation Manager before proceeding with the fieldwork should approve the inception report in consultation with the ERG (PUNOs).

[xxx-xcvii](#).b) **PowerPoint Presentation slides** (both in **Thai and English**) that provide key evaluation findings and recommendations at the end of field work phase

[xxx-xcviii](#).c) **Stakeholders' workshop**. A half day workshop will be technically organized by the Evaluation Team with the logistic support of the project, to present key evaluation findings and recommendations at the end of field work phase. The comments from stakeholders will be considered in the draft evaluation report.

[xxx-xcix](#).d) **First draft of Evaluation Report**. See Annex 2 for suggested report structure and Section VIII for quality assurance of the report.

[xxx-c](#).d) **Final version of the evaluation report** (both in **Thai and English**) incorporating comments received (or a specific justification for not integrating a comment). The report should be no longer than 50 pages excluding annexes. The quality of the report will be assessed against the EVAL checklist 6. The report should also include a section on output and outcome level results against indicators and targets as well as comments on each one. The final version is subjected to final approval by ILO Evaluation Office (after initial approval by the evaluation manager, ERG and Regional evaluation officer). **The joint evaluation report must be translated into Thai.**

[xxx-ci](#).e) **Executive summary and Lessons Learned and Good Practices** in ILO template

[xxx-cii](#).

Management Arrangements and Timeline

[xxx-ciii](#).The programme is subject to a joint independent evaluation with established arrangements for managing it. The evaluation will be led by ILO and managed jointly by the partner agencies through a joint Evaluation management team, i.e. ERG. The evaluation report should be submitted to ILO Evaluation Office for its evaluation repository. Kindly refer to the [UNEG Resource Pack on Joint evaluation](#) for more details.

[xxx-civ](#).An M&E Officer from ILO ROAP will be the **Evaluation Manager**. Evaluation Team leader reports to the evaluation manager. The evaluation manager is responsible for completing the following specific tasks:

- Draft and finalize the evaluation TOR with inputs from key stakeholders including PUNOs team (draft TORs to be circulated for comments);
- Develop a call for expression of interest and manage selection of an independent Evaluation Team in coordination with Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and ILO Evaluation Office (EVAL);

- Brief the evaluator on ILO evaluation policies and procedures;
- Initial coordination with the project team on the development of a field mission schedule and a preliminary result workshop;
- Approve the inception report;
- Circulate the first draft of the evaluation report for comments by key stakeholders;
- Ensure the final version of the evaluation report address ERG's and other stakeholders' comments (or an explanation why any comment has not been addressed) and meets ILO requirements, and;
- Share the report with RCO and PUNOs for the final approval.

[lxxxiii.cvi](#) **ILO project team**

[lxxxiv.cvi](#) The ILO, as lead agency, will handle administrative and contractual arrangements with the evaluator and provide logistical and other assistance as required.

[lxxxv.cvii](#) **Joint evaluation Committee**

[lxxxvi.cviii](#) A Joint evaluation Committee (JEC) should be set up as the main decision-making structure. It is chaired by RC and composed by in-country PUNO staff (e.g. M&E specialists) who had not prior involvement in the project implementation. The JEC has the approves authority of the evaluation process and report. Primary responsibilities include:

- Approving ToRs, endorsing the overall evaluation framework and the release of the evaluation products;
- Providing oversight of the evaluation and being accountable for its robustness;
- Reviewing and approving all deliverables including the evaluation reports;

[lxxxvii.cix](#)

[lxxxviii.cx](#) **Evaluation Reference Group (PUNOs teams).**

[lxxxix.cxi](#) An Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) should be set up and comprise a small group of key UN internal stakeholders, i.e. project staff of ILO, UNICEF, IOM, and UNWOMEN. Primary responsibilities include:

- Provide comments on the development of the ToRs;
- Providing project documents and materials to the ILO National Project Coordinator and Evaluation Manager;
- Providing list of interviewees and their contact details;

- Helping schedule interviews/consultations when needed;
- Being on hand and available to provide information, written inputs, and face to face interviews as requested;
- Participating in the stakeholders' workshop;
- Contributing to quality assurance through comments and feedback on draft deliverables; reviewing and providing feedback on the terms of reference, inception report, draft and final evaluation report, and;
- Develop the Evaluation Management Response in consultation with stakeholders.

[xc-cxii.](#)

xc-cxiii. Evaluation Team

[xcii-cxiv.](#) The evaluation will be conducted with the support of a team of consultants. The Evaluation Team will have the final responsibility for the evaluation report and ensure the quality of data (validity, reliability, consistency, and accuracy) throughout the analytical and reporting phases. The Evaluation Team will agree on the distribution of work and schedule for the evaluation and stakeholders to consult. It is expected that the report will be written in an evidence-based manner.

[xciii-cxv.](#) The Evaluation Team reports to the ILO's Evaluation Manager.

[xciv-cxvi.](#)

VIII. Quality Assurance

Quality assurance throughout the process will be undertaken by:

- **ILO in consultation with the ERG**, leading on quality assurance of all deliverables, will provide quality assurance in line with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines and other relevant procedures checking that the evaluation methodologies, findings and conclusions are relevant, and recommendations are implementable, and contribute to the dissemination of the evaluation findings and follow-up on the management response. ILO/ERG will review the initial deliverables (such as draft inception report, first draft of the final report) and work with the Evaluation Team on necessary revisions to ensure the deliverables meet minimum quality standards. Once the minimum standards are met, the Evaluation Manager requests feedback from stakeholders, consolidates all comments from the Evaluation Reference Group, and other key stakeholders on a response matrix and requests the Evaluation Team to indicate actions taken against each comment in the production of the penultimate, and final draft.
 - **ERG** provides provide comments and substantive feedback to ensure the quality – from a technical point of view – of key evaluation deliverables including the inception report and draft report.

- o **ILO** is responsible for final quality assurance checking and final sign off on all deliverables of the evaluation

IX. Qualifications

~~xv-cxvii.~~ **The Evaluation Team leader** has the responsibility to undertake the evaluation and deliver all the required deliverables as per this TOR. He/she will be supported by a national consultant.

~~xvi-cxviii.~~ The table below described desired competencies and responsibilities for an evaluation team leader

Responsibilities	Profile
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Conduct evaluation and deliver all deliverables under this TOR ✓ Desk review of programme documents and other related documents ✓ Develop evaluation instrument and draft inception report ✓ Virtual interviews with project team and specialists of PUNOs ✓ Undertake a field visit within Thailand (to be determined) ✓ Facilitate stakeholders' workshop/ debriefing with the programme and key stakeholders ✓ Draft evaluation report ✓ Finalize evaluation ✓ Draft stand-alone evaluation summary as per standard ILO format 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Not been previously involved with the Accelerating Progress towards an Integrated and Modernized Social Protection System for All in Thailand Project. ✓ Can be either Thai or foreigner. ✓ University Degree, with 10-12 years of experience in Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) experience, including significant experience with UN development cooperation projects. ✓ A minimum of 8 evaluations led at the program and/or outcome levels with international organizations. ✓ Experience in conducting evaluations for UN agencies or major bilateral donor country programs, and familiarity with UNEG Norms and Standards. ✓ Strong background in the areas of organizational and institutional capacity building, Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA) programming, and Results-Based Management and Monitoring. ✓ Ability to bring gender dimensions in to the evaluation including design, data collection, analysis and reporting writing. ✓ Has extensive knowledge, and experience in applying, qualitative and quantitative research methodologies. ✓ Excellent analytical skills and communication skills. ✓ Demonstrated excellent report writing skills in English. ✓ Prior professional experience in social protection issues (ideally in Asia) would be an advantage.

~~xix-cxxi.~~

~~xx-cxxii.~~ The table below described desired competencies and responsibilities for the Evaluation Team member

Responsibilities	Profile
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Desk review of programme documents and other related documents ✓ Assist the team leader in developing evaluation instrument and drafting inception report ✓ Take part in the interviews with key stakeholders and assist in note taking during interview ✓ Undertake a field visit in Thailand ✓ Assist the team leader in facilitating stakeholders' workshop/ debriefing with the programme and key stakeholders ✓ Contribute to the drafting of the evaluation report prepared by the team leader ✓ Might be requested to write certain sections in the draft report as requested by the team leader · participate in and jointly facilitate the stakeholders workshop ✓ Provide interpretation during the evaluation data collection as required ✓ Translate the final evaluation report and PPT slides into Thai language. While ILO could provide translation service, it is the responsibility of the Evaluation Team to check the accuracy of the translation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Not been previously involved with the Accelerating Progress towards an Integrated and Modernized Social Protection System for All in Thailand Project.; ✓ Thai national ✓ University Degree, with 5-8 years of experience in Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) experience, including significant experience with UN development cooperation projects; ✓ Demonstrated technical expertise in evaluation methodologies and demonstrated skills and experience in undertaking evaluations of similar projects; ✓ Strong background in the areas of organizational and institutional capacity building, Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA) programming, and Results-Based Management and Monitoring; ✓ Has extensive knowledge, and experience in applying, qualitative and quantitative research methodologies; ✓ Excellent analytical skills and communication skills; ✓ Demonstrated excellent report writing skills; ✓ Knowledge of UN evaluation norms and UN programming is desirable; ✓ Prior professional experience in social protection issues (ideally in Asia) would be an advantage.

X. Evaluation timetable and schedule

[eiii-cxxv](#). The evaluation will be conducted tentatively between **1 March 2022 and 15 June 2022**. The final report is due on 15 June 2022.

Task	Responsible person	Timeline
Preparing and drafting TOR Evaluation Manager	Evaluation Manager	October 2021
Sharing the TOR with all stakeholders for comments/inputs	Evaluation Manager	October 2021
Finalization of the TOR	Evaluation Manager	October 2021
Approval of the TOR EVAL	JEC	Oct 2021
Circulation of TOR		7 November 2021-7 February 2022
Selection of consultant team	Evaluation Manager/ILO ROAP/JEC	27 November 2021
Sign the contract (vendor registration requires 2 weeks)		20 February 2022
Brief evaluators on ILO evaluation policy	Evaluation Manager	1 March 2022
Desk review, and audio/skype/video conference with project, and inception report	Project and evaluators (at home based)	Submission of inception report – 1 st week of March 2022
Data collection	Evaluator	Between 3 rd week of March and 3 rd week of April 2022
Stakeholder consultation workshop	Evaluator/All stakeholders	on 4 th week of April 2022
Drafting of evaluation report and submitting to the Evaluation Manager	Evaluator	Early May 2022.
Sharing the draft report to all concerned for comments	Evaluation Manager	2 nd week -3 rd week of May 2022.
Consolidated comments on the draft report, send to the evaluator	Evaluation Manager/ERG/JEC	3 rd week of May 2022.
Finalisation of the report	Evaluator	4 th week of May -1 st week of June 2022
Review of the final report	Evaluation Manager/ERG/JEC	2 nd week of June 2022
Submission of the final evaluation report	Evaluation Manager	June 2022

Task	Responsible person	Timeline
Approval of the final evaluation report	JEC	15 June 2022

[civ-cxxvi.](#)

Proposed workdays (payable days) for the Evaluation Team

Phase	Responsible Person	Tasks	# days
i.I	i.Evaluator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Briefing with the evaluation manager, the project team and the donor - Desk Review of programme related documents - Stakeholder analysis - Inception report 	i.12
i.II	i.Evaluator, i. Organisa- tional support from ILO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In-country consultations with programme staff - Field visits - Interviews with projects staff members of the 4 PUNOs, partners beneficiaries, ultimate beneficiaries - Survey (if needed) - Stakeholders workshop for sharing findings 	i. 10
i.III	i.Evaluator	- Draft report based on consultations from field visits and desk review and the stakeholders' validation workshop	i.10
i.IV	i.Evaluation Manager	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quality check and initial review by Evaluation Manager - Circulate revised draft report to stakeholders - Consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to team leader 	i.0
i.V	i.Evaluator	- Finalize the report including explanations on why comments were not included	i.5
TOTAL			37*

**36 days maximum. Working days of each team member may vary depending on specific tasks assigned to them.*

[XI. Role of key stakeholders](#)

[exii-cxliv.](#) All stakeholders, particularly the relevant ILO staff, the donor, tripartite constituents, relevant government agencies, NGOs and other key partners will

be consulted throughout the process and will be engaged at different stages during the process. They will have the opportunities to provide inputs to the TOR and to the draft final evaluation report. The main stakeholders that should be consulted as following:

- [exxiii-cxlv](#)• The Royal Thai Government
- [exxiv-cxlv](#)• Workers' and Employers' organizations
- [exxv-cxlvii](#)• ILO DWT - Bangkok
- [exxvi-cxlviii](#)

[exxvii-cxlix](#).Key stakeholders will be informed and consulted in the design of the evaluation, and the views of a wide range of stakeholders will be solicited in the consultation and data collection stage.

XII. Legal and Ethical Matters

[exxviii-cl](#).The evaluation will comply with UN Norms and Standards. The TOR is accompanied by the code of conduct for carrying out the evaluations. UNEG ethical guidelines will be followed. It is important that the evaluator has no links to project management or any other conflict of interest that would interfere with the independence of evaluation.

[exxix-clii](#).Ownership of data from the evaluation rests jointly with the RC/RCO and all PUNOs and the evaluator. The copyright of the evaluation report will rest exclusively with the RC/RCO and all PUNOs. Use of the data for publication and other presentations can only be made with the written agreement of the RC/RCO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with the original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

[exxx-clii](#).

XIII. Annexes

Annex 1: Inception Report structure

The Inception Report ensures that the evaluation team has a clear understanding of the TOR of the evaluation. It translates the TOR into an operational plan which determines how the evaluation will be carried out. The Inception Report forms the agreement between the Evaluation Manager and the Evaluation team on the operational plan for the evaluation. The structure for the inception report is:

- **Table of contents**
- **Abbreviations and acronyms**
- **Introduction**
 - Purpose of the Country Programme Evaluation
 - Scope of the evaluation

- **Country context**
 - Highlight key features of the country context which are relevant to Social Protection
 - Identify any key changes in context during the period being covered by the evaluation (e.g. any conflicts or disasters, major changes in policies affecting children etc)
- **UN Joint Programme**
 - UN Joint programme in context of UN response
 - UN Joint programme strategy, objectives, goals, reach and achievements
- **Stakeholder analysis**
 - Identify key stakeholders, their interests and how they will be involved in the evaluation
- **Evaluation Approach and Methodology**
 - State the evaluation approach and rationale for the approach with reference to the degree of stakeholder participation
 - State the evaluation questions which the evaluation will address; if these differ substantially from those noted in the Terms of Reference, indicate why they have been changed.
 - Indicators
 - Sources of data and data collection methods
 - Data analysis approach and tools to be used to answer the evaluation questions
 - (If applicable) Sampling strategy or plan and rationale for it
 - Limitations
- **Quality assurance**
 - Sets out the key quality assurance milestones, processes, and responsibilities for QA of the evaluation
- **Work Plan**
 - Indicate timing of key steps and deliverables for the evaluation
 - Outline responsibilities of each member of the evaluation team and level of effort
- **Annexes**
 - Terms of Reference
 - Bibliography
 - Evaluation matrix (evaluation questions, indicators, data sources and data collection methods)

- Draft data collection tools/ instruments (e.g. Key Informant Interview protocols, draft survey instruments)

Annex 2: Evaluation Report Format

Report length: 40-50 pages excluding annexes

- **Executive Summary (up to 4 pages)**
- **Acknowledgments**
- **Table of contents**
- **Abbreviations and acronyms**
- **Map**
- **Introduction (6-7 pages)**
 - Purpose of the Country Programme Evaluation
 - Scope of the evaluation
 - Methodology and approach to the evaluation
- **Country context and UNJP (6-7 pages)**
 - Draw from the appropriate sections of the Inception Report, with relevant updates based on the subsequent fieldwork and analysis
- **Findings (25-30 pages)**
 - Answers to each of the evaluation questions
- **Conclusions (5- 6 pages)**
- **Lessons Learned and Good Practices (3-4 pages)**
- **Recommendations (3-4 pages)**
- **Annexes**
 - Terms of Reference
 - Inception Report including Evaluation Matrix
 - Bibliography
 - (As appropriate) methodological tools (including the reconstructed Theory of Change)

Annex 3: Assessing Risks and mitigating against these.

The table sets out some risks based on previous evaluation experience that need to be assessed and mitigation measures that the evaluation team need develop

Risk and implications	Mitigation measures
Covid-19 Virus spreading, or risk of spreading, results in	Delay implementation of the evaluation by an agreed period

restricted access and it is being impossible for evaluation country visit and meet stakeholders. Major impact on methodologies and/or timing	Consider options on ET working remotely through desk review and telecoms/video cons and surveys to engage with stakeholders (and include consideration of further reduction of scope) Consider delaying the timing of the start of the evaluation Build in regular review times (e.g., at start and end of inception) to assess and decide on progressing, delaying, or cancelling the process, and review proposed methodologies designed to cope with access constraints
The evaluation is over-ambitious in what it is attempting to cover or wrongly focused resulting in insufficient depth of analysis and/or missed opportunities on key areas	Use inception report to ensure relevance/responsiveness to stakeholder needs and to test feasibility, including assessing and factoring in where other evaluation processes already provide data and findings Reduce or change scope, clearly prioritise areas for evaluation focus, and clarify areas deprioritised
Insufficient time and attention paid to the evaluation at critical points in the process	Plan well in advance and ensure strong messaging by leadership. Ensure evaluation tasks incorporated into the team and key individual objectives Ensure other evaluation processes are scheduled outside the evaluation implementation
Major crisis in the country, requiring response by UN and partners leaving reduced capacity and attention on the evaluation	Delay implementation of the evaluation by an agreed period In case of a high-level crisis, postpone evaluation to the next cycle or greatly reduce scope Allocate dedicated staff to be kept free from crisis response to focus on the evaluation
Poor performance by the Evaluation Team (ET) likely to result in poor timeliness and quality of deliverables and poor return on the evaluation investment	Ensure due diligence in ET recruitment and onboarding Invest time in regular interaction with ET and closely monitoring progress in all phases of the process Monitor changes in team members and set requirements on like-for-like replacements Change evaluation team (or individuals) if necessary

Annex 4 – Disability evaluation and guiding questions on Persons with Disabilities

As persons with disabilities are among the most vulnerable and marginalized groups across countries and considering the critical role that social protection can play in supporting their inclusion, most joint programs had identified them as direct or indirect beneficiaries.

In line with the Leaving No One Behind principle and the obligations stemming from the Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities, even programs that do not target directly persons with disabilities should ensure that persons with disabilities within targeted population can access the program without discrimination.

- The evaluation will therefore assess to what extent:
- Joint programme design, implementation, and monitoring have been inclusive of persons with disabilities (accessibility, non-discrimination, participation of organizations of persons with disabilities, data disaggregation)
 - Joint programme effectively contributed to the socio-economic inclusion of persons with disabilities by providing income security, coverage of health care, and disability-related costs⁸ across the life cycle.

Guiding questions

- To what extent did the programme target persons with disabilities?
 - Not specifically targeted
 - One of the groups of direct beneficiaries targeted
 - Main target group for the programme
- To what extent did the design and implementation of activities of the joint program supported include disability-related accessibility and non-discrimination requirement?
 - No requirements
 - General reference
 - Specific requirements
- To what extent have persons with disabilities, in particular children and women with disabilities, been consulted through their representative organizations?
 - Not invited
 - Invited
 - Specific outreach
- To what extent did support to data collection and analysis, registries, and information system feature disability?
 - No reference to disability
 - Disability included via Washington group short set or similar but no analysis

⁸ [Joint statement on inclusive social protection system for full and effective participation and inclusion of persons with disabilities](#)

- Disability included via Washington group short set or similar
 - Part of general analysis
 - with specific analysis
- To which extent did the programme contribute to support inclusion of persons with disabilities via:
 - Ensuring basic income security
 - Coverage of health care costs, including rehabilitation and assistive devices
 - Coverage of disability-related costs, including community support services
 - Facilitate access to inclusive early childhood development, education, and work/livelihood

Annex 5: UNEG Ethical Code of Conduct

UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Foundation Document

UNEG, March 2008

The Code of Conduct was formally approved by UNEG members at the UNEG Annual General Meeting 2008.

Further details of the ethical approach to evaluation in the UN system can be found in the *Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation in the UN System* (UNEG/FN/ETH [2008]).

UNEG/FN/CoC(2008)

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR EVALUATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM

1. The conduct of evaluators in the UN system should always be beyond reproach. Any deficiency in their professional conduct may undermine the integrity of the evaluation, and more broadly evaluation in the UN or the UN itself, and raise doubts about the quality and validity of their evaluation work.

2. The UNEG⁹ Code of Conduct applies to all evaluation staff and consultants in the UN system. The principles behind the Code of Conduct are fully consistent with the Standards of Conduct for the International Civil Service by which all UN staff are bound. UN staff are also subject to any UNEG member specific staff rules and procedures for the procurement of services.

3. The provisions of the UNEG Code of Conduct apply to all stages of the evaluation process from the conception to the completion of an evaluation and the release and use of the evaluation results.

4. To promote trust and confidence in evaluation in the UN, all UN staff engaged in evaluation and evaluation consultants working for the United Nations system are required to commit themselves in writing to the Code of Conduct for Evaluation¹⁰ (see Annexes 1 and 2), specifically to the following obligations:

Independence

5. Evaluators shall ensure that independence of judgement is maintained, and that evaluation findings and recommendations are independently presented.

Impartiality

Evaluators shall operate in an impartial and unbiased manner and give a balanced presentation of strengths and weaknesses of the policy, program, programme or organizational unit being evaluated. **Conflict of Interest**

7. Evaluators are required to disclose in writing any experience, of themselves or their immediate family, which may give rise to a potential conflict of interest, and to deal honestly in resolving any conflict of interest which may arise. Before undertaking evaluation work within the UN system, each evaluator will complete a declaration of interest form (see Annex 3).

Honesty and Integrity

8. Evaluators shall show honesty and integrity in their own behaviour, negotiating honestly the evaluation costs, tasks, limitations, scope of results likely to be

⁹ UNEG is the United Nations Evaluation Group, a professional network that brings together the units responsible for evaluation in the UN system including the specialized agencies, funds, programmes and affiliated organisations. UNEG currently has 43 such members.

¹⁰ While the provisions of the Code of Conduct apply to all UN staff involved in evaluation, only UN staff who spend a substantial proportion of their time working on evaluation are expected to sign the Code of Conduct, including staff of evaluation, oversight or performance management units directly involved in the management or conduct of evaluations. All evaluation consultants are required to sign when first engaged by a UNEG member.

obtained, while accurately presenting their procedures, data and findings and highlighting any limitations or uncertainties of interpretation within the evaluation.

Competence

9. Evaluators shall accurately represent their level of skills and knowledge and work only within the limits of their professional training and abilities in evaluation, declining assignments for which they do not have the skills and experience to complete successfully.

Accountability

10. Evaluators are accountable for the completion of the agreed evaluation deliverables within the timeframe and budget agreed, while operating in a cost-effective manner.

Obligations to participants

11. Evaluators shall respect and protect the rights and welfare of human subjects and communities, in accordance with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other human rights conventions. Evaluators shall respect differences in culture, local customs, religious beliefs and practices, personal interaction, gender roles, disability, age, and ethnicity, while using evaluation instruments appropriate to the cultural setting. Evaluators shall ensure prospective participants are treated as autonomous agents, free to choose whether to participate in the evaluation, while ensuring that the relatively powerless are represented. Evaluators shall make themselves aware of and comply with legal codes (whether international or national) governing, for example, interviewing children and young people.

Confidentiality

12. Evaluators shall respect people's right to provide information in confidence and make participants aware of the scope and limits of confidentiality, while ensuring that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source.

Avoidance of Harm

13. Evaluators shall act to minimize risks and harms to, and burdens on, those participating in the evaluation, without compromising the integrity of the evaluation findings.

Accuracy, Completeness and Reliability

14. Evaluators have an obligation to ensure that evaluation reports and presentations are accurate, complete, and reliable. Evaluators shall explicitly justify judgements, findings and conclusions and show their underlying rationale, so that stakeholders are able to assess them.

Transparency

15. Evaluators shall clearly communicate to stakeholders the purpose of the evaluation, the criteria applied and the intended use of findings. Evaluators shall ensure that stakeholders have a say in shaping the evaluation and shall ensure that all documentation is readily available to and understood by stakeholders.

Omissions and wrongdoing

16. Where evaluators find evidence of wrong-doing or unethical conduct, they are obliged to report it to the proper oversight authority.

(Each UNEG member to create its own forms for signature)

Annex 1: United Nations Evaluation Group – Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Evaluation Staff Agreement Form

To be signed by all staff engaged full or part time in evaluation at the start of their contract.

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Staff Member:

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Evaluation Group Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at (place) on (date)

Signature: _____

(Each UNEG member to create its own forms for signature)

Annex 2: United Nations Evaluation Group Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Evaluation Consultants Agreement Form

To be signed by all consultants as individuals (not by or on behalf of a consultancy company) before a contract can be issued.

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Name of Consultant: _____

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant):

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at (place) on (date)

Signature: _____

Annex 6 – Other resources for inception and evaluation reports

- UNJP project documents, blogs, HIS, reports
- **Other useful documents:**
- [UNEG Resource Pack on Joint evaluation](#)
- [United Nations Evaluation Group. 2008. *Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation in the UN System*](#)
- [United Nations Evaluation Group. 2014. *Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations*](#)
- [United Nations Evaluation Group. 2016. *Norms and Standards for Evaluation*](#)
- [United Nations Evaluation Group. 2018. *UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator - Technical Note and Scorecard*](#)
- [ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 4th ed., \(Nov 2020\)](#)
- [ILO Checklist No. 3 Writing the inception report](#)
- [ILO Checklist 5 preparing the evaluation report](#)
- [ILO Checklist 6 rating the quality of evaluation report](#)
- ILO Template for [lessons learnt](#)
- ILO Template for [Emerging Good practices](#)
- [ILO Guidance note 7 Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation](#)
- [ILO Guidance note 4 Integrating gender equality in M&E of projects](#)
- [ILO Template for evaluation title page](#)
- [ILO Template for evaluation summary](#)

Annex 2: List of Stakeholders to be interviewed

UN Resident Coordinator Office		
1. Ms Gita Sabharwal, UN Resident Coordinator in Thailand		
2. Ms. Iwona Spytkowski, Team Leader and Strategic Planner, UNRCO		
Donor		
3. <i>(To be determined)</i> : Joint SDG Fund		
ILO		
4. Mr. Graeme Buckley, Director, ILO Country Office, Thailand, Cambodia, and Lao PDR		
5. Mr. Nuno Cunha, Senior Social Protection Specialist		
6. Ms. Jittima Srisuknam, Programme Office, ILO Country Office - Thailand		
7. Mr. Vasu Thirasak, National Project Coordinator		
UNICEF		
8. Ms. Kyungsun Kim, UNICEF Representative for Thailand		
9. Ms. Sarah Shahyar, Chief, Social Policy		
10. Ms. Khwanploy Cheechang, Social Policy Officer		
11. Ms. Siriporn Arunsangsuree, Social Policy Officer (Social Protection)		
IOM		
12. Ms. Geraldine Ansart, Chief of Mission, IOM Thailand		
13. Ms. Jitradee Singhakowin, Project Coordinator		
UN WOMEN		
14. Sarah Knibbs, Officer-in-Charge for UN Women Asia and the Pacific		
15. Ms. Naruedee Janthasing, Programme Analyst		
Government:		
Ministry of Social Development and Human Security		
16. Permanent Secretary Office		
17. Department of Children and Youth		
18. Division of Policy Development and Social Innovation		
Ministry of Labour		
19. Permanent Secretary Office		
20. Social Security Office (SSO)		
Ministry of Finance		
21. Fiscal Policy Office (FPO)		
Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council (NESDC)		
22. Secretary-General Office		
Prime Minister's Office		
23. <i>(To be determined)</i> : Budget Bureau (BB)		

Research Institutions:		
24. Puey Ungphakorn Institute of Economic Research, Bank of Thailand (PIER)		
25. Thailand Development Research Institute (TDRI)		
Civil Society/Employer Organizations:		
26. Employers Confederation of Thailand (ECOT)		
27. Foundation for Children Development (FCD)		
28. Foundation for Slum Child Care (FSCC)		
29. HomeNet Foundation		
30. Migrant Working Group (MWG)		
31. State Enterprises Workers' Relations Confederation (SERC)		

Annex 3: Results as per JP Programmatic Results Framework

Results as per JP Programmatic Results Framework

(Source: Summary based on the JP Annual Progress Report 2020-2021 (2022: 14-20)).

O/O (*)	Ind. (**)	2021 Result	Reasons for variance from planned target (if any)	Expected Final target
1		No	The 13 th National Economic and Social Development Plan with strategies and targets on Social Protection is being drafted.	Yes. The National Economic and Social Development Plan with national development plan on social protection will be finalized in mid-2022.
1.1	1	0	Event moved to end of the JP Implementation Period (May or June 2022)	1
	2	6 (Workshops etc.)	Workshops on Pension, Migrant Workers, SPDR Kick-off Webinar, Children, Active Working Age, and Academic, Social Partners, and CSOs Webinars	9 (6 in 2021 + 3 in 2022: Social Protection Financing Workshop, Visioning Workshop, and Policy Reform Options Workshop)
	3	2 (Technical Note on COVID-19 Response)	Delays in arranging seminars/workshops due to COVID-19 situation.	12 (2 in 2020 + 1 in 2021 + 9 in 2022: SPDR, Mapping and Vulnerability Analysis Report, Social Protection Financing, Social Budgeting Report, Background Papers on Children, Informal Economy, Pension, Migrant, and Gender, and Policy Review on Domestic Workers in Thailand)
1.2	1	No	COVID-19	Yes in 2022. Media campaign implemented (press release and possible media interviews)
	2	Medium	The public and decision makers are more aware of the importance of Social Protection. Communication activities are moved to 2022 when the reports are ready to publicize.	High
	3	No	COVID-19	0
	4	0	Rescheduled meeting with Secretary-General of Office of the National Economic and Social Development Council (NESDC) to 2022	3 (2 in 2020: Met with Permanent Secretaries of MSDHS and Ministry of Labour in 2020; 1 in 2022: Meeting with NESDC rescheduled to Q1 2022)
	5	No	Will determine in 2022 if the JP has enough time and resources to pursue this Output.	No
1.3	1	Yes	The report has been published for a limited circulation for a validation purpose. The finalized publication will be publicly available in 2022.	Yes
	2	4 (Background Papers available)	N/A Background Papers on Children, Informal Economy, Migrant Workers, and Pension	5

	3	No	COVID-19, delayed to Q2 2022	Yes
	4	Yes	The report was published for a limited circulation for validation by key government agencies, NGOs, works and employers' organizations, and academic institutions at the Validation Workshop The finalized publication will be publicly available in 2022.	Yes
	5	No		Yes
	6	No	COVID-19, delayed to Q2 2022	Yes
	7	No	The tool is under the development process. It will be finalized in Q1 2022	Yes
1.4	1	No	The 13 th National Economic and Social Development Plan with strategies and target for national development on social protection is being drafted and will be finalized in 2022.	Yes
2		2.3 million (as of Dec. 2021)	New policy expanding CSG to 4 million eligible children pending cabinet approval.	2 million
2.1	1	Yes	The technical report was conducted in 2020 and key recommendations were implemented in 2021 until present.	Yes
	2	Yes	95% completed. The enhanced MIS is being tested and will be hand overed to the Government in early 2022. One training to prepare the Government for the testing and handover was organized in September 2021. The JP has continued providing technical support during the testing and handover. An additional module on grievances is being developed. A series of training on the enhanced CSG MIS and the development of user training materials will be conducted in Q1 2022.	Yes
2.2	1	1	One consultation meeting organized in December 2021.	4
	2	0	Work in progress	2
2.3	1	Yes	Work in progress. TDRI has conducted the three assessments at the moment.	Yes
	2	No	Work in progress.	Yes
	3	No	Work in progress.	Yes
2.4	1	Yes	The communications strategy of the CSG was in place in 2021. Currently the Government with support from the UNJP, has implemented the prioritized recommendations in the strategy.	Yes
	2	Yes		Yes
	3	3.5 million	Based on the CSG website, https://csg.dcy.go.th/th/home 192,000 likes on the CSG Facebook, https://www.facebook.com/CSGProjectOfficial/	3.3 million
	4	383	383 CSG implementing staff trained on public and programme communication in January 2021.	100
3		0	Work in progress. Delay due to COVID-19 situation.	1
3.1	1	0	Work in progress.	1 (Policy Review on Domestic Workers in Thailand – in progress)

	2	1 (Extension of Coverage Workshops)	Consultation Workshop on Domestic Workers will be held once the Policy Review is ready in Q2 2022)	3 (Two Extension of Coverage Workshops in 2020 and 2021 + 1 Consultation Workshop in 2022)
	3	1 (Technical Brief)	Technical Brief on Domestic Workers in Thailand	1
	4	0	Due to the COVID-19 situation, dialogue session will be changed to qualitative interviews and quantitative survey.	20 Qualitative interviews + 200 Quantitative survey.
3.2	1	1	N/A	1
	2	Low	Awareness activities will be implemented 2022.	High
	3	0	To be implemented after the completion of the policy review under Output 3.1.	3

*) Outcomes and Outputs Numbers.

**) Indicator Number

Annex 4: Documents Consulted

UNJP Thailand Programme Documents:

- Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Final Independent Evaluation of UNJP Thailand, November 2021 (see Annex 1).
- Joint Programme Document (PRODOC) for the United Nations Joint Programme on Social Protection for All in Thailand (Revised, 27 August 2021).
- Progress reports
- Minutes of the meetings of the Project Steering Committee (PSC)
- DWCP Thailand
- Relevant ILO's P&B's, and Centenary Initiatives.
- UNPAF and UNSDCF on Thailand.
- Research and studies conducted by the Project
- Financial reports
- Websites, including of the project.

UNJP Thailand Strategic Documents (cf. Progress report 2021 p.20-22):

- 1) Technical Note on Protecting the Most Vulnerable from the Impact of COVID-19; 03/2020.
- 2) The Technical Note on Protecting the most vulnerable from socio-economic impacts of COVID-19; 05/2021.
- 3) Technical Brief: Opportunities for extending social security protection to domestic workers in Thailand; 06/2021.
- 4) Background Paper on Social Protection for Migrant Worker and their Families in Thailand; 06/2021.
- 5) UNCT Social Impact Assessment of COVID-19 in Thailand; 07/2020; <https://thailand.un.org/sites/default/files/2020-09/Social%20Impact%20Assessment%20of%20COVID-19%20in%20Thailand-EN-Designed.pdf>
- 6) Letter to the Office of Council of State, and Policy Brief: Towards better retirement benefits in Thailand, 27 September 2021; 09/2021.
- 7) Technical Note on Protecting the Most Vulnerable from the Impact of COVID-19: Migrant Workers; 03/2020.
- 8) Technical Note on Protecting the Most Vulnerable from the Socio-Economic Impacts of COVID-19: Communities affected by COVID-19, families with children, people with disabilities, elderlies, and migrant workers; 05/2021.
- 9) Technical Brief: Opportunities for extending social security protection to domestic workers in Thailand: Domestic Workers and Migrant Domestic Workers; 06/2021.
- 10) Background Paper on Social Protection for Migrant Workers and their Families in Thailand; 06/2021.

Overall Evaluation Documents

- UNEG Resource Pack on Joint evaluation
- United Nations Evaluation Group. 2008. Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation in the UN System
- United Nations Evaluation Group. 2014. Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations
- United Nations Evaluation Group. 2016. Norms and Standards for Evaluation

- United Nations Evaluation Group. 2018. UN-SWAP Evaluation Performance Indicator - Technical Note and Scorecard
- ILO (2020): Policy guidelines for results-based evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 4th edition (Nov 2020). ILO-EVAL, Geneva. See: https://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS_571339/lang--en/index.htm
- ILO Checklist No. 3 Writing the inception report
- ILO Checklist 5 preparing the evaluation report
- ILO Checklist 6 rating the quality of evaluation report
- ILO Template for lessons learnt
- ILO Template for Emerging Good practices
- ILO Guidance note 7 Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation
- ILO Guidance note 4 Integrating gender equality in M&E of projects
- ILO Template for evaluation title page
- ILO Template for evaluation summary
- EVAL (2020): Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO: An internal guide on adapting to the situation. Geneva: http://www.ilo.ch/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_741206.pdf, and: www.ilo.ch/eval/WCMS_744068/lang--en/index.htm
- ILO EVAL (2021): ILO's response to the impact of COVID-19 on the world of work: Evaluative lessons on how to build a better future of work after the pandemic (August 2021): <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/2787>
- OECD/DAC Network on Development Evaluation (2019): Better Criteria for Better Evaluation; Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use. December 2019.