

Final External Evaluation Report

Project: Elimination of human trafficking
from Moldova and Ukraine through labour
market-based measures

Prepared by: Blanka Hancilova, lead evaluator, Senior Partner of Apreco Group, Blanka.Hancilova@apreco-group.com,

with additional input from Stephen Rogers (evaluator, Ukraine) and Angelina Zaporozhan (evaluator, Moldova).

May, 2009

Table of contents

1	Project information	3
2	Acknowledgements.....	5
3	Summary of Key Findings and Recommendations	6
3.1	Main recommendations.....	7
4	Evaluation background and methodology	8
4.1	Scope of evaluation.....	8
4.2	Sources of information and indicators of achievements	9
5	Project logic and design	10
5.1	General remarks on project logic and design.....	10
5.2	Project strategy.....	14
5.3	Overall objective (developmental impact).....	15
5.4	Specific objectives	16
6	Delivery process.....	17
7	Problems and needs (Relevance)	18
8	Achievement of purpose (Effectiveness)	19
9	Sound management and value for money (Efficiency).....	19
10	Achievement of wider effects (Impact)	20
11	Likely continuation of achieved results (Sustainability)	20
12	Special Concerns.....	21
12.1	Gender Concerns.....	21
12.2	Knowledge Sharing.....	21
13	Overall assessment.....	23
13.1	Key success factors and critical junctures	23
	Annex 1 – Agenda of evaluation seminar.....	24
	Annex 2 – Persons interviewed and consulted during evaluation	28
	Annex 3 – Specific evaluation questions	31
	Annex 4 – Visit of ILO experts and independent evaluator in Moldova.....	33

1 Project information

Donor: European Commission

Implementing Agency: International Labour Organization (ILO) Special Action Programme to Combat Forced Labour in cooperation with ILO SRO/BUDAPEST and the ILO International Migration Programme (MIGRANT)

Project Partners: International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD), the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs Ukraine, the Ministry of Economy and Trade Moldova

Type of Evaluation: Independent Final Evaluation of the Project

Date & Duration of Evaluation: 12 January 2009 – 11 February 2009 (12 workdays – lead evaluator; 11 workdays for national researcher Moldova and national researcher Ukraine)

Geographical Coverage: Moldova, Ukraine

Project work covered by the evaluation: 27 months: 11 November 2006 (starting date of the project) to 5 February 2009

Prepared by: Blanka Hancilova, lead evaluator; Senior Partner of Apreco Group; Blanka.Hancilova@apreco-group.com; with input from Stephen Rogers (evaluator, Ukraine) and Angelina Zaporozhan (evaluator, Moldova).

The contents of this report are solely the contribution of the lead evaluator and do not indicate ILO endorsement.

Copies:

ILO - EVAL (Musharaf Paraíso, Carla Henry)

CODEV (Mito Tsukamoto, Audrey Le Guével)

DECLARATION (Zafar Shaheed)

SAP-FL (Roger Plant, Beate Andrees, Undine Groeger)

MIGRANT (Ibrahim Awad, Patrick Taran, Gloria Moreno-Fontes)

SRO BUDAPEST (Director, all staff)

EUROPE (Petra Ulshoefer, Alena Nesporova)

ILO National Coordinators in Moldova and Ukraine (Ala Lipciu, Vasyl Kostrytsya)

EMP/SKILLS (Ellen Hansen, Carmela Torres)

EMP/TRENDS (Lawrence Johnson)

ACTRAV (Luc Demaret, Claude Akpokavie)

ACTEMP (Christian Hess)

NORMES (Alexander Iafaev)

IPEC (Klaus Guenther)

AIDS (Pallavi Rai)

**INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR MIGRATION POLICY DEVELOPMENT
(ICMPD) - (Elisa Trossero)**

2 Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Jana Costachi, Anna Farkas, Undine Groeger, Daniela Gutu, Sophia Lytvyn, Galina Meshcheryakova, Victoria Nacu, Anne Pawletta and Valeriya Taran for providing me with the necessary documents and insights about the project.

Special thanks go to Angelina Zaporozhan and Stephen Rogers for conducting interviews with national counterparts in Moldova and Ukraine, respectively, and for sharing their insights.

I would like to thank the ILO Moldova project team for their warm welcome in Chisinau and organization of the evaluation workshop.

It was a pleasure to witness the cohesiveness, extraordinary commitment and the enthusiasm of ILO project staff at all levels (Moldova, Ukraine, ILO SRO Budapest, ILO SAP-FL Geneva) and their exceptionally good communication and team spirit is to be lauded.

3 Summary of Key Findings and Recommendations

The evaluated project has been relevant to the needs of Moldova and Ukraine. The project strategy has proven to be an effective and efficient tool in bringing about change. The project concept and design was sound and collaboratively developed with the governments of Moldova and Ukraine. It recognized existing and planned projects being conducted domestically and regionally by other agencies/ entities (e.g. IOM, OSCE) and avoided duplication of interventions. The project added value to existing anti-trafficking activities owing to its comprehensive approach to trafficking prevention and the involvement of social partners.

The two-pronged strategy of (1) strengthening national legal and policy frameworks to combat trafficking in human beings/irregular migration and bolstering national actors' capacity to implement them and (2) awareness raising campaigns about legal migration channels and trafficking in human beings/labour exploitation for potential migrants and/or direct assistance to actual and likely victims of trafficking applied by the project has been a good choice.

It has enabled the ILO and its partners to build on their specific know-how and expertise in order to support the development of comprehensive anti-trafficking strategies with a focus on capacity building of policy makers and institutions, advocacy and input for the development of policies and awareness-raising among potential victims of trafficking in human beings. Some stakeholders mentioned that the greatest achievement of the project lies in the fact that it has familiarized them with the complexity of the issue and prepared them to engage in dialogue with the government.

Integration into the ILO Decent Work Country Programme framework enhanced synergies among related ILO projects and provided a unifying theme ("decent work for all") for the involved partners.

The project teams and wider ILO expertise were instrumental in helping partners with fundamentally different constituents recognize their role in addressing trafficking in human beings. The project provided numerous opportunities for exchange of views and for identification of common interests between different actors, thus preparing the ground for future coalition building and joint advocacy for shared goals.

A critical moment of the project was overly ambitious planning. Fortunately, this was to a large degree off-set by the combination of the project design's flexibility and by the professionalism, extraordinary dedication and the ability of the project team to identify and make use of synergies with related ILO interventions and other anti-trafficking interventions implemented by other actors. For most part of the implementation, the project teams' resources have been relatively thinly spread. The project document foresaw the implementation of a number of distinctive activities with a large number of various stakeholders. In practice this meant that with some stakeholders the quantity and depth of implemented activities may not have been sufficient to ensure that the stakeholders will be able to initiate or continue activities to address the issue of trafficking in human beings.

3.1 Main recommendations

ILO to consider a continuation (second phase) of the project.

Justifications/Comments: The main needs that prompted the formulation of the project continue. A second phase project would enhance sustainability of project achievements, building on already existing infrastructures (project teams, established relations with national stakeholders). The second phase project, if and when implemented, should pay greater attention to delineating the issue of trafficking and irregular migration. The project should be fully embedded in the ILO Decent Work Country Programme framework. It should provide for appropriate human resources for the implementation of the project (an increase in number of project staff when compared to the 1st phase) and for their professional development in various areas relevant to the project (both content and process oriented). The second phase of the project should focus on a limited number of key stakeholders rather than targeting many actors with thinly spread interventions. (Alternatively, the intervention should be conceptualized as a mid-term, minimum 5 year involvement, with sufficiently scaled-up resources.)

In this context, the project teams advocated for projects with objectives achievable with the allocated budget and within the proposed timeframe and with provisions for training of project staff.

ILO to improve project planning, especially the use of logical framework approach and integrate better monitoring and evaluation.

Justifications/Comments: The evaluation found that the overall project strategy and design were sound and that the activities were executed skillfully and efficiently. This has contrasted with the overly ambitious project planning (as captured for example by the logical framework). The project plan did not make appropriate provisions for monitoring and evaluation, hindering the evaluability of its achievements.

4 Evaluation background and methodology

The independent final evaluation of the project “Elimination of human trafficking from Moldova and Ukraine through labour market based measures” was carried out from 12 January to 5 February 2009, at the request of the International Labour Office. As part of the project’s monitoring mechanism, the evaluation was intended to provide an external perspective on the project’s achievements and to generate forward-looking lessons for a possible further phase of this or similar interventions. The evaluation was funded through the project budget. A total of 12 workdays were allocated to the Lead evaluator, who has drawn on the inputs of two national evaluators (records of interviews with national stakeholders) in Moldova and Ukraine.

The 27-month project (implemented between 1 November 2006 and 5 February 2009) in Moldova and Ukraine was funded by the European Union on a total budget of EUR 935.615,97. It is a part of the ILO Special Action Programme against Forced Labour (ILO SAP-FL). The project is coordinated by ILO headquarters in Geneva and the Sub-Regional Office in Budapest and it has been implemented in coordination with ILO Social Finance Programme (EMP/SFU), Skills and Employability Department (EMP/SKILLS), Boosting Employment through Small Enterprise Development (EMP/SEED), International Labour Standards (NORMES), International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour (IPEC) and ILO AIDS. It was administered on a daily basis by Project teams in the Moldovan and Ukrainian offices and with close collaboration with SRO Budapest.

Considering the limited resources assigned to the monitoring and evaluation during the project, the range or use of certain conclusions may be limited. Most importantly, the evaluation did not allow for a precise distinction between results and outcomes achieved by this particular ILO project and by related ILO projects.

4.1 Scope of evaluation

The project was evaluated in terms of DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability defined as follows:

- ❖ Relevance – the extent to which the objectives and the activities are in line with the local and national priorities and needs;
- ❖ Effectiveness – the extent to which the project (1) can be said to have contributed to the development objectives and the immediate objectives and (2) whether the stated outputs have been achieved satisfactorily;
- ❖ Efficiency – the productivity of the project implementation process taken as a measure of the extent to which the outputs achieved are derived from an efficient use of financial, material and human resources;

- ❖ Impact – positive and negative changes and effects caused by the project at the local, provincial and national levels, i.e. the impact achieved with project partners and various implementing partner organizations;
- ❖ Sustainability – the extent to which adequate capacity building of project partners has taken place to ensure that mechanisms are in place to sustain activities and thus are likely to be maintained beyond project completion.

In addition to these criteria, the evaluation focused on gender issues, knowledge-sharing and particular attention was paid to lessons learned and implications for future design and implementation of interventions.

Specific evaluation questions are listed in Annex 3.

4.2 Sources of information and indicators of achievements

The evaluation report findings are based on:

- ❖ A desk study of relevant project documents from each country, ILO SAP-FL in Geneva and ILO Sub-Regional Office in Budapest. Among the documents shared with the evaluation team were the Project document (Grant Application), including logical framework and work plan; work plan 2008-2009; summary records of review meetings; annual activities reports; (selected) mission reports; (selected) research reports; lists of participants from seminars etc.;
- ❖ Semi-structured face-to-face or phone interviews and consultations with project stakeholders in Moldova and Ukraine (conducted by national evaluators in Moldova and Ukraine). The stakeholders to be interviewed were selected by the project teams. It was not possible to gain access to potential/actual victims of trafficking who were designated direct beneficiaries of the project. The interviews with stakeholders focused on how well the project was tailored to national priorities; the clarity of each party's responsibilities within the project; the responsiveness of ILO project staff and headquarters; the main achievements of the project; and areas for improvement or future work;
- ❖ Semi-structured face-to-face or phone interviews and consultations with project staff (national project coordinator and project assistant Ukraine, national project coordinator and project assistant Moldova, ILO project manager, ILO administrative assistant Budapest, ICMPD project manager);
- ❖ Direct observation and information from participants of a one-day evaluation workshop organized on 5 February in Chisinau for participants from Moldova and Ukraine. (For agenda of the workshop see Annex 1);
- ❖ Direct observation and information from participants in a meeting of project team and evaluators held on 6 February in Chisinau;
- ❖ Feedback to draft report from project team and ILO headquarters.

5 Project logic and design

The project was formulated in 2006 by the staff of ILO SAP-FL and ICMPD in cooperation with their local counterparts (Ministry of Labour and Social Policy Ukraine, Ministry of Economy and Trade Moldova). The Project's starting date was 11 November 2006, but the EC project funds were disbursed only in spring 2007. This has led to delays in implementation, pressure to spend funds on time, and it required changes in the activities planned.

Recommendation for future project planning: Considering delays in funds disbursement (in particular EC funds), activities planned for the first six months of a project should wherever possible not require significant financial resources.

5.1 General remarks on project logic and design

The formulation of the project reflects the funding priorities of the main donor (the EC) inasmuch it targets trafficking in human beings as a subset of irregular migration and provides for a regional approach (two countries, Moldova and Ukraine).

The current definition of trafficking in human beings has been formulated in the context of combating transnational organized crime and with the aim to delineate trafficking in human beings (which is a crime against a person) from smuggling across international borders (which is a crime against the state). However, there is an ongoing discussion among academics and policy makers whether the element of movement is necessarily a constituting part of the crime of trafficking in human beings. The EU definition and as a rule national definitions of trafficking do not contain the element of movement. This said, today's responses to the issue of trafficking in human beings tend to prioritize border security and law enforcement more general and often fail to take into consideration structural factors such as conflicts, poverty in countries of origin and demand for labour and services in destination countries that have motivated migration. Though the ILO intervention is rightly focusing on the forced labour and services, including forced sexual services, slavery and slavery like outcomes of trafficking, doing so in the context of eliminating irregular migration may be inadvertently nurturing negative perceptions of migration. Moreover, not all instances of trafficking in human beings take place in the context of (irregular) migration.

Recommendation: It should be therefore further assessed whether the ILO core value of decent work agenda is well served by linking of migration and trafficking in human beings.

Flexibility and adaptability of project design and implementation

The project has displayed a high degree of flexibility and adaptability to facilitate rapid responses to changes in circumstances and to accommodate a time lapse between project formulation and actual implementation. Several activities were replaced by others

(including activities which were not envisaged in the initial project document) because they were no longer relevant, not in line with the national priorities or implemented by other actors, such as the OSCE and IOM.

Use of Logical Framework Approach

The logical framework of the project was originally submitted at the time of application for funds to the EC and other donors. It has not been updated since, despite significant changes at the level of project activities, work plans and expected results.

Recommendations:

- Train project staff in the logical framework approach in order to make better use of the logical framework approach as a planning, monitoring and delivery tool.
- Update logical framework regularly to reflect changes in the implementation and to check for progress. This could be done possibly on a three or six month basis, prior to meetings of the Steering Committee(s) that would approve the changes.

Formulation of specific objectives and overall objective

The specific objectives and the overall objective listed in the logical framework were from the very beginning overly ambitious and did not reflect sufficiently the resources (financial, human and duration) of the project and the challenging environment in which the project has been implemented.

This impression that the objectives set by the project have been overly ambitious has been confirmed unequivocally by members of the project team who stressed the fact that advocacy with certain national partners to ensure their support to some activities is very time and resource intensive. All stakeholders interviewed agreed that the problems the project has set to eliminate or contribute to their elimination continue to exist and advocated for the continuation of the project activities.

Recommendation: Project identification and planning should set realistic goals which are likely to be achievable within the often challenging external context and with (relatively limited) resources available.

Formulation of objectively verifiable indicators

In many instances, the objectively verifiable indicators listed in the project logical framework cannot be verified. The objectively verifiable indicators associated with immediate objectives (especially for specific objectives 2, 3 and 4) were inappropriately selected: their achievement (or non-achievement) cannot be interpreted as correlated or

attributed to the project. In some cases, ‘double’¹ indicators were proposed, making the assessment as to whether a specific objective was achieved in case one of the objectively verifiable indicators was achieved and the other not, ambiguous. In addition, many objectively verifiable indicators (especially quantitative indicators) were/would not be verifiable due to missing sources of information or baseline information. Similarly, the achievement of the overall objective (developmental impact) cannot be verified based on the objectively verifiable indicator(s) provided in the logical framework. The absence of appropriate objectively verifiable indicators and sources of information complicates monitoring and evaluation efforts and suggests that the donor and the implementing team could not draw on the logical framework approach as a management tool to support operational work planning and monitoring during project implementation.

Recommendations:

- Improve the formulation of objectively verifiable indicators at the time of project planning. In particular, where no baseline can be established using already available information, make provisions for collecting baseline data at the onset of the project implementation and updated logical framework and objectively verifiable indicators accordingly once baseline data is available.
- Avoid ‘double’ objectively verifiable indicators.
- Budget additional resources for the collection of information relevant to monitoring and evaluation.

As a result, the evaluation could not use the indicators provided in the logical framework as indicators of the project’s achievement.

Monitoring and Evaluation provisions

The provisions for monitoring and evaluation contained in the project document did not seem sufficient. Project teams had only limited resources to collect data to inform monitoring of the project. (One of the project staff commented: “*Financial means and time of project staff to monitor results of capacity building activities were not foreseen in the project. We have had too intensive workplan and no time for reflection*”.) No specific monitoring and evaluation plan was developed.

The ILO Evaluation Unit should provide guidance on the development of standard clauses/procedures for project planning and make recommendations and provide training on the level of detail required for such evaluation frameworks.²

¹ ‘Double’ indicator means that two (or more) indicators were identified to verify whether a result/objective has been achieved. It is not clear whether a result/objective has been achieved in case only one of these has been fulfilled. Wherever possible, ‘double’ indicators should be avoided.

² A basic rule of project/programme implementation is – ‘if you cannot measure it, don’t do it’ – because there is no way of knowing if outcomes are beneficial or detrimental. Project development experience/professional training argues for the development of monitoring and evaluation plans/frameworks to be integral to an integrated project management approach. Plans inform the

Recommendations:

- Allocate sufficient resources for monitoring and evaluation, taking into consideration that certain activities are pilot activities and need to be evaluated for their future replication in other settings.
- Develop Monitoring and Evaluation Plans either at the project development or latest at the project inception phase.
- Refer to Monitoring and Evaluation plans in, and attach them to Project documents.
- Train project developers and implementing staff in monitoring and evaluation.

Definition of target and beneficiary groups

The project document identifies two main target/final beneficiary groups³: (a) state and non-state institutions with a role in anti-trafficking policies (such as social partners, private employment agencies, and law enforcement including labour inspectors) and (b) actual and potential victims of trafficking and potential migrants (Grant Application, p. 13 – 15). The project document notes that final beneficiaries are identical to target groups (Grant Application, p. 8). However, especially in light of the fact that the project aims to strengthen national legal and policy frameworks to combat trafficking in human beings and bolster national actors' capacity to implement them, a clear distinction between target and final beneficiaries groups should be made. In this sense, the final beneficiaries are, for example, future victims of trafficking who will benefit from better assistance mechanisms or migrants/potential victims of trafficking who will become less vulnerable to trafficking due to increased knowledge about legal migration channels. It seems from the review of the project documentation and information from the project team that the principal direct beneficiaries of the project were the social partners and government officials who participated in capacity-building activities. Their heightened understanding of and capacity to respond to trafficking issues will have indirect but significant long-term benefits for potential and actual trafficking victims.

Recommendation: Make a clear distinction between target and final beneficiary groups.

Staffing and professional development support

identification of gaps/deficiencies in projects (e.g. through the generation of evaluation questions required to determine if objectives are measurable; and identification of data vehicles necessary to populate performance indicators, including the establishment of new data collection processes). As a rule, technical cooperation projects should budget a minimum 5% of total funds for monitoring and evaluation (10% if an element is a pilot for possible future inclusion in other projects, as was the case here).

³ According to the European Commission Project Cycle Management Guidelines (2004), a 'target group' includes the groups/entities who will be directly (immediately) positively affected by the action and 'final beneficiaries' are those who will benefit from the action in the long term at the level of the society or sector at large. This report defines the terms in line with the abovementioned European Commission Project Cycle Management Guidelines.

As noted repeatedly by several project team members, the project set an ambitious agenda, and project teams were at times under strain to complete the activities as required, which has left limited time for reflection.

The evaluated project did not reserve any funds for staff training. This was criticized by the project team members who mentioned that it was important, especially for staff new to the ILO, to be fully trained in “*what messages to bring to the stakeholders*”. This does not mean that the recruited staff members were not up to the job, but rather that – as reported by them – they would have welcomed more training to equip them better for their role in promoting the ILO’s particular approach to combating human trafficking.

Recommendation: ILO as an institution should continue to invest in national staff capacity-building, through technical training. The ILO should also consider increasing the human resources (number of project staff) in order to allow for better project implementation and reflection on lessons learned. Increased human resources would also contribute to the heightened visibility of the ILO and its effective approaches and thus deepen project impact.

5.2 Project strategy

The project is based on a two-pronged strategy of: (1) strengthening national legal and policy frameworks to combat trafficking in human beings/irregular migration and bolstering national actors’ capacity to implement them, (2) awareness raising campaigns about legal migration channels and trafficking in human beings/labour exploitation for potential migrants and/or direct assistance to actual and likely victims of trafficking. This two-pronged strategy seems to be a good mixture that enables the ILO and its partners to build on their specific know-how and expertise in order to support the development of comprehensive anti-trafficking strategies that also target persons trafficked for labour exploitation. The strategy also enables project implementers to combine a top-down approach (capacity building of policy makers and institutions, advocacy and input for the development of policies) with grassroots work and direct assistance to actual and potential victims of trafficking. The project adds value to existing anti-trafficking activities owing to its comprehensive approach to trafficking prevention and the involvement of social partners.

The ILO focus on trafficking for labour exploitation is well justified inasmuch as the prevalent conceptualization of trafficking in human beings continues to prioritize women and children trafficked for sexual exploitation over men trafficked for labour exploitation. Integration into the ILO Decent Work Country Programme framework enhances synergies among related ILO projects and provides a unifying theme (“decent work for all”) for the involved partners. Overall, the project strategy has proven to be an effective and efficient tool in bringing about change.

At the same time, this broad strategy places exceptionally high burden on the project staff that are required to work with numerous counterparts (actors in the area of counter-trafficking, labour market actors etc.).

5.3 Overall objective (developmental impact)

The overall objective the project (*“to contribute to the progressive elimination of irregular migration, in particular trafficking in persons, from Ukraine and Moldova”* (Grant Application, p. 8)) targets both irregular migration and trafficking in human beings.

This particular formulation is somewhat unfortunate inasmuch it may be understood that trafficking in human beings is a specific form of irregular migration. The conflation of irregular migration and trafficking in human beings comes at a cost: there are tensions between the goals of eliminating trafficking in human beings and eliminating irregular migration (for example, restrictive migration policies and effective border controls which are often argued to address irregular migration may increase the vulnerability of certain groups to trafficking).

This explicit linking of irregular migration and trafficking in human beings may also help to sustain negative views on migration. So, for example, some of the evaluation seminar participants maintained that the aim of the evaluated project was to *“prevent migration and trafficking in human beings”* and that *“(external) migration is a threat to national interests”* of their country. (The ILO project staff repeatedly highlighted during the project and also during the evaluation seminar that this is not the position of the ILO, whose mandate is to protect the rights of all workers, regardless of their migration status.)

The ILO mandate clearly includes labour standards (including labour exploitation and forced labour), but it is less clear why/whether the ILO should be involved in activities focused on, for example, *“strengthening of the national capacity to detect criminal activities related to irregular migration”* (Specific objective 2, Grant Application, p. 8).⁴ At the same time, the actual interventions implemented by the project (defined as *“social and economic empowerment of at risk groups and the development and strengthening of institutional capacity in migration management and labour market policy to address the fundamental causes of human trafficking”* and strengthening of *“the implementation of NAP [on trafficking in human beings] in Moldova and Ukraine”* (Grant Application, p. 9)) clearly fall within the ILO mandate. This tension between the goals of contributing to the progressive elimination of irregular migration, and of trafficking in persons, from Ukraine and Moldova has been also mentioned by the project staff. A representative of the ILO project staff pointed out that *“ILO should work with labour inspectors and not with the police”* and that the *“ICMPD has a mandate to focus on criminal activities related to irregular migration.”*

⁴ The mandate of ICMPD covers migration, including irregular migration. See: <http://www.icmpd.org/whatisicmpd.html>, accessed on 27 January 2009.

Recommendation: Formulate overall objective to be clearly in line with the ILO mandate, in a more precise way.

5.4 Specific objectives

The project lists four specific objectives related to (1) policy and legal frameworks to promote legal migration and combat trafficking in persons for sexual and labour exploitation (and irregular migration); (2) capacity of national stakeholders to detect criminal activities related to irregular migration and to prevent trafficking in human beings, (3) decision making of potential migrants and trafficking victims about migration for employment abroad and (4) assistance, including socio-economic reintegration measures, for victims of trafficking (Grant Application, p. 9-10).

Bolstering the policy, legal and administrative and law enforcement frameworks (Specific objectives 1 and 2) against human trafficking is a necessary prerequisite for long-term, sustainable efforts to address this phenomenon. The project includes labour market actors, such as employers, trade unions and labour inspectorates. The focus on labour market actors is of added value and unique to ILO work in the anti-trafficking area and it sets ILO apart from other implementing agencies active in this field. The absence or weakness of policies and their implementation mechanisms is often due to the low capacity of various actors, an issue addressed under specific objective 2. In parallel with specific objective 1 and 2, the project aimed at targeting potential migrants/victims of trafficking who should be, as a result of the project activities, in a position to make better-informed decisions about migration for employment abroad (specific objective 3). The project developed information for potential migrants about legal migration channels to several EU countries and piloted pre-migration orientation in several regions. The overall project strategy aimed at influencing a range of national actors such as trade unions, employers, civil society organizations and public employment services to incorporate advice about legal migration channels and risks of irregular migration into their activities with potential migrants.

The expected outcomes 1, 2 and 3 and scheduled activities build on the core strengths of the ILO (provision of technical advice and capacity-building support to tripartite partners especially at the national and lower levels).

According to specific objective 4, the project aimed at ensuring that an increased number of trafficking victims will have received assistance, including socio-economic reintegration measures tailored to their needs. This aspect of the project was referred to in the project document as direct assistance to actual and potential victims of trafficking. In practice, however, the project activities and strategy focused on strengthening the National Referral Mechanism, a system of identification, protection, assistance and services for all victims of trafficking including victims of forced labour exploitation. The project did not provide this assistance directly, but through its partners on the ground. The strategy and activities implemented under specific objective 4 then to a large degree correspond to strategies and activities employed under specific objectives 1 and 2. During

the evaluation seminar, only one participant could identify a concrete number (19) of victims of trafficking who were assisted by the project. Others referred in broad terms that their organizations have now better operational procedures in place and that these are also addressing victims of trafficking, but at the same time pointed out that usually their respective organizations have not been able (either due to mandate restrictions or shortage of funds and expertise) to develop specific programs targeting needs of trafficked persons.

6 Delivery process

Information provided by the interviewed stakeholders suggests that the overall execution of the project has focused, albeit to a varying degree, on the achievement of the identified specific objectives. The delivery strategies established by the project has generally been effective and efficient, though the implementation individual activities were often delayed compared to the initial workplan.

Management and coordination arrangements

The project management has skillfully built on the strengths of ILO and its project partners. The project teams have demonstrated a high degree of flexibility and 'entrepreneurship' when identifying and seizing opportunities and turning them into synergies with related ILO projects, activities implemented by other international organizations and by national stakeholders.

The project documentation (especially the annual work plans) specifies the responsibilities of project partners. The cooperation of ICMPD and the ILO was overall very positive as reflected by the annual activity reports and stressed during the interviews. At the same time, the project staff indicated that proper coordination takes resources and that at times there was room for improved planning and the timely exchange of information between project partners.

The institutional setup with dual reporting lines (on technical matters to ILO SAP-FL in Geneva and on finance and administrative issues to ILO SRO Budapest) and management from the national project offices in Kiev and Chisinau supported the project adequately. The project staff in the field highly praised the work of the technical backstopper in ILO SAP-FL Geneva and of finance and administration staff in ILO SRO Budapest. The evaluation team clearly felt that friendly, efficient and professional communication has greatly contributed to the achievements of the project.

The project teams indicated that the 'decentralized' management of the project (i.e. one in which finance and administrative issues are handled by ILO sub-regional offices) are preferred to centralized management (where finance and administrative issues are handled by ILO headquarters) and noted decentralized management as a factor contributing to the effectiveness and efficiency of the project.

Recommendation: ILO staff need training on various specific provisions related to the management of EC funded projects

Stakeholders' participation in Design and Management/Implementation

The project has been guided by two steering boards, one for Moldova and one for Ukraine, comprised of representatives of various stakeholders' and target groups' organizations. The steering boards have met regularly. In the interviews, respondents generally commended the communication with the ILO project teams and their involvement in project implementation. Several stakeholders mentioned that they would have wished to be involved in the project at an earlier stage, preferably during planning, yet others indicated that they were consulted in the very earliest preparation stages. The inclusive representation of project partners and national stakeholders in the project steering committees provided a solid platform for interagency cooperation. This was especially needed given the still weak and understaffed national administrative structures in charge of counter-trafficking initiatives.

In interviews, all respondents expressed satisfaction with the project's respect for their national priorities and noted that their involvement in the design ensured that the project activities did not duplicate efforts of others. The respondents also commended the ILO and ICMPD technical advice, organizational support, and training materials tailored to the target partners. Strong partnerships with international and national actors and donors established during related ILO projects amplified the scope and impact of project activities.

7 Problems and needs (Relevance)

The issues of trafficking in human beings and irregular migration from Ukraine and Moldova continue to be pertinent and the overall objective the project (*"to contribute to the progressive elimination of irregular migration, in particular trafficking in persons, from Ukraine and Moldova"* (Grant Application, p. 8)) was and continues to be relevant.

The problems that gave rise to the project continue to exist, but the project has contributed to increasing the capacity of various national stakeholders to address them more effectively. As such the project was an appropriate response to the problems/needs when it started and more activities along the same lines would be appropriate to consolidate the achievements and increase their sustainability.

The assessments and information provided by the interviewed national stakeholders and the project staff point out clearly that the project activities were in line with the national priorities and consistent with the requirements of various target groups, ILO priorities and the EC policies. The project was coherent with current initiatives of the ILO as well as other actors in the anti-trafficking field (both international and national). The project results and impact are likely to mutually reinforce one another, without duplicating or conflicting with each other.

8 Achievement of purpose (Effectiveness)

As noted above, the objectively verifiable indicators for specific objectives 2, 3 and 4 do not afford the opportunity to assess whether/to what extent these specific objectives were achieved.

At the same time, information from interviews with national stakeholders substantiates the contention that the understanding of trafficking in human beings and capacities of various stakeholders to address it have increased as a result of project interventions. In this sense, it can be stated that the project has effected a behavioural change among stakeholders (public employment services, private employers, trade unions, local and state authorities) at various levels. These target groups are now better aware about the issue of trafficking in human beings and their respective contribution to addressing this issue. The project skillfully facilitated contact and communication between stakeholders who have in the past either not communicated at all or whose communication patterns have been burdened by negative stereotypes and expectations. At the same time, numerous stakeholders indicated that they would have welcomed an extended involvement of ILO so that they can transform acquired skills and knowledge into a lasting impact.

9 Sound management and value for money (Efficiency)

This evaluation did not review the budget and spending of the project and thus conclusions about project efficiency are based on non-financial information. In order to assess whether the expected project results continue to justify the costs incurred, whether the resources have been spent as economically as possible, a financial and administrative audit would be required.

The information available to the evaluation team suggests that the quality of day-to-day management in operational work planning and implementation (input delivery, activity management and delivery of outputs) was generally high and that the costs of the project have been justified by the benefits. Technical assistance provided helped to develop local capacities to produce results.

The project has established and nurtured effective relations and coordination with local authorities, institutions, beneficiaries and other donors. This has in general prevented the duplication of efforts and facilitated the savvy use of opportunities that have resulted in synergies between related ILO projects and activities of other organizations.

10 Achievement of wider effects (Impact)

The evaluation could not establish whether the project has achieved its planned overall objective due to missing data (both current and baseline) and methodological issues of attribution.

A recent report of the European Court of Auditors (par. 36) noted concerns related to the efficiency and economy of anti-trafficking projects implemented in Ukraine and Moldova: *“many donor organisations are ready to fund the fight against trafficking in persons, it is a challenge to avoid unnecessary duplication of actions and to ensure cost effective use of resources”* (European Court of Auditors (2008): *Special Report No 9/2008 (pursuant to Article 248(4), second subparagraph, EC) The effectiveness of EU support in the area of freedom, security and justice for Belarus, Moldova and Ukraine together with the Commission’s replies*. European Court of Auditors, Luxembourg).

It has to be highlighted against this background that the evaluated project has uniquely contributed to addressing trafficking in human beings in several key aspects: (1) it has sensitized stakeholders to the issues of labour exploitation and male victims of trafficking in human beings and (2) it has emphasized the importance of supply and demand for exploitable labour and has ‘brought in’ labour market actors to address trafficking in human beings from this particular perspective.

The effects of the project have been greatly facilitated by related ILO projects and by other interventions in the anti-trafficking field, to the degree that it was not always possible to clearly delineate the achievements of this particular ILO project from achievements of other interventions (especially the 5-year ILO-led Technical Cooperation Project “Employment, vocational training opportunities and migration policy measures to prevent and reduce trafficking in women in Albania, Moldova and Ukraine, which has finished in October 2008 and from other ILO technical cooperation assistance provided in the framework of the Decent Work Country Programmes).

The project has contributed to economic and social development and it has made a positive difference in terms of cross-cutting issues like gender equality and good governance.

The results of the project were constrained by a continuing lack of capacity on part of the national actors and at times lack of political will to address trafficking in human beings as an issue of priority (exemplified for example by the lack of sufficient funds to implement state programs on combating trafficking in human beings in Moldova and Ukraine).

11 Likely continuation of achieved results (Sustainability)

At the end of the project, there was a high degree of local and national ownership of the project results. This was reflected by the consensus among a broad range of stakeholders about the need to continue addressing trafficking in human beings and about the role of labour market and its actors in this area.

This level of understanding and consensus is a clear testament to the achievements of the project: At the time of the evaluation, the stakeholders maintained that the project results continue to influence the way they formulate and implement various policies and mandates to address the issue of trafficking in human beings. However, they also pointed out that this will be difficult without the direct and indirect (advocacy) support of the ILO. Already during the evaluation seminar, several participants pointed out to continuing needs for capacity building and spreading of knowledge they have acquired in seminars organized by the ILO. Others have mentioned specific examples of implementation of acquired knowledge in practice: *“Seminars of ILO were useful and we have changed our work with presumed victims of trafficking.”*

It seems then that although the project contributed to the creation of an enabling environment and to developing the capacity of local partners, their capacity is not yet sufficiently high to guarantee sustainability in any of the countries. In some cases the relevant national and regional budgetary policies and priorities are affecting the project results adversely, i.e. the anti-trafficking policies continue to suffer from under-funding and the project was not in a position to address this systemic issue.

The project has finished at a time of deepening global financial crisis, which has led to the contraction of labour markets, including in Moldova and Ukraine and countries of destination for migrants from Moldova and Ukraine. Facing the prospects of protracted unemployment and resultant poverty, workers from Moldova and Ukraine may be increasingly ‘pushed’ to search for jobs abroad despite the fact that most countries are further tightening legal labour migration channels. It is reasonable to assume that these global developments could partially negate the positive impact of the project and that in the future a number of persons from Moldova and Ukraine will continue to be vulnerable to labour exploitation and trafficking in human beings.

12 Special Concerns

12.1 Gender Concerns

The project with its emphasis on labour market actors and their involvement in addressing the issue of trafficking in human beings has employed a gendered strategy inasmuch it sensitized various stakeholders to the different needs of potential/actual victims of trafficking, both men and women. The added value of this project lies in the fact that stakeholders were sensitized to the issue of trafficking in men, a group that has been in the past often neglected by anti-trafficking interventions.

12.2 Knowledge Sharing

The project has benefited from the vast experience of the ILO in various areas related to work. The ILO has specifically provided several training courses on entrepreneurship (such as ‘Start Your Own Business’) and supported the project with technical expertise from various areas of the ILO mandate. The project benefited from ICMPD experience with strengthening national referral mechanisms for victims of trafficking. The transfer of

this knowledge/expertise has been a key strategy in capacity building of various national stakeholders and thus a backbone of the project.

At the same time, the resources available within the project to document project experiences and achievements, to share accrued knowledge among the project's country teams and with stakeholders within and outside the ILO (with similar ILO projects in-country and in the region, other donors' projects, government agencies etc.) seem to have been limited to knowledge sharing through regular internal reports. These reports have foremost focused on enumeration of activities implemented but did not provide a deeper reflection on the achievements of project results and objectives or the suitability of project strategies.

Recommendations:

- Plan and allocate more/sufficient resources to record the project achievements and lessons learnt.
- Make research results and training materials available at the sub-regional and international levels. The contents of the project website could migrate to the ILO SAP-FL website and/or to ILO SRO Budapest to allow for their continuing dissemination.
- Improve reporting: shift focus from activities to the achievement of project results and objectives; wherever necessary include analyses of risks and provide the Project Manager with an early notice on possible problems and actions to be taken.

13 Overall assessment

The evaluated project has been a success. With relatively limited resources the project has provided a good basis for a lasting change in the way various national stakeholders in Moldova and Ukraine conceptualize and act upon the issue of trafficking in human beings. It has built their capacity and increased their ‘coalition building’ potential which is a necessary precondition for identifying lasting solutions to deeply rooted problems such as trafficking in human beings.

13.1 Key success factors and critical junctures

Among the key success factors in this particular project are the highly appropriate overall project strategy, skillful selection of partners and not least the extraordinarily committed project teams, who have masterfully identified opportunities and synergies in an overall relatively difficult political environment. The project has masterfully drawn on the vast body of expertise accumulated by ILO in various areas relevant to its mandate.

A critical moment of the project was overly ambitious planning. Fortunately, this was to a large degree off-set by the combination of the project design’s flexibility and by the professionalism, extraordinary dedication and the ability of the project team to identify and make use of synergies with related ILO interventions and other anti-trafficking interventions implemented by other actors. For most part of the implementation, the project teams were responsible for the implementation of two parallel projects, suggesting that their resources have been relatively thinly spread and placing high demands on their efficient coordination. The project document foresaw the implementation of a large number of distinctive activities with a large number of various stakeholders. In practice this meant that with some stakeholders the quantity and depth of implemented activities may not have been sufficient to ensure that the stakeholders will be able to initiate or continue activities to address the issue of trafficking in human beings.

Annex 1 – Agenda of evaluation seminar

EVALUATION SEMINAR

Sub-regional evaluation seminar

“Elimination of human trafficking from Moldova and Ukraine through labour market based measures”

Pink Hall, Codru Hotel, 127, 31 August 1989 str.

5 February, Thursday

8.30 – 9.00 Registration of participants

9.00 – 9.45 Opening of the seminar

Ala Lipciu, ILO National Coordinator

Oleg Chirita, Project Manager, EC Delegation to Moldova

Sergiu Sainciuc, Deputy Minister of Economy and Trade

Anne Pawletta, consultant for the ILO Special Action Programme to Combat Forced Labour

Brigitte Stevkovski, ICMPD, Vienna

Blanka Hancilova, independent evaluator, Apreco Group

9:45 – 10:00 Coffee Break

10.00 – 10.30 Presentation of Project Objectives and Results (2007-2009)

Jana Costachi, ILO National Project Coordinator Moldova

Sophia Lytvyn, ILO National Project Coordinator Ukraine

10:30 –12:00 Panel 1 - Project achievements and lessons learnt:

Specific objective 1: Better policy and legal frameworks to promote legal migration and combat trafficking in persons for sexual and labour exploitation

Chair: Anne Pawletta, consultant for the ILO Special Action Programme to Combat Forced Labour

National key partners Moldova

Ecaterina Buracec, Ministry of Economy and Trade

Elena Vîtcărau, National Bureau of Statistics

National key partner Ukraine

Oleksii Dashkovskyi Ministry of Labour and Social Policy of Ukraine

Inna Syvyrynyuk, Ministry of Ukraine for Family, Youth and Sports

Questions and Answers

12.00 – 13.00 Lunch

13:00 –14:15 Panel 2 - Project achievements and lessons learnt:

Specific objective 2: Strengthened capacity of national stakeholders to detect criminal activities related to irregular migration and to prevent trafficking in human beings

Chair: Brigitte Stevkovski, ICMPD

National key partner: Moldova

Daniela Gutu, ILO, National Project Assistant, Moldova

Igor Ciloci, Labour Inspection

Vladislav Caminschi, National Employers Organisation

National key partner: Ukraine

Inna Syvyrynyuk, Ministry for Family, Youth and Sports

Dmytro Marshavin, Public Employment Service

Rostislav Kurinko, Federation of Employers of Ukraine

Questions and Answers

14.15 – 14.45 Coffee break

14:45 –15:45 Panel 3: Presentation of project achievements and lessons learnt

Specific objective 3: Potential migrants and trafficking victims will make more informed decisions about migration for employment abroad.

Chair: Anna Farkas, ILO, Budapest

National key partner Moldova

Raisa Dogaru, National Employment Agency

Ala Moldovanu, National Confederation of Trade Unions

Mihaela Vidaicu, National Association of Private Employment Agencies

National key partner Ukraine

Dmytro Marshavin, Public Employment Service

Viktor Stratan, Confederation of Trade Unions of Ukraine

Olena Lobchenko, Federation of Trade Unions of Ukraine

Yuriy Kurylo, All-Ukrainian Union of Workers' Solidarity

Questions and Answers

15.45-16.15 Coffee break

16:15-17:45 Panel 4 - Project achievements and lessons learnt:

Specific objective 4: An increased number of trafficking victims will have received assistance, including socio-economic reintegration measures tailored to their needs.

Chair: Undine Groeger, ILO Special Action Programme to Combat Forced Labour

National key partner Moldova

Lili Borzin, Centre to Prevent Trafficking in Women

Ministry of Social Protection/National Agency of Employment

National key partner Ukraine:

Viktor Stratan, Confederation of Trade Unions of Ukraine

Olena Lobchenko, Federation of Trade Unions of Ukraine

Yuriy Kurylo, All-Ukrainian Union of Workers' Solidarity

Dmytro Marshavin, Public Employment Service

Questions and Answers

Conclusions	Conclusions and recommendations for the future work against human trafficking and forced labour
17.45 -18.30	<p>Chair: Blanka Hancilova, Independent evaluator, Apreco Group</p> <p>Sergiu Sainciuc, Deputy Minister of Economy and Trade</p> <p>Sophia Lytvyn, ILO National Project Coordinator, Ukraine</p> <p>Jana Costachi, ILO National Project Coordinator, Moldova</p> <p>Ala Lipciu, ILO National Coordinator</p>
18.30	Reception

Annex 2 – Persons interviewed and consulted during evaluation

Staff involved in project implementation

Ms Anne Pawletta, Project Officer (June 2007 – December 2008 ILO SAP-FL, Geneva

Ms Undine Groeger, Project Officer (as of January 2009), ILO SAP-FL, Geneva

Ms Anna Farkas, Administrative and Financial Coordinator, ILO SRO Budapest

Ms Sophia Lytvyn, National Project Coordinator, ILO Ukraine

Ms Jana Costachi, National Project Coordinator, ILO Moldova

Ms Galina Meshcheryakova, Project Assistant, ILO Ukraine

Ms Valeriya Taran, Project Secretary, ILO Ukraine

Ms Daniela Gutu, Project Assistant, ILO Moldova

Ms Victoria Nacu, Project Secretary, ILO Moldova

Ms Elisa Trossero, Programme Manager, ICMPD

National stakeholders Moldova

Mrs. Raisa Dogaru, Chief of Directorate on the Implementation of Occupational Policies, National Employment Agency

Mrs. Elena Vatcarau, Chief of Directorate on the Labour Market Statistics, National Bureau for Statistics

Mrs. Lilia Borzin, Project Coordinator, Social Assistance Center to Prevent Trafficking in Women (NGO)

Mr. Vladislav Caminschi, Chief of Direction Internal and International Relations of the National Confederation of Employers

Mrs. Ecaterina Buracec, Chief of Directorate on Migration Policies, Ministry of Economy

Mrs. Valentina Ungureanu, Consultant of the Directorate on Migration Policy, ME

Mrs. Mihaela Vidaicu, Representative of the Association of Private Employment Agencies

Mr. Ion Focsa, Principle Inspector, Ministry of Internal Affairs, formerly Secretary of the NC on THB and Inspector of the Center to Combat Trafficking in Human Beings, MIA

Mrs. Ana Moldovanu, Deputy Director of the Department of Social and Economic Protection, Trade Unions Federation of Moldova

Mr. Petru Chiriac, Deputy Chairman of the National Federation of Trade Unions from Moldova

Mr. Sergiu Iurcu, Principal Specialist of the Department of Social and Economic Protection, Trade Unions Federation

Mrs. Ala Supac, Director of the Chisinau Employment Agency

Mr. Sergiu Sainciuc, Deputy Minister of Economy, Ministry of Economy of the Republic of Moldova

National stakeholders Ukraine

Mr. Hlib Yasnytsky, Human Rights Officer, OSCE

Ms. Maja Wiebler, CBMMP Project Manager, IOM

Ms. Olena Bogdanova, Project Specialist/CMA, IOM

Ms. Marianna Evsyukova, Director, Legal Department, La Strada Ukraine

Mr. Viktor Burlaka, Local Project Manager, EC/AENEAS Project “Safe Bridges for Migrant Workers” in Moldova and Ukraine

Ms. Elvira Mruchkovska, Director, NGO “Suchasnyk”

Mr. Vyacheslav Bykovets, First Vice President, All-Ukrainian Employers’ Association

Ms. Olga Lopatkina, Deputy Director of the Financial and Analytical Department, Confederation of Employers of Ukraine

Mr. Vasyl Nadraha, Deputy Director General, Federation of Employers of Ukraine

Mr. Rostislav Kurinko, Head of the International Relations Department, Federation of Employers of Ukraine

Ms. Irina Kirkina, Director, “Personal” Consulting Agency (Private Employment Agency)

Mr. Olexandr Savenok, Deputy Director, Department of Family and Gender Policy, Ministry for Family, Youth and Sports

Ms. Inna Syvyrynyuk, Head Specialist, Department for the Prevention of Domestic Violence and Counter-Trafficking, Ministry for Family, Youth and Sports

Mr. Taras Simak, Senior Specialist, Labor Migration Regulation and License Conditions Branch, Employment Policy and Labor Migration Department, Ministry of Labor and Social Policy

Ms. Lyudmyla Pozhydaeva, Consultant to the Director, Public Employment Center

Mr. Dmytro Marshavin, Senior Lecturer, State Employment Service Staff Training Institute

Mr. Volodymyr Gyshchak, Director, Kyiv Youth Labor Center, Kyiv City Administration

Mr. Alexei Gavrilenko, Legal Specialist, Kyiv Youth Labor Center, Kyiv City Administration

Mr. Andriy Orlean, Head of the Research Institute of the Department of the Academy of the Procuracy of Ukraine

Mr. Bogdan Overkovsky, Head of the Employment and Remuneration Branch, Economic Protection Department, Federation of Trade Unions of Ukraine

Annex 3 – Specific evaluation questions

- ❖ **Project logic and design** (Are the objectives clearly stated, describing the solutions to the identified problems and needs? Are the indicators of achievement clearly defined, describing the changes to be brought about? Is the project document logical and coherent linking the inputs, activities and outputs to each immediate objective? Are the roles and commitments of the various partners clearly identified? Is/was there any reason to revisit and change the project design? Have the external factors affecting project implementation been identified and assumptions proven valid? Is there, or would there have been, a more effective way of addressing the problems and satisfying the needs in order to achieve the project objectives? Is the project strategy still valid or should it be reformulated? What particular factors or events have affected the project's results? Were these factors internal or external to the project?)
- ❖ **Delivery Process** (Has the overall execution of the project focused on the achievement of the objectives? Is the delivery strategy established by the project effective? Have the main partners interacted and coordinated as planned? Have the various partners contributed to project implementation as planned? Has the project management sufficiently combined project activities with the strengths of its project partners? How flexible and 'entrepreneurial' was the project management and the development of the project in terms of seizing available opportunities and adding additional important enterprise development components (within the framework of the project goals)? To what extent was the project innovative in its delivery and in developing new enterprise development approaches, which were not planned from the outset in the project document? Did the 'institutional set up' (backstopping from HQ Geneva and management from the national project offices in Kiev and Chisinau) support the project adequately or more? In addition and as importantly, the objective is to draw lessons learned from the project implementation with a view to assess whether the project objectives, methods and approaches had the results and impact expected and were useful and relevant.
- ❖ **Relevance** (Do the problems/needs that gave rise to the project still exist, have they changed or are there new needs that should be addressed? Was the project an appropriate response to the problems/needs that existed when it started? Is the project still appropriate to the problems/needs? Have the priorities given to the basic components of the project, i.e. institutional development versus direct support, changed? If so, why? Are the objectives still valid or should they be reformulated?)
- ❖ **Effectiveness** (Has the project made sufficient progress in meeting its objectives? Has the 'integrated approach' contributed to the project's effectiveness? Has data been collected to measure the outputs of the project? Is it necessary to collect additional data? Has the project made sufficient progress in conducting activities and producing outputs? Did the target groups participate in the formulation and implementation of the project? Have the project benefits accrued to the target groups?)

- ❖ **Efficiency** (Do the expected project results continue to justify the costs incurred? Have the resources been spent as economically as possible? Were the actions of the various project partners complementary? Are there more efficient ways and means of delivering more and better outputs with the available inputs?)
- ❖ **Impact** (To what extent the objectives of the project, in particular the project planned overall objective, have been achieved as intended? Is the project having any significant (positive and/or negative) unforeseen effects? What could be done to enhance/ mitigate them so that the project has a greater positive impact? Were the effects of the project facilitated/constrained by external factors; by project management, by co-ordination arrangements, by the participation of relevant stakeholders? Have the project contributed to economic and social development, to poverty reduction etc.)
- ❖ **Sustainability** (What is the likelihood that the project's benefits will be sustained after the withdrawal of external support? Do conditions exist to ensure that the project's results will have lasting effects?)
- ❖ **Special Concerns**
 - Gender Concerns (Have the different needs of women and men been addressed in the delivery process? How have women and men in the target groups benefited from the project activities? To what extent did the project mainstream gender in its approach and activities? To what extent did the project use gender specific tools and products?) have made a difference in terms of cross-cutting issues like gender equality, environment, good governance, conflict prevention etc.
 - Knowledge Sharing (Has sufficient attention been given to documenting the project experiences and achievements? In what ways has the knowledge pertaining to these project experiences and achievements been documented? Has the project sufficiently shared its accrued knowledge on the experiences and achievements among the project's country teams? Have the project experiences and achievements been shared with stakeholders within and outside the ILO (with similar ILO projects in-country and in the region, other donors' projects, government agencies etc.)?)
 - Lessons Learned (What are the lessons learned in terms of an 'integrated project approach' and what have we learned about the project's experience? What are the major lessons learnt through the project implementation and what are the implications for future project design?)

Annex 4 – Visit of ILO experts and independent evaluator in Moldova

**Visit of ILO experts, independent evaluator and delegation from Ukraine to
Moldova**

4-6 February, 2009

Technical Cooperation Project

**“Elimination of human trafficking from Moldova and Ukraine through labour
market based measures”**

4 February, Wednesday

After 16.00	Arrival of Ukrainian delegation to the hotel “Dacia”
17.30	Meeting of Blanka Hancilova, independent evaluator with Local evaluators from Moldova and Ukraine (Codru Hotel or office of the ILO Project in Moldova)
19:00	Joint ILO/evaluators briefing over dinner (restaurant of the Codru Hotel)
19:00	Dinner of the Ukrainian delegation (according to the desire of participants)

4 February, Wednesday – Evaluation seminar

Objectives of the seminar:

1. Assess the achievements of the ILO project, implemented in Moldova and Ukraine during December 2006-February 2009
2. Facilitate meeting of national project partners from Moldova and Ukraine in order to discuss project implementation, problems encountered and lessons learnt
3. Provide information for the independent evaluator

February 6, Friday

9.00 -10.30	Meeting of ILO project teams from Moldova, Ukraine, Geneva and Budapest to discuss remaining activities and closure of project (Office of the ILO Project in Moldova)	Meeting of the independent evaluator with the delegation from Ukraine (Office of the ILO Project in Moldova)
10.30 -12.00	Meeting of the independent evaluator with the project team from Ukraine (Office of the ILO Project in Moldova)	
12:00-13:00	Lunch of the Ukrainian delegation and ILO staff from Ukraine	
13.00	Departure of Ukrainian delegation	
13.00 – 13.30	Meeting of independent evaluator with Deputy Minister of Economy, Mr Sainciuc	
16.00	Meeting of independent evaluator with Vasile Cantarji (sub-contractor to ILO Moldova)	