



International Labour Organization

iTrack
Evaluation

ILO EVALUATION

Evaluation Title: Global Action Programme on Migrant Domestic Workers and their Families (GAP-MDW)

ILO TC/SYMBOL: GLO/12/28/EEC

Type of Evaluation : **Final independent evaluation**

Country(ies) : Global and 5 Migration corridors (11 countries)
Indonesia-Malaysia
Nepal – Lebanon
Paraguay – Argentina
Ukraine – Poland
Zimbabwe-Lesotho- South Africa

Date of the evaluation: **18.1.2017**

Name of consultant(s): **Una Murray**

ILO Administrative Office: **Labour Migration Branch (MIGRANT)**

ILO Technical Backstopping Office: **Labour Migration Branch (MIGRANT)**

Other agencies involved in joint evaluation:

Date project ends: **31.07.2016**

Donor: country and budget US\$ EU contribution: US\$3.9 million
ILO contributed US\$960,000 to cost share activities.

Evaluation Manager: **Natalia Popova**

Key Words: Domestic Workers; Migrants; Migrant Domestic Workers; Corridor Approach; ILO Convention 189

This evaluation has been conducted according to ILO's evaluation policies and procedures. It has not been professionally edited, but has undergone quality control by the ILO Evaluation Office

Quick Facts

Donor:	European Union
Funds:	EU contribution: €4,375,000 ILO contribution: €867,577 to cost share activities
Countries:	Global and 5 Migration corridors (11 countries) Indonesia-Malaysia Nepal – Lebanon Paraguay – Argentina Ukraine – Poland Zimbabwe-Lesotho- South Africa
Project Start:	February 1 st 2013
Project End:	31 st July 2016 (including 6 months no cost extension)
Project Code:	GLO/12/28/EEC
Evaluation type:	Final independent evaluation
Evaluation Management:	Ms. Natalia Popova
Evaluator:	Dr. Una Murray
Keywords:	Migrant Domestic Worker; Migration; Domestic workers; Informal workers; ILO Convention 189

Table of Contents

<i>Outline of evaluation report</i>	4
<i>Acronyms</i>	5
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	6
1. Executive Summary	7
2. Introduction	11
2.1 <i>Migrant Domestic Workers: Background</i>	11
2.2 <i>The GAP-MDW project: Background</i>	13
2.3 <i>Purpose, scope and clients of evaluation</i>	15
2.4 <i>Methodology</i>	16
2.5 <i>Constraints</i>	17
3. Relevance	18
3.1 <i>Relevance for ILO-led Global Agendas</i>	18
3.2 <i>Relevance to ILO Programming</i>	19
3.3 <i>Relevance to National Strategies</i>	20
4. Effectiveness	23
4.1 <i>Global Elements of the GAP-MDW Project</i>	24
4.2 <i>Regional Elements of the GAP-MDW Project</i>	25
4.3 <i>Corridor Approach</i>	26
4.3 <i>Achievements of GAP-MDW</i>	27
4.4 <i>Views of GAP-MDW stakeholders via evaluation questionnaire responses</i>	32
4.5 <i>Challenges</i>	32
5. Coherence	37
5.1 <i>Changing Perceptions amongst Constituents</i>	37
5.2 <i>Indicators in the GAP-MDW Project</i>	38
5.3 <i>Gender Equality and Mainstreaming Decent Work</i>	39
6. Efficiency	41
6.1 <i>Collaboration and Synergies</i>	41
6.2 <i>Use of Projects Resources</i>	42
6.3 <i>Project Management</i>	43
6.4 <i>Communications</i>	46
7. Sustainability	47
7.1 <i>Sustainability Strategy</i>	47
7.2 <i>Examples of Initiatives that are likely to Continue</i>	49
7.3 <i>Global Report on Migrant Domestic Workers</i>	51
8. Conclusions	52
9. Recommendations	54
10. Lessons learned and emerging good practices	61
10.1 <i>Lessons learned</i>	61
10.2 <i>Emerging good practices</i>	67
Annexes to Evaluation	71
Annex 1: <i>Terms of reference for final evaluation</i>	71
Annex 2: <i>List of those interviewed</i>	77
Annex 3: <i>Evaluation questionnaire</i>	80
Annex 4: <i>Evaluation questionnaire respondents</i>	84
Annex 5: <i>Outputs from GAP-MDW</i>	85
Annex 6: <i>IDWF report on electronic platform set up under GAP-MDW</i>	90

Annex 7: Views of GAP-MDW stakeholders via evaluation questionnaire responses	93
Annex 8: Resources for monitoring and evaluating policy influence	96
Annex 9: Measuring the GAP-MDW Objectives – comments	97
Annex 10: GAP-MDW Case Study findings from the 5 migration corridors	100
A10.1 Ukraine - Poland corridor	100
A10.2 Zimbabwe, Lesotho and South Africa.....	103
A10.3 Paraguay –Argentina Corridor	109
A10.4 Nepal - Lebanon Corridor	112
A10.5 Indonesia – Malaysia corridor.....	117

List of Tables

Table 1: Domestic workers, global estimates	11
Table 4: National policy documents of relevance to the GAP-MDW project.....	21
Table 6: Achievements of the GAP-MDW project.....	28
Table 12: Issues raised as challenges in the GAP-MDW project.....	33
Table 13: Collaboration (internally within ILO headquarters and in the field)	45
Table 15: Recommendations arising from evaluation	55
Table 2: Migration corridors and Respondents to questionnaire	84
Table 3: Who do questionnaire respondents work for	84
Table 5: Results/outputs from GAP-MDWs.....	85
Table 7: How well GAP-MDW implemented approaches for MDWs.....	93
Table 8: How well do you consider staff capacity has been built in your organization...	93
Table 9: How do you rate any research on MDWs conducted for this project.....	94
Table 10: Do you think that the research results have reached those it should reach?...	94
Table 11: Do you think advocacy/information awareness work has fostered change? ..	94

Outline of evaluation report

This evaluation report is broadly structured around the key evaluation questions outlined in the terms of reference (ToR) covering the relevance of GAP-MDW; the coherence; how effective GAP-MDW project was; the efficiency of the project; sustainability issues; and how gender equality was address. More detailed analyses of what took place in each migration corridor are presented as case studies in Annex 10. In this Annex, the context for each corridor is presented, followed by achievements/challenges and lessons learned from the GAP-MDW in the corridor.

Acronyms

ASEAN	South East Asian Nations
BLSs	Bilateral Labour Agreements (BLAs)
CBS	Central Bureau of Statistics
CoP	Community of Practice
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DW4DW	Decent Work for Domestic Workers
GAP-MDW	Global Action Programme on Migrant Domestic Workers and their families
GEFONT	General Federation of Nepalese Trade Unions
GCC	Gulf Cooperation Council
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IDWF	International Domestic Workers Federation
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
ILO	International Labour Organization
IOM	International Organization for Migration
ITUC	International Trade Union Confederation
KSBSI	An Indonesian Trade Union (Konfederasi Serikat Buruk Sejahtera)
KSP	Knowledge Sharing Platform
KSP / CoP	Knowledge Sharing Platform/ Community of Practice
LFS	Labour Force Survey
MDW	Migrant Domestic Workers
MLAs	Multilateral Labour Agreements
MTUC	Malaysian Trade Union Confederation
NEDLAC	National Economic Development Labour Council, South Africa
OHCHR	The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
P&B	ILO Programme and Budget
PERC	The Pan European Regional Council of ITUC
ROAP	Regional Office for the Arab States
SAARC	South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SDC	Swiss Development Cooperation
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SINTRADOP	Sindicato Itaipú and Asociación de Trabajadoras Domésticas Paraguay
ToT	Training of Trainers
TUESWU	Trade Union of Education and Science Workers of Ukraine
UAE	United Arab Emirates
VOST VOLYA	All Ukrainian Workers' Solidarity Organisation
WiF	Work in Freedom
ZAWU	Zimbabwean Domestic workers organization
ZIMSTAT	National Statistics Institute of Zimbabwe

Acknowledgements

The Evaluator would like to acknowledge and sincerely thank all involved in the GAP-MDW project for their access and support in conducting this final evaluation, and their immediate responses to the many queries throughout the process. Thanks also to those who facilitated the field visits (Ukraine and South Africa) and travel to Geneva and logistics, and the ILO staff and consultants who generously hosted and facilitated visits to partner organizations. Constituents, researchers, trainers and consultants took time to be interviewed, providing their useful observations and perceptions, which is fully acknowledged. The evaluator really appreciated the time constituents and ILO staff took in responding to the evaluation questionnaire, providing rich qualitative insights, and meaningfully forward looking recommendations. Special thanks also to those working in ILO Geneva on migration, domestic work and force labour for their useful insights for this evaluation and insightful comments. Warm thanks are also extended to Natalia Popova, who was the evaluation manager and coordinated the final evaluation, and who vigilantly and conscientiously advised throughout. Thanks also to Rasha Tabbara and Chantal Dufrense at ILO Geneva.

Una Murray, January 18th 2017

1. Executive Summary

Through an international bidding process ILO was awarded US\$3.9 million for the EU for the Global Action Programme on Migrant Domestic Workers (MDWs) and their Families (GAP-MDW) project. ILO contributed US\$960,000 (€867,577) to cost share activities. GAP-MDWs ran from February 2013 to July 2016 (including a 6 months extension). This report is the final independent evaluation of the GAP-MDW project.¹

The demand for ILO technical assistance from national constituents on matters relating to domestic workers has increased since the adoption of the Domestic Workers Convention (No. 189) and Recommendation (No. 201), 2011. In 2011, the ILO Governing Body endorsed a global ILO *“Strategy for action towards making decent work a reality for domestic workers worldwide”*, serving as a unifying framework for action at country, regional and global levels on domestic work. The GAP-MDW project (the subject of this evaluation report) focused on five domestic workers migration corridors: Nepal to Lebanon; Paraguay to Argentina; Indonesia to Malaysia; Ukraine to Poland; and Zimbabwe/ Lesotho to South Africa. GAP-MDW sought to promote the human and labour rights of MDWs worldwide by addressing the challenges that make them particularly vulnerable to the risks of exploitation and abuse. Research was undertaken to provide evidence of their situation; activities were put in place to enhance capacities of organizations who advocate for MDWs rights; and capacity building approaches were pilot tested in three corridors to protect, support and empower MDWs. The project focused on five migration corridors, but also achieved global reach through knowledge sharing and dissemination information widely.

Methodology: The purpose of this evaluation is to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, and sustainability of the GAP-MDW project, focusing on what was achieved, what challenges were encountered and the underlying reasons for both. The evaluation is for accountability and learning purposes. Key evaluation clients are the EU, the ILO and project partners. The evaluation took place between mid-July and September 2016. Over 60 people were interviewed face-to-face or by Skype for this evaluation including ILO staff and partners. Field visits took place in late July to Ukraine (a sending country) and South Africa (a destination country). A survey questionnaire yielded 36 qualitative responses (18 percent response rate). Constraints related to the scope of the evaluation (covering 11 countries and many global partners and products) and timing (it began during a holiday period). This final evaluation was carried out fairly soon after the mid-term evaluation, with some interviewees experiencing evaluation ‘fatigue’.

Findings: Managed from ILO Geneva, the project had global, national and migration corridor focused elements under a strong gender and workers rights focus. Primarily the project sought to make linkages in sending and receiving countries, and amongst various stakeholders within countries, but linking to a global rights agenda. The project set itself an ambitious task. The GAP-MDW project fits with ILO initiatives such as the ILO office wide *Decent Work for Domestic Workers Strategy*; the *ILO Fair Migration Agenda*; and the *ILO Fair Recruitment Initiative*. Four technical departments (MIGRANT, INWORK, SAP/FL and ACTRAV) at ILO headquarters were involved. The GAP-MDW project was relevant to many other ILO initiatives, and timely, in that it was able to seize opportunities through ILO’s 2013 leadership of the interagency Global Migration Group and at related high profile events to raise the

¹ Project code: DCI-MIGR/2012/283-032

visibility of migrant domestic workers. It aligned with two Outcomes of the Programme and Budget 2012-15.

The International Domestic Workers Federation (IDWF) was an associate of the project and they developed a global electronic knowledge platform. The number of registered members began at 603 and rose to 40,564 by September 2016.² Another associate was the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) who launched the '12 by 12' campaign in partnership with IDWF/IUF and others, and with IDWF host the 'My Fair Home' campaign. In most of the 11 countries of focus, work on domestic workers/migrants preceded GAP-MDW, albeit more in some countries (Lebanon, Paraguay, South Africa) than others (Ukraine, Lesotho, Zimbabwe). Operationally the GAP-MDW project linked to projects that worked on combating trafficking or safe migration (such as the ASEAN Triangle project, the GMS Triangle Project, PROWD, *Work in Freedom*) and worked closely with UN Women in Argentina. In fact UN Women and OHCHR were official partners to the project along with the trade union KSBSI in Indonesia. The project experienced many external political and environmental challenges. For example the ongoing crisis in Syria has led to massive displacement of people including into Lebanon; two major earthquakes in Nepal greatly affected project activities; and Ukraine is experiencing ongoing conflict.

Research commissioned examined the different needs of MDWs throughout the migration cycle (pre-employment, at work, and on return). The Global Flagship on MDW summarises many of the key lessons learned on the rights of migrant domestic workers through the GAP-MDW project (including the 11 baseline and five thematic studies; the 7 policy briefs). The strong collaboration with and between ITUC and IDWF, and the technical assistance provided to IDWF to support their founding congress were effective for global strategies to improve the organization of MDWs. Many regional, bi national and tri national workshops took place in the 5 migration corridors and beyond, to develop strategies, build alliances and move forward the agenda for domestic workers. An inter-regional knowledge-sharing workshop in Madagascar was reported as particularly effective with ILO playing an excellent facilitating role amongst constituents and others, and an emphasis on labour agreements between regions and countries. These events allowed for countries to learn from each other, and to understand the international context under which MDWs are placed. National stakeholders also used research findings to strengthen their engagement with government. For example a study contributed to discussions around lowering this age ban in Nepal.

Another achievement was the quantitative statistical module included in the Zimbabwe Labour Force Survey, which provided a detailed profile of the flows of migrant workers. The module was adopted by SADC as an instrument to be used by its other members to inform Labour Market Information Systems. A range of information guides, newsletters, booklets, and 4 videos (one through OHCHR) were produced. Notably both the ITUC-IDWF-ILO guide for collective bargaining and the information 'passports' (for domestic workers as they travel) were reported to provide useful and practical information. When disseminated and widely referenced in other initiatives, these tools should continue to enhance awareness of social partners so they can advocate for MDWs. The three vocational training skills manuals developed in Argentina to professionalize workers who care for the elderly, children and housework are operational, and are already being further adapted for migrants in refugee situations, and will be piloted in 2017 in Jordan, Lebanon and in Egypt.

In Paraguay the project contributed towards the passing of new law on domestic work approved by Parliament in March 2015, equating domestic workers rights with all wage workers rights, although the minimum wage adopted for domestic workers is lower than the

² IDWF now (Dec 2016) report that the number of registered members are at 400,000-500,000

general minimum wage. In Argentina, with new legislation passed in 2015, it was reported that a relatively higher number of MDWs enrolled for social security. In Ukraine, Convention 189 ratification is now scheduled for 2019. In most countries, employers did not feature strongly in the overall GAP-MDW project. However in Lebanon, innovative pilots were put in place with bank employees, which are expanding further through ILO projects currently under negotiation. In Malaysia, a code of conduct was developed through a consultative process with employers, and launched in March 2016. Research in South Africa and Malaysia also provided useful insights on how employers view MDWs. In Argentina, employers were encouraged to register their domestic workers.

Generally, with some exceptions questionnaire respondents for the evaluation were positive about the GAP-MDW project, considering activities to be worthwhile, and mentioning those they particularly appreciated. Many stakeholders interviewed were appreciative of the support from the EU, which allowed for a spotlight MDWs via ILO and partners.

Challenges: The GAP-MDW project could have benefited from a stronger ‘theory of change’ with regard to what it was trying to achieve, and how. With so many products, workshops, regions, and multi-processes, the project required more visible ‘discipline’ with regard to how all the components contribute towards eventual outcomes. Even with efforts made by the GAP-MDW project (developing both a results and progress matrix), with so many activities taking place in so many countries, monitoring was very difficult. The project was reliant on ILO national officers or partners reporting. Many interviewed did not find the project indicators particularly useful. However this evaluation notes (as did the mid-term and evaluability assessment) that projects which have an ambitious task (changing attitudes and mind frames towards MDW, not to mention examining laws and working with so many actors), require longer time frames. Attribution is difficult to measure, and in many cases, incremental changes can only be noted in the policy sphere. Other challenges included the lack of dedicated project staff in many of the 11 countries. Bidding regulations in the EU expects activities to be undertaken with existing human resources, and does not encourage flexibility in budget allocations for staff during implementation. Most interviewees made the point that with more human resources and better coordination with national strategies from the start, pilot initiatives would have made better progress and be more sustainable.

In line with ILO’s mandate, the GAP-MDW project strove to reach MDWs through partners, encouraging trade unions to represent this category of worker with IDWF reaching out through their electronic platform. Another approach was building the capacity of domestic workers unions. For example SADSAWU in South Africa are pioneering approaches to reach more migrants. Mobilizing and sustaining efforts amongst different authorities and stakeholders to come together to address MDW rights is a long process. Policy requires dialogues with those working directly with MDWs. Mobilising domestic workers requires much outreach activities and a ‘community development’ approach.

Project management challenges related to the complexity of commissioning multi-country studies, handling 5 migration corridors with multiple sites and organizations that were intended to generate information towards concrete legislative change in each corridor as well as for global action and advocacy to protect MDWs. Many of the challenges related to a lack of dedicated staff to this project, coordinating across units at headquarters, as well as budgets and co-financing requirements. Management of the project often relied on the good will of country offices. Effective projects need dedicated staff in the countries of delivery and adequate travel budget to ensure support from Geneva. This was lacking in the GAP-MDW project. The Working Group to implement the ILO global strategy (Decent Work for Domestic

Workers) provides a good anchor for all work related to domestic work within ILO, but could have been used more by GAP-MDW.

In conclusion, the GAP-MDW project allowed for an exclusive opportunity to research and focus on the migrant domestic workers domain. If disseminated widely, and packaged in discrete policy briefs, the Global Report on Migrant Domestic Workers will be significant for driving policy advice and change, as it draws on many experiences across the globe. Capacity for relevant organizations to advocate for MDWs drew considerable attention to the MDWs amongst trade unions in many of the countries, but trade unions still require much encouragement to focus on this category of informal worker. The need for a focus on MDWs themselves has been fully recognised as the most sustainable approach for collective action to build advocacy approaches. Organising domestic workers, not an easy task, requires further support.

Recommendations: (1) Continue to focus on this category of often forgotten workers through a corridor approach, using regional dialogue approaches. (2) Use MDW experience as an example of gender and the care economy in the global 2030 agenda. Ensure MDWs are visible in the framework for Alliance 8.7. (3) Continue to document innovative ways of reaching employers of domestic workers and share widely with ILO staff, partners and ACTEMP. An awareness raising campaign that highlights research results is still required to reach many more stakeholders, using the information (such as the Global Report on MDWs) emanating from this project. (4) Dedicate time to share information, and follow up on what has taken place particularly through the GAP-MDW knowledge sharing forums. Create more opportunities for international and inter regional exchange of experiences on MDWs using South-South cooperation, linking to regional bodies such as the SAARC, SADC and the Gulf countries and presenting results widely.

(5) Keep the voices of MDWs at the heart of any initiative. Encourage more close links with MDW organizations themselves. Explore possibilities for peer exchange of domestic workers unions to view other projects or see what is happening in other regions. Encourage governments to extend professional skills for domestic workers to NGOs and government training centres. (6) Continue to mainstream the issue of migrant domestic workers in other ILO initiatives and also focus on building skills of how ILO staff measure how policy is influenced. (7) In future projects define adequate M&E procedures using existing ILO procedures and tools and establish a better supervision body and mechanism to better monitor performance. Always ensure that evaluation results are comprehensively discussed and the most appropriate recommendations used. (8) Explore opportunities for funding collaborating with a range of agencies interested in migration. For example through the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD) or 'Africa Trust Fund for stability and addressing root causes of irregular migration and displaced persons'.

Throughout this project, ILO staff learned that although challenging to implement a corridor approach with many stakeholders, an overall migration pattern becomes apparent, which is very useful when linking research results on migrant domestic workers to policy dialogue. Projects that focus on a particular category of migrants (migrant domestic workers) require a strong central focus on supporting Domestic Workers to organise. A further lesson learned relates to building project teams and careful planning for typical delays inherent in a global project with so many collaborations and partnerships.

Emerging good practices relate to the usefulness of using a corridor approach to tackle migration issues. How ILO pitched MDW work within the broader gender and global care agenda is also an emerging good practice and fits with 2030 global sustainable development agenda.

2. Introduction

“...what is evidently lacking in the current international migration framework is that it is not treated as an inevitable process that can richly benefit our country”

Minister of Home Affairs Malusi Gigaba,
Launch of Green Paper on International Migration
Pretoria in July 2016.

2.1 Migrant Domestic Workers: Background

Article 1 of ILO Domestic Workers Convention 189, defines **domestic work** as work performed in or for a household or households within an employment relationship. The ILO estimates there are 67 million domestic workers over the age of 15. Women and girls mainly carry out domestic work, providing a source of income to millions of women in the world. Domestic work thus provides an employment opportunity for women who migrate. Even though there are at least 67 million domestic workers in the world, historically domestic work is undervalued and invisible. Many domestic workers (migrants or members of disadvantaged communities) are particularly vulnerable to discrimination in respect of conditions of employment, and other abuses of human rights.

Table 1: Domestic workers, global estimates

How many domestic workers?	Conservative estimates
Migrants	232 million
Migrant workers	150 million
No. of domestic workers in the world	67.1 million
No. of males employed (gardeners, drivers, guards in private households)	8.9 million
International migrant domestic workers	11.5 million
Migrant domestic workers as a proportion of all domestic workers	17.2%
Migrant domestic workers as percentage of all migrant workers ³	7.7%
Female migrant domestic workers	8.5 million
Females as percentage of all migrant domestic workers	73.4%

Source: ILO Global Estimates on Migrant Workers. Special focus on migrant domestic workers 2015.

³ In terms of economic activity, migrant domestic workers make up almost 8 percent of the global distribution of migrant workers (agriculture is just over 11 percent; Industry is nearly 18 percent and other services make up over 63 percent).

Typical issues faced by domestic workers, including migrant domestic workers, include non-payment of wages; a lack of rest time and extremely long hours. Although not all migrant domestic workers are mistreated, MDWs face specific vulnerabilities as workers, because of being both migrants and also working predominately in an isolated mainly informal sector. Many of the challenges faced by domestic workers reflect gender inequalities in the labour market. They also relate to societal values on the division of labour regarding paid work and care (paid and unpaid) work. When working in a different country, and not fully aware of the national laws and culture, MDWs are more likely to be mistreated, paid erratically or subjected to violence or sexual abuse. Migrants are often unaware of their rights and can lack social networks. In some countries migrants may have limited knowledge of the local language and have restricted access to public services. Undocumented workers in particular do not dare to contact the authorities to seek protection, or access health services because they fear being returned to their home country and/or punishment by their employer. The conditions to which migrant domestic workers are subjected are often the result of their de facto or de jure exclusion from rights and protections afforded under domestic law (ILO, 2015).

The situation of domestic workers has been highlighted in recent decades and in particular as a result of campaign that led to the adoption of the ILO Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189) (known as C189). Twenty-three countries have now ratified C189. Apart from setting out minimum labour standards for domestic workers, Article 8 of the Convention concerns migrant domestic workers. Article 8 specifies that migrant domestic workers should have a written offer of contract; and highlights that laws, regulations or other measures should specify the conditions under which migrant domestic workers are entitled to repatriation on the expiry or termination of the employment contract for which they were recruited. Members should also put in place measures to cooperate with each other to ensure the effective application of the provisions of other articles in C189 to migrant domestic workers.⁴ In many cases, existing legal and policy frameworks are either poorly implemented or inadequate to address the specific needs of migrant domestic workers that arise at different stages of the migration cycle, including recruitment, employment and return.

Following the ILO Convention and Recommendation on Domestic Workers in 2011, the ILO developed a Global Strategy to support its constituents in achieving decent work for domestic workers. This strategy includes efforts to expand knowledge, raise awareness, promote dialogue and develop policy tools to ensure the effective protection of migrant domestic workers' rights. The strategy also aims to promote migrant domestic workers labour market integration in countries of destination and address the specific vulnerabilities migrant domestic workers face prior to and during their migration experience.

⁴ Recommendation 201 outlines migrant domestic issues in articles 20(2), 21, 22, 23, 26(1).

Box 1: EU Donor provides leadership by passing resolution on domestic workers

Migration is a priority in the EU due to the influx of migrants in the past years. The EU has given several billion Euros to tackle the root causes of migration. The European Parliament drafted a resolution on migration, and submitted it to the European Commission in 2010/11.⁵

In November 2013, the EU made a Council decision authorising Member States to ratify, in the interests of the European Union, the Convention concerning Decent Work for Domestic Workers, 2011, of the International Labour Organisation (Convention No 189).⁶

In April 2016, a European Parliament resolution on women domestic workers and carers in the EU was adopted.⁷ The resolution called for domestics' inclusion in future labour legislation, to take into account their unique work environment, and give training, social security, and set work hours to domestic workers. The resolution was approved by 279 votes to 105, with 204 abstentions. The Resolution asks the EU institutions to amend all EU directives which conflict with ILO Convention No 189; and calls on the Member States to include domestic workers and carers in all national labour, healthcare, social care, insurance and anti-discrimination laws, recognising their contribution to the economy and society. It urges the Commission accordingly to consider revising any EU directives, which exclude domestic workers and carers from rights that other categories of workers enjoy. The next step is to forward this resolution to the Council and the Commission.

2.2 The GAP-MDW project: Background

To obtain funding to work on migrant domestic workers (MDWs), the ILO participated in an international bidding process by the EU under its Asylum and Refugees program and was subsequently awarded funding. The project, entitled *Global Action Programme on Migrant Domestic Workers and their Families* (GAP-MDW Project), began on February 1 2013 with a duration of 36 months, which was later extended to 42 months (finishing on 31 July 2016). ILO implemented the GAP-MDW project in partnership with the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), UN Women, the Confederation of Indonesia Prosperous Trade Union (KSBSI), and in association with the International Trade Union Congress (ITUC) and the International Domestic Workers Federation (IDWF). The project had a total budget of Euro 4,375,000 (approximately USD \$4.8 million). The EC's contribution to GAP-MDW was Euro 3,507,423 (approximately USD \$3.9 million). The ILO contributed Euro 867,577 to cost-share its activities. The bidding process had stipulated that the main bidder should contribute 20% of the cost of the project. This is equivalent to approximately USD\$ 960,000. Partner institutions did not have to commit to cost-share.

A central focus of GAP-MDW was on the different needs of migrant domestic workers throughout a 'migration corridor' cycle, working through a range of relevant stakeholders. GAP-MDW combined different levels of action (global, regional and national actions).

⁵ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=TA&language=EN&reference=P7-TA-2010-0365>

⁶ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+REPORT+A7-2013-0394+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN>

⁷ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+TA+P8-TA-2016-0203+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN>

Country-based interventions took place along five migration corridors that have a high incidence of migration for domestic work. The **migration corridors** were:

- (1) Nepal-Lebanon
- (2) Zimbabwe-Lesotho-South Africa
- (3) Paraguay-Argentina
- (4) Indonesia-Malaysia
- (5) Ukraine-Poland.

Overall the GAP-MDWs project aimed to increase the number of MDW worldwide that have access to decent work, and human and labour rights protection. ILO were aware that this required increased knowledge amongst migrant domestic workers on their labour rights; in conjunction with better systems to provide services and protection to migrant domestic workers. A better knowledge base about the characteristics and situations of migrant domestic workers and their employers was considered a pre-requisite for inputs into policies and initiatives that provide services to ensure the protection of human and labour rights.

The specific **objectives** of the project were:

1. Enhanced research and practical knowledge on migration and trafficking in domestic work across global care chains.
2. Enhanced capacities of relevant organisations and practitioners to advocate for migrant domestic workers' access to decent work and human rights and increased recognition of their role in economic and social development.
3. National capacity building approaches to protect, support and empower migrant domestic workers at all stages of the migration cycle pilot tested (to be implemented in 3 corridors: Paraguay-Argentina, Indonesia-Malaysia and Nepal-Lebanon).

Although set to start in February 2013, there was a delay in EU funds for the GAP-MDW project reaching ILO; and in the appointment of the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) for the GAP-MDW project. Coordination and research activities already started without the CTA.

An Evaluability Assessment of the project was carried out in January-February 2015, which suggested the project outputs and outcomes should be more distinctive with more clarity on how to measure results. This assessment also critiqued the highly centralized delivery model used for project roll-out and governance. However the project team felt that renegotiating for a revision of the project was unrealistic at this stage, given EU's position regarding grants secured through a competitive bidding process. A mid-term evaluation was carried out a year after the Evaluability Assessment, (between December 2015-March 2016) and rather late in the GAP-MDW project lifecycle. The mid-term evaluation stated that the GAP-MDW project has made a strong and solid contribution in advancing the global agenda to better protect migrant domestic workers but acknowledged many of the projects difficulties and limitations.⁸

⁸ Both a mid-term and a final evaluation(s) of the GAP-MDW project were specified in the ILO-EU agreement for project. The evaluability assessment could not substitute for the mid-term evaluation.

2.3 Purpose, scope and clients of evaluation

The purpose of this final evaluation is to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, and sustainability of the ILO's actions undertaken during the course of the implementation of the GAP-MDWs project. As the mid-term evaluation took place so late in the project life cycle, the ILO and the EU requested that this final evaluation concentrated on what was considered to have worked; what challenges were encountered by the project (what has not worked); and the underlying reasons for the successes and challenges.

Based on a documented review, field visits (to Ukraine and South Africa), a survey (with 36 qualitative responses) and information obtained from interviewing stakeholders (62 interviews) involved in the GAP-MDW project, this final evaluation outlines achievements and challenges. This report also makes suggestions and recommendations for moving forward or in implementing similar projects, identifying lessons learned from the GAP-MDW. Insights on the European Commission/ILO partnership are also provided.

The final evaluation is primarily for accountability and learning purposes. The key evaluation clients are: the European Commission (EC); the ILO as executor of the project; the project management and staff; as well as project partners. The Department of Labour in South Africa specifically requested that a copy of the evaluation report be sent to them.

2.4 Methodology

This evaluation is based upon the ILO's evaluation policy and procedures, which adhere to international standards and best practices as articulated in the OECD/DAC Principles and the Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the United Nations (UN) System approved by the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) in April 2005. The evaluator also examined the new UNEG Norms and Standards from June 2016⁹, in particular standard 4 around Conduct of Evaluations.¹⁰ Using the ILO's Evaluation Policy Guidelines, the Evaluator obtained information about the implementation of the EU funded GAP-MDW project activities between February 2013 to July 2016. As per the ToRs in Annex 1, the evaluator concentrated on the positive outcomes from the project, innovative processes implemented, possible improvements and opportunities for scale up. Attention was paid to identified challenges in the GAP-MDW project and an analysis of the solutions implemented or suggestions by stakeholder interview or whose who completed a qualitative questionnaire. Overall the evaluation has produced forward-looking recommendations.

The evaluation applied mixed methods that drew on both quantitative and qualitative evidence and involve multiple means of analysis. These include:

- A document review of relevant documents that related to the performance and progress of the MAP-MDW project (including the mid-term evaluation report and the evaluability assessment, policy documents, advocacy materials, ILO reports, estimates, project flash reports, programme documents). A review of the implementation reports provided evidence on the implementation of the three project objectives, associated activities and results.
- A data collection plan, a set of questions related to the evaluation criteria and a questionnaire (Annex 3) provided an evaluation instrument. These were set forth and approved in the evaluation inception report.
- Interviews with ILO staff at HQ, with field-based ILO staff including ILO liaisons and others having roles and responsibilities for contributing to the GAP-MDW project. Some 62 interviews took place (Annex 2), with some individuals interviewed twice.
- A field visit to Ukraine and South Africa took place early on in the evaluation process, and included interviews with ILO staff, constituents and partners.
- Other key project stakeholders (not visited by evaluator) were contacted by Skype to ensure complete geographic coverage. Case studies were prepared on each migration corridor.
- Interviews with key stakeholders outside the ILO including tripartite constituents, implementing partners, and UN WOMEN, ITUC and IDWF.
- An electronic questionnaire to reach a broader range of GAP-MDW stakeholders was designed (see Annex 3). The questionnaire was sent directly to approximately 200 GAP-MDW stakeholders by email and 36 responses were received. The sample for the survey was targeted to the list provided to the evaluator by the project. This list was segmented into stakeholders in each of the GAP-MDW countries of focus;

⁹ <http://www.uneval.org/document/download/2601>

¹⁰ 2016 UNEG The ten general norms should be upheld in the conduct of any evaluation; the four institutional norms should be reflected in the management and governance of evaluation functions.

international actors; and ILO staff linked to the project. The mode of distribution was direct email to the potential respondent. Considerable time was given to respond, as the evaluator recognised that some respondents do not have consistent email access. Annex 4 broadly outlines the geographic coverage of who responded to the questionnaire, and the type of respondent.

The evaluator drew from a range of tools available for use in social research, triangulating across data sources, and using both primary and secondary sources of information. Quantitative data analysis examined outputs that were measured in the GAP-MDW Project against baselines, performance figures and targets. Qualitative information obtained from interviews and the open-ended questions in the questionnaire were content analysed to determine patterns of responses, and themes. Case studies findings from each corridor are contained in Annex 10. Preliminary findings are shared in the first draft report which was circulated to project stakeholders and ILO staff. Comments were consolidated by the Evaluation Manager and incorporated by the Evaluator into the final evaluation report.

2.5 Constraints

A key constraint to the evaluation was the size and complexity of the GAP-MDW project. With 11 countries involved, and a range of global activities, as well as complex collaborations, at times the evaluator felt that there was insufficient time to fully appreciate the different contexts, and the activities and stakeholders involved. Relatively more details are available from the Ukraine and South Africa as the evaluator visited these two countries during the evaluation.

The mid-term evaluation was completed fairly soon before the final evaluation. A few GAP-MDWs stakeholders indicated that they are experiencing 'fatigue' in discussing the project.

The short electronic questionnaire designed for ILO staff and key stakeholders was sent out at the end of July 2016. The questionnaire was sent in two languages only (English and Spanish). The evaluator sent 3 reminders to complete the questionnaire. In total, the survey was sent out by direct email to 217 email addresses. Of that 217, about 17 were no longer available at the email provided. Most organizations that responded preferred only 1 response per organization.

Although the response rate was a little disappointing, because many of the questions were qualitative, rich information was obtained in the 36 responses and sufficient detail was available from each corridor. The evaluator is aware that it can be difficult to predict the level of survey responses as response rates vary widely. One factor that may have had an impact on the response rate, was that the survey was sent out over the August holiday period. Another factor was that many of those to whom the survey was sent were only involved in single activities (such as conducting research for the GAP-MDW project objective 1). These individuals (and others who did not respond) were not still involved in GAP-MDW activities so there was less motivation to respond. Many may not have seen any direct benefits in responding. In other words, they did not feel a strong loyalty to the project. It is difficult for survey respondents, far from ILO to believe that participating in this survey will result in real improvements in the immediate term.¹¹ The information obtained in the questionnaire

¹¹ Surveys to ILO employees alone probably have a much higher response rate than those distributed to stakeholders external to ILO (constituents). Surveys to external respondents which normally be expected to be on average of 10-15%. This is reflected in the high number of ILO responses to the questionnaire 13 out of 36. To motivate a response, however the evaluator tried to

reports was not used to provide statistical evidence of impact or draw major conclusions. The information was qualitative and rich and was used to illustrate particular points in the report. Throughout the evaluation report, it is indicated how many respondents made a particular point.

3. Relevance

3.1 Relevance for ILO-led Global Agendas

All interventions in GAP-MDW were in line with the ILO Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189) and the Domestic Workers Recommendation (No. 201). ILO is implementing a 'global strategy' towards the goal of making decent work a reality for domestic workers worldwide (initially 2012-15).¹² The global strategy is attempting to unify support and outline practical approaches to address challenges in the domestic work sector, at different levels across five areas:

- i) Building and strengthening national institutions and, when required, adopting effective policy and legislative reforms and/or programmes;
- ii) Facilitating the organization /representation of domestic workers and their employers;
- iii) Support in respect of ratification and implementation of Convention 189 and the implementation of Recommendation 201;
- iv) Awareness-raising and advocacy on domestic workers' rights;
- v) Building the knowledge base on domestic work and exchange of experiences between countries to enhance actions and impact at country level.

In 2014, the ILO Member States endorsed the Fair Migration Agenda. This agenda further reinforces the principles and guidelines of ILO's Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration, placing the right of all workers including migrants at the centre promoting:

- (i) decent work opportunities in countries of origin;
- (ii) respect for the human rights, including labour rights, of all migrants;
- (iii) fair recruitment and equal treatment of migrant workers;
- (iv) stronger linkages between employment and labour migration policies;
- (v) the involvement of Ministries of Labour, trade unions and employers' organizations in migration policy making; and,
- (vi) genuine cooperation between countries and within regions.

ILO staff interviewed in Geneva said that domestic workers can be marginalized in the larger debate on labour migration; similarly migrants can be marginalized in debates that focus on national domestic workers. This project allowed a spotlight to be placed on MDWs. Linkages were made between the rights of migrants and the rights of domestic workers as well as the right and 'special case' of migrant domestic workers. Such a focus was already underway in

stress that survey respondents opinions will be heard and that their views will be reflected in the final evaluation report based on their feedback.

¹² ACTRAV and others consider C189 as an excellent and significant Convention as it covers migrant workers along with other key labour and rights issues (gender, women workers, occupational health and safety issues, child labour, minimum wages, rest time, maternity protection, discrimination). Convention 189 acts as a framework for monitoring the application of many standards.

some regions. For example, FAIRWAY is a regional project in the Arab States to support ILO constituents achieves fair migration with initiatives for migrant workers including domestic workers.¹³

In 2015, ILO launched a global “Fair Recruitment Initiative”, to:

- (i) help prevent human trafficking and forced labour;
- (ii) protect the rights of workers, including migrant workers, from abusive and fraudulent practices during the recruitment and placement process (including pre-selection, selection, transportation, placement and safe return); and,
- (iii) reduce the cost of labour migration and enhance development outcomes for migrant workers and their families, as well as for countries of origin and destination.

With regard to domestic workers who are migrants, preparing and disseminating information prior to their departure (through the GAP-MDW project) fits with the fair recruitment initiative. Specific discussions took place in Indonesia and Malaysia on recruitment agencies of MDWs as well as in Nepal and Lebanon. GAP-MDWs for instance commissioned research on the effects of the age ban for migration of domestic workers from Nepal, which contributed to discussions on lifting this ban. The GAP-MDW can be said to have contributed to keeping MDWs on the agenda for ‘fair recruitment’.

In summary, the GAP-MDW project fitted into guidance all three ILO initiatives: *Decent Work for Domestic Workers* strategy; the *ILO Fair Migration Agenda*; and the *ILO Fair Recruitment Initiative*.

3.2 Relevance to ILO Programming

ILO’s Decent Work Agenda during the period of the EU project implementation was detailed in the 19 outcomes set out in the Strategic Policy Framework (2012-15) and ILO Programme and Budget (P&B). Domestic work fell under Outcome 5 (*Women and men have better and more equitable working conditions*) and Outcome 7 (*migrants focus*) in the 2012-13/2014-15 ILO Strategic Framework.

The Outcome 5 strategy sought to strengthen the capacity of member States to establish policies on wages and earnings, working time and other conditions of work that ensure decent standards of living and adequate protecting, including to address domestic workers’ vulnerabilities. Outcome 5 had two indicators – progress in policies and strategies for equitable working conditions; and sound wage policies in member countries.¹⁴ GAP-MDW focused on equitable working conditions for MDWs rather than the latter.

Outcome 7 aimed to ensure that more migrant workers are protected and that more migrant workers have access to productive employment and decent work. Outcome 7 also had two indicators. ILO measured gender-sensitive labour migration policies that protect migrant workers in line with ILO standards; and migration policies that reflect the ILO’s Framework that promotes employment and decent work for migrant workers.¹⁵ The GAP-MDW project

¹³ The project “Regional Fair Migration Project in the Middle East (FAIRWAY project) takes both a country-specific and regional approach, and initiatives will revolve around low-skilled migrant workers in sectors where they predominate, i.e. construction and domestic work.

¹⁴ **Indicator 5.1:** # of member States in which tripartite constituents, with ILO support, adopt policies or implement strategies to promote improved or more equitable working conditions, especially for the most vulnerable workers.

Indicator 5.2: # of member States that, with ILO support, strengthen institutional capacity to implement sound wage policies.

¹⁵ **Indicator 7.1:** # of member States that, with ILO support, adopt gender-sensitive labour migration policies to protect migrant workers that reflect the ILO Multilateral Framework and the provisions of relevant international labour standards

contributed to both these indicators. The GAP-MDW project was aligned to ILO outcomes, albeit two different outcomes in the 19 P&B outcomes in place during the project timeframe.

During implementation, the GAP-MDW linked to the ILO Women at Work (W@W) centenary initiatives, ahead of the ILO's 100th anniversary in 2019. The W@W initiative is undertaking a stock-take of the status of women in work, and identifying structural barriers so as to advise on innovative targeted interventions as we move forward in this century. The 'Care Economy' is one of the W@W four areas of focus, including domestic work, child care and elderly care.

3.3 Relevance to National Strategies

Many non-ILO staff interviewed (from Ukraine, Zimbabwe and Indonesia) wished to thank the donor for paying attention to the issue of migrant domestic workers. They appreciated that the pilot interventions at the corridor levels were designed to operationally explore ways in which national governments and trade unions could pilot test approaches that protect, support and empower migrant domestic workers. For some destination countries (e.g. Lebanon, Argentina) the work on MDWs predates the GAP-MDW project.

The GAP-MDW project conducted a consultation process with visits to many participating ILO country offices prior to starting major project activities.¹⁶ Interviewees and questionnaire responses from the Ukraine, Zimbabwe, Indonesia, Nepal and in South Africa stated that it is better to start such a project with broader national level consultations to determine how national stakeholders view this issue of migrant domestic workers. In Ukraine a representative from the migrant unit at the Ministry of Social Policy stated they may have had other priority choices of destination countries (Italy is important for Ukrainian migrants).

With regard to national policies, the countries involved were a mixed bag. Three countries directly involved in the project had ratified C189, hence were legislatively attempting to put in place rights for domestic workers. Each country that participated and had an interest and willingness to move ahead, albeit some countries more keen than others. Table 4 gives an indication of GAP-MDWs countries interest in the issue of *domestic work* or *migration* via their agreed Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCP) – the main vehicle for delivery of ILO support to countries to advance the Decent Work Agenda. Country Programme Outcomes (CPOs) are presented in the DWCPs and reflect the tripartite agreement on ILO priorities at the country level (for a 4-5 year timeframe).¹⁷ CPOs are thus indicative of the national priorities. For some countries, reference is made in Table 4 to the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). The UNDAF describes the collective actions and strategies of the UN to the achievement of national development. CPOs should align broadly with UNDAF.

The right hand column in the Table 4 looks at the current CPOs. Whether the work now planned can be linked or attributed to follow up activities of GAP-MDW is unknown. In most countries, work on domestic workers or work on migrants preceded GAP-MDW, and will continue as long as resources have been secured, whether through regular budget or extra budgetary resources. Thus, whether the national interest on MDW, domestic workers or

Indicator 7.2: # of member States that, with ILO support, adopt gender-sensitive labour migration policies & practices that reflect the ILO Multilateral Framework with a view to promoting productive employment & decent work for migrant workers.

¹⁶ For example in June 2014 the CTA travelled to Kiev, Ukraine to establish contacts with project partners, stakeholders and possible collaborators, to finalise the workplan and to assess the possible effects of the political crisis on the project.

¹⁷ CPOs represent the shared priorities of constituents. All ILO Outcomes are expected to promote gender equality and non-discrimination. Note that the evaluator is not aware of which CPOs are considered *Target* CPOs (selected CPOs that are prioritised by the field offices and tied to the P&B outcome as biennial targets) or which were resourced or in the *pipeline*.

migrant workers was carried through to the next programme and budget remains to be seen at the end of the 2017 biennium.

Table 4: National policy documents of relevance to the GAP-MDW project

Country	DWCP Outcome CPO during project period	CPO in 2016-17 or current planning ¹⁸
South Africa DWCP 2010-14 (extended to 2016)	A focus on migration governance, in line with the ILO multilateral framework. Strengthening the capacity of the SADC secretariat on labour migration, enhancing social dialogue structures at the regional level on labour migration issues. Outcome 6 in the South African DWCP mentions domestic workers under a section on labour and employment legislation. More people have access to better managed and more gender equitable social security and health benefits, indicator include the existence of policy reform to improve and extend social security coverage, including the informal sector. Output 6.6 covers Support for social security coverage to migrant workers (including portability of benefits).	DWCP is ongoing Domestic work has been a long time priority in South Africa. There is a sub regional CPO covering South Africa that includes domestic work as a target sector under Outcome 6. In addition, there is a CPO ZAF802 under Outcome 10 (workers' activities) to continue to support the capacity building of the domestic workers' union, notably on organizing domestic workers, including migrant domestic workers. The focus there will be on improving implementation of C189. Finally, there is a CPO ZAF101 that may start a domestic workers' coop with the domestic workers' union.
Zimbabwe DWCP 2012-15	Migration is a priority in the DWCP and UNDAF. The CPO ZWE131 had a focus on governance structures, to develop and implement a national labour migration policy. Up to date statistics for labour migration in Zimbabwe also required.	ZWE131 includes a component on integrating domestic work into the Labour Force Survey. The CPO is under Outcome 9, unsure if funding is secured.
Lesotho DWCP 2012-17	Under Priority 2 <i>Social Protection</i> coverage, it is expected that more people including migrant workers, women, children and elderly persons have access to adequate and better managed social security benefits.	DWCP is ongoing CPO LSO129 under Outcome 9 to provide support to the government objective of including domestic workers among those sectors covered by the SADC labour policy framework.
Ukraine DWCP 2012-15	The DWCP had a reference to migration and recognised that illegal migration exposes workers to the risk of exploitation. The DWCP mentioned lack of up-to-date data on migration. Data and analysis was recognised as essential for the design and administration of legal labour migration schemes. There was an emphasis on qualifications recognition and skills matching. The CPO UKR 152, focused on improved policy and regulatory framework, with institutions capacity to manage labour migration and prevent exploitation of migrant workers	DWCP 2016-2020 has a section on labour migration. The DWCP states that migrant domestic workers are especially vulnerable to violation of their labour rights. One of the outcomes under priority 3 enhancing social protection and working conditions relates to Wage and income policies with an emphasis on equal opportunities to be developed and implemented (outcome 3.2). An outcome indicator included here is that the ratification of C189 is initiated in 2016.
Poland	-	-
Malaysia	Government and social partners were to develop and implement policy to manage migration and combat trafficking in line with ILO principles	Work under CPO MYS827 under Outcome 9 will continue on promotion of fair migration under GMS TRIANGLE II. Covers all migrant workers, including MDWs.
Indonesia DWCP 2012-15	A CPO IDN102 called for enhanced policy, institutional framework, and programme implementation for empowerment and protection for Indonesian migrant and domestic workers expected as an outcome with monitoring activities organized by constituents, with ILO's support, on migrant workers placement and protection . At least 2 monitoring activities at the national or provincial level were expected by 2015 through the ASEAN TRIANGLE project	CPO IND102 on migrant and domestic workers ongoing to promote ratification and extend labour protections to domestic workers.
Nepal DWCP 2013-17	One of the CPOs, NPL 105 expected constituents to have improved capacities to address implementation	DWCP is ongoing The CPO mentions domestic workers.

¹⁸ Source: Claire Hobden *ILO INWORK*

Country	DWCP Outcome CPO during project period	CPO in 2016-17 or current planning ¹⁸
	<p>gaps in respect to specific migrant, forced labour conventions and C189</p> <p>Vulnerable migrant workers are mentioned: ILO will engage with relevant actions, trade unions and service providers at the community level to support the empowerment, organization and representation of women MW, and promote their access to accurate and timely information. Training will be provided to service providers and skills training to potential domestic workers. ILO will test innovative methods to prevent trafficking of women and girls and improve their access to information and remittance transfer.</p> <p>Indicator 3.1.4 no of potential migrant workers benefitting from targeted trafficking prevention services (target of 10,000 by 2017)</p>	
Lebanon UNDAF 2010-14	<p>The UNDAF document, under outcome 2.2 (agencies) expected an increased level of enjoyment of human rights by vulnerable and marginalized groups</p> <p>Output 2.2.2 expects that protection mechanisms for women migrant domestic workers in Lebanon are established (UNHCR and ILO). Overall, continuing work with the Ministry of Labour, protection mechanisms for women migrant domestic workers will be reviewed, including proposed amendments to Lebanon's labour law in order to balance rights and duties and protect these workers' human and labour rights.</p>	<p>Technical support to Lebanon on domestic work pre-dated GAP-MDW and will continue under CPO LBN151 under Outcome 9. There is also a TC project on Fair Migration that includes promotion of ratification of C189.</p>
Argentina	<p>Encouraging decent work and protection of migrant workers is important with a focus on child labour (including domestic child labour)</p>	<p>A CPO ARG104 under Outcome 6 works on the formalization of domestic work. The government has requested assistance to increase effective social security coverage, and the ILO is providing technical assistance.</p>
Paraguay	<p>The CPO, PRY 106 was to design and implement policies that improve the working conditions and strengthen the rights of domestic workers and migrant domestic workers in the Paraguay- Argentina corridor. Extend social protection to domestic works; draft law in line with C189; capacity building with regard to the professionalization of domestic work. Info centres</p>	<p>Unsure if work will continue under PRY106. CPO PRY128 under Outcome 6 targets the formalization of domestic work, and PRY131 under Outcome 3 on the extension of effective social protection to domestic workers.</p>

Conclusion relevance

It can be concluded that all GAP-MDW project activities were relevant to ongoing ILO initiatives and in line with the ILO C189. The GAP-MDW project was relevant to national country programme outcomes, mostly related to ILO Outcomes 5 and 7 in the previous P&B. Broader consultation at the national level was recommended as necessary and important prior to initiating similar projects. This was lacking in the GAP-MDW project, due to the competitive bidding processes, which did not allow for extensive national consultation at the design stage. It is important to note that extensive consultation is challenging when funds are not yet secured as expectations are generated amongst partners.

Looking ahead, the 2016-17 P&B has 10 outcomes and whether there is a focus on MDWs is indicated in Table 4. Outcome 6 relates to formalizing informal workers, and domestic workers fit under this outcome. Outcome 9: concerns fair and effective labour migration policies expects that labour migration governance is strengthened to ensure decent work for migrant workers, meet labour market needs and foster inclusive economic growth and development. Follow up work from the GAP-MDW project fits with both indicators under Outcome 9.¹⁹ How countries followed up on pilot initiatives organised under GAP-MDW will become evident in the results reported at the end of the 2016-17 biennium. In conclusion as long as resources are available (through regular budget or extra budgetary resources), work on MDWs will continue as part of ILO's mandate. The extent of work on migrant domestic workers and the ability of the ILO to respond to the growing demand from constituents will depend on the availability of resources.

4. Effectiveness

This section examines whether the project outputs have been effective in supporting the achievement of the project objectives and whether the project has been responsive to the contexts in the different national environments. The project had global elements, national elements and migration corridor focused elements. Primarily the project sought to make linkages in sending and receiving countries, and amongst various stakeholders within countries, but linking to global agendas. Bi national and regional dialogue was encouraged, through validation of research to provide evidence of the situation of MDWs, particularly between trade unions, and domestic workers organizations, and trade unions and governments.

¹⁹ E.g. indicator 9.2 relates to *strengthened institutional mechanisms and inclusive practices or services for the protection of migrant workers or for the promotion ... and decent work for migrant workers*. Follow up on work undertaken by GAP-MDW project also will help member states achieve Indicator 9.3: *...developed a knowledge base and statistics on labour migration to better inform policy and enhance synergies between labour migration, employment, training and development policies*.

Table 5 contains a summary of outputs (annotated) in line with the project objectives and is presented in Annex 5. Although Table 5 indicates the project outputs and some results, it is difficult to get a sense of how all together contribute to change. Details by migration corridor are presented in 22 pages in Annex 10.

In the Section below, an analysis of global outputs is firstly presented. Following this, an analysis of the achievements is presented in bulleted formatted, specifying examples where such achievements were found during this evaluation. This is followed by the views of some 36 questionnaire respondents. Finally this section outlines the constraints and challenges faced by the GAP-MDW project during implementation. Details on how the project was responsive or not to political, legal, and/or institutional changes in the project environment are outlined by corridor in Annex 10.

4.1 Global Elements of the GAP-MDW Project

In 2013, the ILO assumed leadership of the Global Migration Group (GMG), an 18-member inter-agency group bringing together the heads of agencies to promote the application of instruments and norms relating to migration. Such leadership offered immediate opportunities to raise the visibility of the 2011 Domestic Workers' Convention as well as a focus on MDWs. The project was visibly launched at a side event of the *High Level Dialogue on Migration and Development* at the UN in New York on the 2-4 October 2014.²⁰ More than 100 participants attended the event, with speeches by the ILO Director-General; the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for International Migration and Development; and the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights.²¹ This event allowed the project to set the stage for the need to promote human and labour rights for migrant domestic workers in line with C189. Such an inauguration may have created high expectations of what could be achieved during implementation.

The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) collaborated with GAP-MDWs to develop a publication on the human rights of migrant domestic workers in an irregular situation (*Behind closed doors*).²² They also produced a short documentary film (25 minutes) entitled *I am not here*, which contains the harsh stories of three women in three different cities (Kuala Lumpur, New York and Zurich).²³ OHCHR organised a global seminar on the human rights of MDWs (*Behind closed doors*) in Bangkok in (28-29 September) 2015, with over 70 experts. A short background paper and an outcome document with 10 key messages on protecting and promoting the human rights of migrant domestic workers set the stage for the seminar. This Bangkok meeting served as a platform for building solidarity among unions and associations for national, bi national and regional cooperation for campaigns and advocacy on decent work. Prior to and after these activities, OHCHR engaged very little with GAP-MDW, although they reported they would liked to have provided more advice on the empirical research and ensuring human rights were mainstreamed in all GAP-MDW products.

²⁰ The ILO Director General participated, as did the special advisor of the UN Secretary General on Migration, the Deputy Commissioner of OHCHR, the Minister of Labour from the Philippines and representatives of employers and workers organizations, and civil society. The ILO, in partnership with the Governments of Italy and the Philippines and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), organized this high level panel discussion on "Migrant Domestic Workers: Ensuring Human Rights and Making Decent Work a Reality."

²¹ Mr. Guy Ryder; Mr. Peter Sutherland and Mr. Simonovic

²² http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications/Behind_closed_doors_HR_PUB_15_4_EN.pdf

²³ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v1GY6ItQVaM>

Many interviewed reported that the ITUC along with the International Domestic Workers' Federation (IDWF)²⁴ were important partners for advocacy and campaigning on the rights of domestic workers. ITUC's 12 + 12 campaign in particular works with national coalitions to push for legal reform and the organisation of domestic workers, calling upon governments to ratify ILO Convention 189. According to ITUC, the campaign had a very strong *bottom-up* approach, connecting local level to national centres to the international level. GAP-MDW contributed to and helped to expand the electronic Knowledge Sharing Platform/ Community of Practice (KSP/CoP) hosted by IDWF. This Platform allows for the coordination of a knowledge network for and on behalf of domestic work and domestic workers. Hosting the platform at IDWF (rather than ILO) means it should be sustained, as domestic workers is the core focus of IDWF. Prior to preparing this platform, three regional training workshops were conducted (Hong Kong, Santiago and in Burkina Faso) to discuss the potential of how an electronic community (CoP) could support Domestic Worker's empowerment. For example in Africa the IDWF members agreed to create a database on wages as this was felt to be a starting point. For this evaluation, IDWF provided a summary of members and users for the IDWF communications networks they set up. This is available in Annex 6.

Although attribution does not only related to GAP-MDW, Annex 6 tells us that the number of registered users on the **IDWF website**, which went from 603 in 2014 to 10,328 in 2015 to 40,564 in 2016 (September 20th), with a reported 400-500,000 users. Thus the numbers of users have increased four fold between 2015 and 2016, which is very positive. In order to sustain members, it might be important (if not already doing so) to keep track also of the monthly active members, and whether they register and subscribe to the newsletter. Other interesting information might be:

- The percentage of traffic coming from social media (i.e. from other GAP-MDW social media tools, such as facebook; 'WhatsApp')
- Navigation coming from other websites - what were the top referrals, are they from associated organizations?
- Analytics of the newsletter – how many were sent? how many were opened?
- The 'bounce' rate', i.e. the percentage of users who visited a single page on the site but do not do anything else.

ILO implemented the GAP-MDW project also in partnership with UN Women. The ILO-UN Women partnership worked well in Paraguay, whereas in Nepal, the UN Women office found it difficult to assume responsibility without an allocation of funding for staff. They did collaborate but without responsibility for the project.

4.2 Regional Elements of the GAP-MDW Project

GAP-MDWs project staff attended or organised a range of regional meetings, such as a regional domestic workers knowledge sharing forum in Africa in Tanzania (May 2013); in Latin America (December 2013); a workshop on challenges and good practices in Istanbul (October 2014); and a conference on the labour dimensions of trafficking in persons in the ASEAN region in Manila (January 2015); and a regional workshop on organizing domestic workers in Bangkok (September 2015). Another inter-regional event took place toward the end of the project in Madagascar and this allowed for exchange of experiences on ways to address

²⁴ GAP-MDWs also provided support towards the Founding Congress of the International Domestic Workers Federation in Uruguay (October 2013).

migrant domestic issues following three years of GAP-MDW project activities. Many commented that the way this final workshop was organized really allowed for dialogue and an exchange of experiences.

The objectives of most of meetings in Tanzania, Latin America, and Bangkok were explicitly for the purpose of sharing experience among advocates and practitioners among the tripartite partners. Each meeting covered a specific policy area that was identified as particularly challenging for the region. Regional workshops aimed to support initiatives of groups mobilizing to make change, and share knowledge for strategy building. For example at the Bangkok meeting, 10 key messages were shared with participants.

However it can be difficult to follow up regional workshops. The evaluation did not find documented reference of follow from these meetings.

With high level events such as those mentioned above, along with events in more than 11 countries (described in more detail in the migration corridor case studies in Annex 10); many interviewed felt that the project was of great value in terms of raising the profile of MDWs. A communications expert working with GAP-MDW ensured the project had a wide reach via a Twitter feed and linking/expanding databases from ITUC/IDWF with GAP-MDW. At time, some 'Tweets' were reaching between 500-800 people. GAP-MDW attempted to link the global advocacy component with national component and focus on the lives of MDWs themselves. It was reported that GAP-MDW placed migrants as domestic workers on the agenda and accelerated a lot of attention to this forgotten group. Many interviewed stressed that the Global Report on Migrant Domestic Workers will be instrumental in further raising visibility. This report should continue to move the international agenda forward, provided its messages are carefully summarized and packaged into other communication formats (e.g. Twitter, policy briefs) and disseminated to different stakeholders.

4.3 Corridor Approach

A corridor approach to address the issue of MDWs was considered a solid approach by most interviewed for this evaluation. The corridor approach was in principle meaningful particularly from the recruitment point of view; and sharing information on legal systems in destination countries, prior to migrating. Yet the practicalities of corridor coordination requires strong consolidated approaches and explicit political will on both sides. For example coordination in workplans across corridors was not evident according to some interviews. Details of what took place in each of the 5 corridors are outlined in Annex 6. With five corridors and 11 countries, many felt that the project should have focused on fewer corridors.

Criteria for the corridors chosen included the relevance of migrant domestic workers in the corridor; and the presence of a related project initiative in the corridor that could be built upon. Sharing experiences across different geographic regions was considered by the team that designed the project as particularly important, because it would provide opportunities for some countries who have already ratified C189 to demonstrate what regulations they have put in place (South Africa); particularly if other countries were thinking about amending legislation. This did occur, at the ILO Inter-Regional Knowledge Sharing Forum held in Madagascar in May 2016.²⁵ A comment by a few interviewed during the evaluation is that a significant learning for governments was the realization if you want to truly protect migrant

²⁵ On this occasion good practices and lessons learned on promoting international cooperation and partnerships to realize a fair migration agenda for MDWs in Africa, the Arab States and Asia were discussed.

domestic workers when they are abroad, you must start in your own country. If a country does not have its' own house in order, how can it point its finger at states where there is abuse of migrant domestic workers. Countries of origin must be involved in preventing abuse of migrants (providing information; instructing their embassies to proactively provide help setting up sound labour migration polices, including regulation and monitoring of recruitment practices).

Examining Table 5 in Annex 5, it is evident that there was considerable focus on evidence and research. The process through which evidence from research commissioned was validated and disseminated with tripartite partners in migration corridors was reported to be often as significant as the research results themselves. The qualitative research results also informed on the 'lived experiences' of MDWs. Much of the research was commissioned from Geneva. Research was mostly conducted by national researchers; ToRs were reviewed by national partners/offices stakeholders. UN Women, as a partner in Paraguay, facilitated the baseline assessment, with national and binational workshops to validate and discuss findings from the baselines.

From 2014, a number of workshops with trade unions took place, and some tri-national events took place, including also tripartite binational workshops (Indonesia). Presenting the results of the research was important for such workshops. Many of these resulted in tripartite declarations or plans of action on how to move forward. South America was quoted as a good example of alliance building.

4.3 Achievements of GAP-MDW

With regard to what overall GAP-MDW has achieved, Table 5 in Annex 5 presents the majority of GAP-MDW outputs. The following table (6) highlights the specific achievements raised and frequently mentioned by different ILO Stakeholders in Geneva and in field offices, as well as constituents and some partners of the project. These issues were raised through interviews and through evaluation questionnaire responses. As already mentioned more detailed achievements, challenges and lessons learned by country/corridor are outlined as case studies in Annex 10.

Table 6: Achievements of the GAP-MDW project

The Table below is based on the evaluator’s own assessment of the achievements of the GAP-MDW. The evaluator’s assessment is based on the questionnaire responses sent out for this evaluation, key note interviews with project staff and ILO staff in participating countries, document and report reviews, observations and field visits.

Issue	Achievement of GAP-MDW
Profile of MDW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The GAP-MDW raised the visibility and awareness of MDWs. Many opportunities was taken to do so: internationally; through strategic partnerships; through sharing of research results at national level: through social media; as well as through specific activities in most of the countries involved. ▪ OHCHR’s documentary was by a well-known filmmaker (Ashvin Kumar), and has been screened in a number of countries, with good feedback. OHCHR’s publication ‘<i>Behind Closed doors</i>’ broadens the focus on labour to a human rights framework (related to migration in irregular situations) and provides empowering messages on MDWs. ▪ The IDWF Community of Practice (CoP) and Knowledge Sharing Platform (KSP) are acting as a ‘knowledge bank’ and providing access to research, manuals and tools, training programs, and other resources related to domestic work. When the community of practice platform was launched with IDWF, ILO interns reported that they were able to see lots of people registering on the platform with interest from many different parts of the world. The KSP helped raised profile of MDWs.
Corridor approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Many interviewees and questionnaire respondents stated that the corridor approach was an interesting and relevant approach. The GAP-MDWs project allowed for attention on both countries of origin and countries of destination (with less emphasis on countries of transit according to one interviewee at ILO). Such an emphasis meant that countries of origin realize that they should address loopholes in their existing legislation, while they seek to address the challenges faced by their MDWs abroad. The corridor approach allowed for a lot of learning for ILO and partners.
Research and knowledge products	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The GAP-MDW brought to the fore a lot of research on how to legislate on migrant workers using domestic workers as an example. The project motivated ILO to conduct and publish global and regional estimates on MDWs as a sample sector of migrants. The evidence base for governments to pay attention to the issue of migrants has increased. For example a labour force survey module that included migrant workers was designed and undertaken in Zimbabwe. This labour force survey would have been conducted in Nepal but postponed due to the earthquakes in April 2015. The age ban research in Nepal helped in informing policy debates on reducing the age ban; the research on employers attitudes in Malaysia and Lebanon (<i>Intertwined - An study of employers of migrant domestic workers in Lebanon</i>) provided very relevant insights. In Malaysia, the research results were presented at a tripartite workshop, which triggered the development of a code of conduct for employers of domestic workers.

Issue	Achievement of GAP-MDW
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In some countries, the process and validation of the qualitative research was as important as the actual research reports. Validation processes invited tripartite partners; in particular trade unions and governments to sit together and engage on this issue. Issues such as skills recognition; employers' roles; information for potential migrations prior to leaving; or work contracts were all discussed as they were raised in the research results. ▪ Trade unions are struggling to a) get larger trade unions to take on board this important category of informal worker b) actually help shop stewards mobilise domestic workers. The guide for building collective power to achieve rights and protections for domestic workers, prepared jointly by ITUC, IDWF and ILO GAP-MDW (2016: Domestic Workers Unite) will be particular useful for organising domestic workers. ▪ Research conducted through the GAP-MDW has brought new light to issues on the <i>Global Care Economy</i>, and the need to review the place and conditions of women in the world of work
<p>Bringing together key stakeholders</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ GAP-MDW brought together key actors to tackle the issue of migration and domestic workers, in particular trade unions and, domestic workers unions. The project honoured and supported the collaboration between ITUC and IDWF. GAP-MDW brought domestic workers and migrant domestic workers together. This took place at a national and global level. For example ITUC and IDWF worked closely with GAP-MDW. Their partnership was strengthened, as evidenced by interviews with both, and with ILO staff. The project supported IDWF as it evolved into a federation; and to reach out to more members. Thus GAP-MDWs strengthened ties between MDW organizations and existing unions. ▪ Interviewees from the IDWF reported that they appreciated being part of the steering committee and the communications with ILO and ITUC. Being a member of the Steering Committee provide ownership to an organisation such as IDWF, where they were involved in planning, even if the project was managed financially through ILO. ▪ Workers organisations linkages with domestic workers associations on the ground were important although there was less focus on this in some countries, as domestic organisations do not exist (e.g. Malaysia, Ukraine). The support for the setting up of the Lesotho Domestic Workers Union was important, and funding for the Congress for the Lebanese Domestic Workers Union. It is worth noting however that many stakeholders involved on the ground highlight the further need to engage MDWs themselves (listen to their views), engage and advocate with employers and governments to realise concrete actions for MDWs.
<p>Creating dialogue</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bi-national trade union to trade union approaches were considered important, even if they did not always yield concrete results. In Ukraine and Poland trade unions only began this process, whereas in Paraguay and Argentina more concrete collaborations were established. Taking another corridor, ILO facilitated discussions among domestic workers organisations in Zimbabwe and in South Africa on strategies to promote <i>Decent Work for Domestic Workers (DW4DW)</i>, and came up with a road map towards the development of an information brochure leading to better-informed MDWs on their rights. The project supported the revival and expansion of an MOU between trade unions in Indonesia and Malaysia, including a shared information passport and establishing a whatsapp group to share information. Social media was used effectively to reach MDWs themselves (Twitter, Facebook, Whatsapp).

Issue	Achievement of GAP-MDW
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Following workshops and capacity development for workers organisations, joint statements, or joint action plans to focus on MDWs were developed. For example in Argentina, Indonesia, Malaysia, Zimbabwe, Lesotho and South Africa. ▪ Support for capacity building of trade unions on migrant domestic work (objective 2) yielded results in all corridors. Indeed important lessons learned in terms of organizing domestic workers coming from: SADSAWU in South Africa; a case study funded by GAP-MDW on the setting of the domestic workers union in Lebanon; and elsewhere²⁶, all indicate the importance of adapting a ‘community development’ perspective and dialogue when bringing domestic workers together. ▪ Many interviewed felt that the GAP-MDW was effective in creating a dialogue between ILO constituents and organisations representing domestic workers to ensure the domestic workers voices were heard. In some cases the project helped to initiate such a dialogue; in other cases the project helped to ensure migrant domestics issues are on the agenda. ▪ The dissemination of research on MDWs, along with capacity building of trade unions, resulted in some MDWs organisations and some civil society organisations, making claims on duty-bearers and influencing legislation. It can be argued that this occurred in Nepal, Paraguay and Argentina and the Ukraine.
Sharing experiences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Inter Regional Forum in Madagascar brought together stakeholders from three regions (African, Asian and Arab). African countries are relatively new to the process of domestic workers travelling to the gulf countries for work, whereas attendees from the Philippines have a lot of experience. Those who attended the workshops realised there is a difference in how nationalities are treated, which relates to racists attitudes and also bilateral agreements. ▪ Stakeholders who attend regional fora on MDWs began to understand that ‘bans’ (such as were in place in Nepal or Ethiopia) are not always best answers for sending countries. ▪ The binational meeting in Indonesia brought together the tripartite constituents and key NGOs from Indonesia and Malaysia for the first time.
Joining forces to advocate for fairer migration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increasingly it has become evident that sharing experiences of negotiating labour agreements is the way forward. Particularly interesting as reported by some interviewees for this evaluation were discussions on how MDW are framed through Bilateral Labour Agreements (BLAs) and Multilateral Labour Agreements (MLAs). Discussions focused on how BLAs should contain fundamental rights. BLAs are often the result of an imbalance in power. Sharing experiences from non-GAP-MDW countries was very relevant. For example bilateral talks between the Philippines and the UAE focused on a unified contract for domestic workers to prevent contract substitution (when workers sign a contract in the Philippines but are forced to sign new, inferior ones when they arrive in the UAE). The fact that such provisions are possible is interesting for ‘newer’ countries engaged in BLA negotiations.

²⁶ Including interviews with the Migrant Rights Council of Ireland who successfully supported MDWs and advocated for the ratification of C189

Issue	Achievement of GAP-MDW
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MLAs are particularly important for regional negotiations such as SADC or the South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) with countries within the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC). Mechanisms that can be put in place to monitor the implementation of BLAs and MLAs requires further discussion. ▪ Paraguay, Argentina and Ukraine could be regarded as having established slightly better national ownership on the challenge of MDWs as a result of GAP-MDWs.
<p style="text-align: center;">Tools and advocacy materials</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Global Report on MDWs, although late in being published, is a major output from the GAP-MDW project. The main audience of the global report is members of IDWF and ITUC as well as ILO staff and constituents who work on the issue of MDWs. Technical cooperation projects that have a component on MDWs will also be interested. The MDW report examines the push and pull factors; outlines country profiles; examines perceptions of MDWs, examines skills and migration issues; and issues around recruitment. Issues around organising MDWs and different models of organising domestic workers are presented in the global report on migrant domestic workers. ▪ The 10 key messages prepared by OHCHR/GAP-MDW on protecting the human rights of MDWs is a useful 2 page brief. ▪ The GAP-MDW project produced some interesting electronic tools, such as the mobile phone application using ‘WhatsApp’; and policy briefs. ▪ The three vocational training manuals produced in the Paraguay to Argentina corridor are important in terms of professionalising Care work. The nature of migration in the 21st century is that migrants expect to return to their country of origin. Therefore they should be able to use the skills later, and also if in regular employment, their contributions (pension, social security) must be transferrable. The issue of skills is also of interest to ASEAN Trade Unions who are discussing the development of a qualifications framework for domestic workers. ▪ An information brochure for MDWs is available in all corridors (providing important information for migrants as they prepare to leave and as they arrive in the destination country). As an ACTRAV officer reported during this evaluation, individuals cannot bargain collectively. Although domestic workers can be isolated in their work place, the first step is to have a well-informed domestic worker.
<p style="text-align: center;">Internally within ILO</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Within ILO, this GAP-MDW project moved beyond working only with migrant specialists, bringing labour specialists and those working on the implementation of C189 to the same table to come up with ideas on how they can all address MDWs. Some individuals within ILO headquarters (SAP-FL, INWORK, MIGRANT) who had a passion for working on domestic workers felt that the project cut across institutional boundaries and they got the chance to really work closely together, on some occasions. ▪ Some interviewed felt that the project was extremely effective in the achievement of the project objectives, given the staffing situation for a global project of this nature (1 CTA, 1 administrator, 2-3 interns allocated at different times to work on monitoring, communications, a percentage of staff time allocated from other ILO headquarters and ILO field offices). As one interviewee outside the ILO stated <i>“GAP-MDW made the impossible possible”</i>.

4.4 Views of GAP-MDW stakeholders via evaluation questionnaire responses

Overall, when designed, the structure of the GAP-MDW project appeared well balanced in its design, with logical objectives. The research commissioned (under objective 1) should inform capacity development for stakeholders to advocate for migrant domestic workers rights (objective 2). Pilot activities were to take place in 3 corridors (objective 3).

A questionnaire administered specifically for this evaluation received 36 replies. Many of the questions provided rich qualitative information and these results are dispersed throughout the evaluation report, and presented by migration corridor case study in Annex 10. Quantitative questions asked respondents to rate the overall approach and the project objectives. These are presented in Annex 7, but summarized below.

Over 25 out of 36 respondents rated that GAP-MDW project as good (17) or very good (8) in its approach to decent work for migrant domestic workers in the country where the respondents were located. In comparison, more respondents rated the global approach as very good (14) with 11 rating the global approach as good, indicating the global approach was perceived more positively than national approaches. Over half of the respondents reported that staff capacity on migrant domestic workers had definitely or probably been built in their organization. Over two thirds (21 out of 30) of respondents rated the research undertaken for the GAP-MDW highly or above average. Only 5 respondents felt that research had definitely reached who it should reach, with a third stating it possibly reached those with influence. Eight respondents stated that it had not reached those it should reach, indicating that dissemination of research results more widely may be an area for further focus. Half of the respondents felt that the advocacy and information awareness work undertaken through the GAP-MDWs project had definitely or probably fostered change. Thus respondents who rated the objectives of the GAP-MDW provided largely positive rating, with some exceptions (see Annex 7).

4.5 Challenges

The main challenge noted during this evaluation was that the GAP-MDW project set an ambitious if not impossible agenda without a coherent theory of change globally or in each migration corridor. In other words, the GAP-MDW project lacked an overall coherent picture of how all the project results were expected to lead to the results, which would have helped those implementing the project to think critically about the individual pieces they were involved in. Bearing in mind that it is impossible to programme for the messy '*real world*', those involved in the GAP-MDW project would probably have benefitted with more discussions on the possible pathways leading to change, and how the project could provide evidence of its impact.

Table 6 tells us that a lot has been achieved, yet there also have been many challenges with the GAP-MDW project. Table 12 below outlines challenges reported during this evaluation with regard to the GAP-MDW project.

Table 12: Issues raised as challenges in the GAP-MDW project

The Table below is based on the evaluator's own assessment of the challenges experienced by the GAP-MDW. The evaluator's assessment is based on the questionnaire responses sent out for this evaluation, key note interviews with project staff and ILO staff in participating countries, document and report reviews, observations and field visits.

Issue	Challenges in the GAP-MDW project
<p>Overall coherence (see also section 5 below)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The project could have benefited from a stronger 'theory of change' with regard to what it was trying to achieve, and how. For example it could have had a stronger campaign and strategies for where communication messages on migrant domestic workers were going and who they were to reach and why (see also Annex 7). ▪ With so many products, workshops, regions, and multi-processes, the project gave the impression to some as having a scattergun approach, and required more visible 'discipline' with regard to how all the components would contribute to the results expected.
<p>Time frame and need for continuity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ One issue noted by a few interviewed for this evaluation, is that projects have a short time span, and have expectations that certain results will be achieved. Reality with regard to change for MDWs can be a long process, with incremental attitude change amongst policy makers and those that influence them occurring slowly over time. The original lifespan of the Project at 36 months was too short, although a six months no-cost extension extended the project to 42 months.²⁷ ▪ Placing the issue of MDWs on the international and national agenda, and raising the profile of domestic workers labour and human rights is only the start of a process that will take a much longer time. National institutions require more capacity development and reminders from ILO partners to keep the issue of MDWs right moving forward. ▪ Domestic workers unions and trade unions require support to ensure that advocacy work is followed up upon. Major break through for rights of domestic workers may not occur overnight, but attention to the issue can maintain a consistent constructive dialogue and engagement with authorities. The isolation of domestic workers makes reaching them difficult. Reaching out to domestic workers themselves (through religious institutions, and other places where they are allowed to congregate) is important for sustainability in engagement for change. This requires that a project has flexibility to work with many types of stakeholders who do such outreach. This project required more flexibility to be able to work with different stakeholders groups in the countries (ministry of interior as well as ministry of labour), which firstly requires the time to establish solid relationships and more close collaboration in national ILO offices.
<p>Large geographic spread</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This project was complex, broad and covered too many corridors at once. Each corridor had different levels of progress and different

²⁷ The Evaluability Assessment carried out in January-February 2015 stated the project life span was too short. Many interviewed during this final evaluation stated that what was expected to be achieved was over ambitious, given the lack of country level staff.

Issue	Challenges in the GAP-MDW project
	<p>ways of treating MDWs. This could be challenging in terms of the relevance of one corridor to another. On the other hand, this approach facilitated an analysis of different contexts and provided insights on a variety of different models/actions to better protect MDWs. Thus although challenging, the project allowed for the documentation of a wide diversity of situations and approaches.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ With such a wide geographic coverage, it is difficult to ensure that all relevant stakeholders are aware of initiatives such as the GAP-MDWs. For example EU representatives interviewed for this evaluation felt that it is important that projects ‘sub-delegated’ to multilateral organizations such as ILO, UNDP, UNEP should contact the EU office in the country of focus to update on progress from time to time; or to invite EU delegates to events. Some researchers did not know what happened after the research was presented. Some trade unions were not able to follow up on bi-national meetings. This issue also relates to the number of dedicated staff for the GAP-MDWs project and the lack of national staff fully dedicated to the project. It can be argued that in some corridors this resulted in a piecemeal approach in terms of allocating activity funds.
<p>Different levels of understanding</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The level of understanding of the issues pertaining to MDWs, the training and technical work needed by ministries of labour and trade unions varied considerably by country and presented different challenges to project management. Also relevant in many countries is the low capacity of government staff to address the domestic workers issue, and migrant workers issues more generally. ▪ Some UN agencies have had a different way of approaching the issue of MDWs. ▪ Another issue raised is the rotation of staff. Heads of government departments change, and capacity has to be built with the new administrators and bureaucrats. UN Women counterparts changed a number of times during the lifespan of the project.
<p>Keeping a focus on DW4DWs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The issue of decent work for domestic workers requires action at many levels using many different angles and perspectives. For example, fair recruitment; transit; border control; labour rights; social security; labour inspection; and statistics are all part of discussions on MDWs. It is a complex issue, and some interviewed argued that it may be best not to simplify the issue or narrow the focus on one aspect of MDWs, such as the fact that they are migrants. It is worth highlighting however, that GAP-MDW was in response to a call for proposals on migration and asylum as an entry point to address the broader situation of domestic workers. Within the ILO there may be a difference in opinion regarding whether the focus should be on specific categories of domestic workers (e.g. migrant workers) or a focus on domestic workers as one target group for a broader focus (e.g. on extension of social protection to informal workers). The latter would ensure that the emphasis is on a decent work framework within a country that applies to all workers not just domestic workers. This is important given that many countries send domestic workers but have many national domestic workers without

Issue	Challenges in the GAP-MDW project
	<p>labour rights.²⁸ South Africa government representatives mentioned this many times – they did not wish to be seen to be encouraging migration. On the other hand, it can be argued that MDWs are a very particular category of workers, who face particular vulnerabilities by being migrants, in a vulnerable and often irregular isolated employment situation as well as difficulties related to being female in transit and arriving in another country.</p>
<p>Project design/management challenges</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For project management, a major challenge was to keep up with the rhythms of work in the different countries, and keep up with progress. The monitoring framework (discussed later under Section 5.2 Coherence) for GAP-MDW was inadequate and focused on outputs rather than contributing to an overall theory of change on MDWs. ▪ Coordination at headquarters level, with partners and consultation mechanisms at different levels was challenging. Advancing an integrated approach within ILO can be difficult and must be reflected in how budgets are organised. Within ILO, this often brings up the issue of who reports to whom, at different levels. Differences in opinion on where to spend funds on MDW programs could relate to which ILO P&B outcome officials must report to through their workplans. Linkages between different ILO units are important, to understand and discuss for example why migrant domestic workers themselves (as was found in the research undertaken by Ukraine) do not wish to be formalized. ▪ Some interviewed felt that more could have been achieved if the GAP-MDW project had been managed in a more collaborative way across ILO headquarters departments. Another view was that there should have been more collaboration on the ground. However the project did not have any national staff deployed on the ground with ILO offices at the level of strategic planning, rather than later when under pressure to deliver outputs. ▪ Allocating funding for national coordinators was not in the originally bid submitted to the EU, and change was not possible. Although in Malaysia and Indonesia coordinators were appointed for specific periods of the project, this was not the case in Lebanon, Nepal, South Africa, Zimbabwe, Lesotho or Poland. Consultants were hired in some cases for specific tasks (Ukraine). Partners such as UN women were expected to work in close collaboration with ILO. This was possible in South American, but other UN Women offices were unable to allocate staff time (e.g. UN Women Nepal) due to their heavy workloads.

²⁸ The Philippines is an example of a country that has ratified Convention 189, and now has a very strong framework for domestic workers in their own country, and can thus advocate strongly for the rights of domestic workers who migrant to other countries.

Conclusions effectiveness

The ILO sought to start to address MDW challenges through an evidence-based approach and allowed ILO to provide technical support for enhancing capacities to advocate for migrant domestic workers rights; and operationally pilot test national capacity building approaches that protect, support and empower migrant domestic workers. Undoubtedly the project raised the visibility of this category of worker, and built a network of those concerned about MDWs. Also effective were the many efforts to share experiences from other regions of the world with regard to what can practically and legislatively be done to bring MDW rights in line with international labour standards.

However the project was extremely ambitious in its objectives. Coordination and collaboration with such a wide range of partners, and also within ILO was challenging. Excellent collaboration took place with some partners (e.g. IDWF and ITUC) raising the visibility of MDWs amongst many stakeholders and organisations representing domestic workers. The project responded appropriately to ongoing political and legal changes. A missed opportunity was closer synchronization with other initiatives at the country level to ensure ownership. However this was likely due to the way the project was designed; implementation was mainly without ILO national officers at the country level. At the same time it is necessary to stress that there were also many successful efforts to cooperate and coordinate with a number of existing projects, initiatives and processes at national, regional and global level.

5. Coherence

5.1 Changing Perceptions amongst Constituents

The GAP-MDW project worked hard to change perceptions about domestic work amongst workers organizations, governments, employers, and the public at large. In terms of ILO's tripartite nature, the project engaged much more with workers organizations and governments than with employers of domestic workers. However in Malaysia the entire emphasis was on the employers of domestic workers, using research conducted to understand how to change employers behaviour and attitudes towards domestic workers.

Employers are however key and it is a significant challenge to address the rights of domestic workers via their employers. It is always worth bearing in mind that trade unionists, government officials, individuals in employers' organisations and the general public are all the employers of domestic workers. Generally it is difficult to get employers interested in domestic workers rights. Employers probably require incentives to deliver change. In Malaysia, Lebanon and South Africa the respective studies commissioned by GAP-MDWs on employers of domestic workers were considered really useful as the studies outlined attitudes of employers.

Although ACTEMP at ILO are interested in migration issues, domestic workers is not a 'relevant' issue for federations of employers they represent (at present), as there are few 'employer' organisations or associations that can negotiate nationally as employers of domestic workers.²⁹ More examples of employers addressing domestic work, and migrant domestic work would be useful to engage their interest. However one interviewee noted that at the Istanbul conference in 2014, GAP-MDW shared experiences from other regions of working with employers. The Global Report on MDWs contains such examples, but arrived too late in the GAP-MDW project lifespan. For example the report outlines the Jordanian Insurance Scheme as an interesting incentive that may eventually lessen the hold of the kafala system. The *Codes of Conduct* for employers in Lebanon and in Malaysia also look promising but must be endorsed and disseminated.³⁰ One interviewee reported that Philippines, Tanzania and Zambia employers' organizations are further along the road of taking on the issue of domestic work, starting in their individual capacity as employers though these countries were not part of the GAP-MDW project.³¹

However a relevant question to ask in the future is how and whether a time bound headquarters based project working on migrant domestic workers rights understand how public perception (i.e. employers of domestic workers) in different countries is changing? Relevant issues to track would be how engaged the public are on the issue or whether there is general discussion in the media, whilst recognizing that changing perceptions are very difficult to measure. In a future project, it would be helpful to document what the project has done to involve employers or build their interest. Is it possible to measure any change in discussions among policy actors and commentators, for example have they started to refer to domestic workers as workers?

²⁹ ACTEMP are however concerned with forced labour and trafficking.

³⁰ Advice and guidelines such as codes of conduct mentioned above are becoming more prevalent for employers For example in Qatar a guide to employing foreign domestic workers was prepared by HIVOS and Migrant-Rights.org

³¹ The Zambian Federation of Employers had developed code of conduct for employers of domestic workers in Zambia. Employers organizations (ATE) were supportive of decent work for domestic workers in Tanzania.

5.2 Indicators in the GAP-MDW Project

The GAP-MDW project lacked a detailed performance measurement analysis framework or system. The evaluability assessment carried out in January-February 2015 concluded that the project lacked precision in defining linkages between how the different outputs could coherently contribute to the outcomes; and questioned aspects of the log frame and results chain. The assessment suggested differences between the project outputs and outcomes should be more distinctive, with more clarity on how to measure results. Those involved in the project reported the indicators in the project document as not being particularly useful.

Following the evaluability assessment, an intern with substantive previous experience in project management developed a monitoring framework. The resulting results framework allowed project staff to track activities towards specific objectives. A progress matrix was used internally to track activities that had common outputs. Regionally tracking different activities allowed those involved to gauge where more work with stakeholders should be advanced. Yet, even though many output indicators have been reached, how they impact on the development objective was not well established. Going through the indicators and results reported to date in the GAP-DW project, as specifically requested in the ToRs, this final evaluation comments on some aspects of the indicators in Annex 9, boxes 3-5, with summarized comments below.

- Attributing policy change to the GAP-MDW project could best be described as difficult, particularly in Indonesia, Jordan and Nepal where there were related ILO and other projects with similar objectives in place. All complemented each other, although the extent to which they worked together is difficult to discern in this evaluation and without undertaking field visits and meeting many stakeholders on the ground.
- Although evaluation forms were distributed for some capacity development initiatives, and an internal ILO headquarters GAP project group reviewed them, documented systems for follow up from bi-national and interregional workshops were not in place.
- Tracking information was often reliant on project partners. For example tracking of the knowledge sharing platform impact is reliant on information from IDWF.
- Whether capacity had been built as a result of pilot approaches to protect, support and empower MDWs cannot be realistically measured and tracked.
- Whether the GAP-MDW project provided for a change in the situation or working conditions for migrant domestic workers cannot be determined, without more in-depth longitudinal studies and cannot be expected within a short project timeframe.

The indicators in the GAP-MDWs project were difficult to measure and track. The means of verification were not appropriate for such a large project, with so many activities across five corridors along with global activities. The process of routinely gathering information on all aspects of the project was impossible from ILO headquarters. Given that project staff should collect the first level of information on the ground, without national officers this was impractical. Even when information was directed towards ILO Geneva, the analysis of this information could mainly help to identify immediate problems and try to find solutions to keep project activities on schedule (such as making decisions about immediate human and financial resources required). Identifying trends and patterns across the different corridors did occur, often tied to reporting schedules. The indicators in the GAP-MDW did not easily allow for a confirmation of progress towards the achievement of specific results. Collecting, collating and quantifying

qualitative data on the perception of the project would have provided richness and a depth of information, but this task is extremely labour intensive and was not possible (with the short time frame and with few staff fully dedicated 100% time to the project). In conclusion the GAP-MDWs kept excellent records regarding progress (inputs, activities undertaken and results delivered) including financial progress (budget), but did not have the time to usefully translate such information towards an overall theory of change, which itself required more discussion.³²

5.3 Gender Equality and Mainstreaming Decent Work

The GAP-MDW focus on formalizing domestic work for migrants is a way of mainstreaming decent work. The main thrust of focus was that MDWs should also be entitled to the provision in Convention 189 (for instance entitled to a clear communication on their employment conditions; minimum wages; rest hours; freedom to choose how to spend their free time; and are protected from violence in their workplace). Through the GAP-MDW project, domestic work was framed within the broader care economy. Care work is broadly defined as looking after the physical, psychological, emotional and developmental needs of one or more other people.³³ This focus is useful and broadens the focus towards gender equality issues, the gender division of labour, demographics and links to migration.

Gender issues and non-discrimination underlay all activities planned in the GAP-MDW project. Much has been written about the strongly gendered nature of globalization wherever possible in particular the 'care economy' and how domestic work allows other economic activities take place. Domestic work is part of the fast-growing, female-dominated care economy. ILO links the linkages between the feminization of migration and domestic work in many documents stressing how the movement of women fill the deficit in the care economy in industrialized economies. The project used as many occasions as possible to highlight how unpaid care and low wages in the domestic work sector present a direct obstacle to accessing and progressing through the labour market. Throughout the implementation of the GAP-MDWs project, wherever appropriate, emphasis was placed on how traditional gender roles dictate that women are primarily responsible for household chores and family responsibilities. GAP-MDW also highlighted how migrant domestic work fills the gap of insufficient public care services. This was linked to the undervaluation of domestic work within the broader context of care work and its invisibility in social protection measures. The GAP-MDW project also acknowledged that men and boys are represented among migrant domestic workers. According to ILO (2013) estimates although about 8.9 million men are employed by private households – typically as gardeners, chauffeurs or security guards – although domestic work remains a heavily female-dominated sector.

A key concern for those implementing this GAP-MDW project was to support the empowerment of migrant domestic workers themselves. The project moved beyond disaggregating between women and men, and tried to highlight how domestic workers are discriminated by labour law in comparison to other occupations and isolated compared to other migrants. The research terms of reference requested that these issues be considered in the research design commissioned.

Other gender related issues of focus in the GAP-MDW project were how 'protection' measures, although well-intended can sometimes be counterproductive. For example the effects of the restriction of mobility or age bans for women or the need for written authorization of male

³² Mayne J (2016) may be useful to examine for similar initiatives in terms of generic theories of change models.

³³ Presentation on the Care Economy, prepared by Susan Maybud, GED, ILO

members of a family (in Nepal and Indonesia for example) can encourage irregular migration and trafficking. Throughout the implementation of this project, all ILO staff involved stressed with stakeholders that domestic workers are not vulnerable because they are women, but because of their occupation; their isolation; their lack of protection under labour law; and because they are migrants. Abuse of female domestic workers was raised frequently during the GAP-MDW discourse with stakeholders. Some specific gender training took place for some constituents. For example the trade union FENASOL (and the newly formed Lebanese domestic workers union) benefited from gender-sensitive training delivered by ITUC and the Lebanese NGO Nasawiya.

Representatives from other agencies interviewed during the evaluation reported that ILO is excellent at reflecting gender issues in their work, and tend to have gender cross-cutting all projects. As mentioned, gender dimensions underlay all activities.

Conclusions coherence

Various activities in the project's strategy were coherent with global efforts on MDWs, although not always in parallel with or at the same pace as other country-level interventions. The GAP-MDW project worked mainly on changing perceptions amongst trade unions to advocate for the rights of MDWs (using research results), as well as sensitizing governments. Some interesting initiatives with employers took place, with many interviewed and questionnaire respondents stressing the need for more focus on employers.

Indicators as described in the project document were not that useful for assessing the project's process. Indicators as such, should allow for facts; figures; or measurements of feeling or perceptions that allow judgments as to whether the GAP-MDW contributed to the overall objective of increasing the number of migration domestic workers who have access to decent work. The indicators in the GAP-MDW did however allow for a description of the project's immediate progress in measurable terms such as the number of pilot intervention models developed; or the number of research publications completed; but there was inadequate time or staff to continuously assess how interventions undertaken by the project were viewed by stakeholders, except for inconsistent feedback from project stakeholders. Thus, the project was able to report consistently on output indicators. Input indicators (resource allocation) were also carefully tracked. The project kept detailed financial records detailing budgets spent on specific activities. Impact indicators from the GAP-MDW cannot be determined yet. The GAP-MDW project did its best to maximize synergies with other ILO interventions in the countries of focus.

Strong links with gender equality issues were made throughout the implementation of the project. Decent work for migrant domestic workers was mainstreamed in the project's implementation.

6. Efficiency

6.1 Collaboration and Synergies

In theory, the most effective approach to work on rights for domestic workers is to work collaboratively with partners in the field, including trade unions, workers organizations, human rights organizations, migrants' organizations and international NGOs, along with different technical units at ILO headquarters who can provide value insights and advice. Such an approach avoids duplication and enables resources to be put to their best use. In practice such an approach is difficult and requires a lot of good will and coordination. Throughout implementation, the GAP-MDW project staff, and other ILO staff involved, used strategic links and contacts they had with: other ILO implemented projects; existing unions; women's organizations; and through the UN system in whatever way they could. Staff on the ground however reported that there were sometimes missed opportunities to strategically planning with other related project.

Yet, resources were allocated strategically to synergize with other projects, although attribution with regard to outcomes is difficult to determine. More details about collaboration at the corridor level is presented in Annex 10. Some examples include:

- In Malaysia and Indonesia GAP-MDW collaborated with three other projects, the ASEAN TRIANGLE project, the GMS TRIANGLE project (included Malaysia) and PROMOTE (Indonesia). Work plans were designed to complement each other. . The GMS TRINAGLE project national officer in Malaysia contributed substantially to carrying out the project activities, at no additional cost.
- In Indonesia, PROMOTE (*Decent Work for Domestic Workers to end Child Domestic Work*) ran from 2012 to 2016. It aimed at reducing child domestic workers significantly by building institutional capacities of organizations to promote *Decent Work for Domestic Workers* effectively. A child labour project, GAP11 has a component in some countries on child domestic workers and was initially managed in a similar way to GAP-MDW. However GAP11 has more flexibility from the donor to hire staff in countries of focus.
- A range of projects were in place in Lebanon, some focusing on the rights of female migrant workers. For example a project on protecting the *Rights of Migrant Women Domestic Workers* in Lebanon ran between 2011 and 31 October 2014. The gender specialist in the ILO Regional Office in the Arab States took on board some the GAP-MDW activities and integrated them into her existing workload. Two project, that ended in mid-2015 set to improve the governance and protection mechanisms for labour migration in the Middle East (MAGNET); and a project to develop a Regional Advocacy Strategy on ILO's Domestic Workers Convention in the Arab States (C189). These two projects were integrated into one single implementation unit.³⁴
- In Nepal, some of the major activities implemented under the GAP-MDW project were in collaboration with the UK funded *Work in Freedom (WiF), Making migrant work safer for women from South Asia* which concentrated on women who are trafficked from South Asia.
- A staff member focused on workers rights of the ILO Decent Work Team (DWT) for Eastern and Southern Africa and Country Office for South Africa, Botswana, Lesotho and Swaziland took on board many project activities for the region.

³⁴ The evaluation for this project stated that regional and global initiatives on migration such as Kathmandu meetings, Abu Dhabi and Colombo dialogue, and the ILO Fair Migration Agenda are important for stakeholders. The evaluation also recommended that there be cooperation in sending countries.

6.2 Use of Projects Resources

With regard to the extent to which project's resources (technical and financial) were used efficiently, it can be reported that many cost effective strategies and cost-sharing efforts were put in place. Some examples:

- The government of Switzerland cost-shared the production of the OHCHR documentary film "*I am not here*", also funded through GAP-MDW.
- The DFID funded *Work in Freedom* project cost shared many activities with GAP-MDW in Nepal and Lebanon. The study on effects of the age ban on MDWs in Nepal was cost-shared with other ILO projects.
- In Nepal a co-funding agreement was signed between *WiF* and GAP-MDW for the Nepal-Lebanon migration corridor work (April 2015). This covered the law and policy study where GAP-MDW and *WiF* covered over 50% of the cost. For the age ban thematic qualitative study in Nepal, GAP-MDW covered over 50%. The American University of Beirut (AUB) completed the Employers Survey in Lebanon, in partnership with KAFA and Anti-slavery international interviewing 30 employers of domestic workers and a quantitative survey (1200 interviews). Costs were shared by PROWD, GAP-MDW (less than 10% contributed) and mainly paid for by *WiF*. *WiF* paid for a mapping exercise on resource materials on safe migration and a technical mission on recruitment, which also informed GAP-MDW. In Nepal it was the mainly *WiF* project that paid contracts to provide direct services to migrant and domestic workers at the community level,³⁵ and also paid for training for trade unions, domestic worker organizations and other service providers on safe migration and victim assistance. GAP-MDW contributed about a third of the funds required for a headquarters mission to Nepal early on in the project.
- In Malaysia, the national officer of the GMS Triangle Project carried out and/or oversaw several activities that were co-funded by GAP-MDW, which enabled the efficient use of funds. Issuing joint contracts to partners who were conducting complementary activities prevented administrative overload for the partners. The project also seized opportunities made available by the ASEAN Triangle project to send participants to regional exchanges on trafficking and migration.

The project provided adequate funding for activities, but due to the nature of how the project had been constructed, inadequate funding was allocated for staff. Cost shared activities were to be implemented with ILO contributing 20 percent. This proved challenging. Tagging expenditures correctly in a budget requires a lot of careful oversight. As one respondent to the evaluation questionnaire sent out during this evaluation stated "*co-funding requirements are key for the appropriate institutionalization of project goals and objectives but they tend to place project staff under a great deal of pressure*". ILO specialists (e.g. migration, statistical, workers and gender specialists) based in the responsible regional and sub-regional offices provided technical support to the project. These staff did not always have a space in their work plan to include GAP-MDWs activities.

Although many comments were made during the course of this evaluation about the lack of human resources dedicated directly to the project, it can be argued that the staff cost sharing initiatives that were put in place was efficient in terms of project resources. Some staff argued

³⁵ However the GAP-MDW project contributed about USD 40,000 to the community empowerment project in Morang and Dolakha districts out of the total Implementation Agreement amount of USD 142,000.

that more could have been achieved with more dedicated staff, whereas others argued that this was a very efficient way to run the project. Nevertheless many lessons have been learned about such a process, including:

- having more time to ensure all who would be cost sharing activities sit together and go through a more thorough planning process;
- develop complementary indicators;
- ensure that country directors or ‘sister’ projects are reminded of any letters of agreement they sign with a project to cost share.

In some countries national coordinators were appointed. Although cost saving to appoint nationals to perform specific pieces of work (rather than appoint national coordinators), such an approach can result in a very task oriented set of national activities. For example in the Ukraine, the ILO hired a former ILO project manager, which was efficient, as she knew the ILO mandate and procedures. Indeed this proved to be a very sensible decision, as many of the stakeholders trusted her.³⁶ Not having national project coordinators is problematic for the following reasons:

- ILO officers have better opportunities to network and coordinate with other projects.
- Without national staff dedicated to the project, other ILO staff face physical limits in terms of the percentage of time they can fully devote on the topic of MDWs.
- An ILO fixed term contract gives national staff UN status; the individual is representing ILO. This is important for governments, workers and employer organisations.
- With a national coordinator, monitoring responsibility for country level activities lies with them, and takes the burden of monitoring from Geneva. Consultants and ILO staff who devote a percentage of their workload to the project, only report on their tasks, rather than on the bigger picture.
- The actual roles /responsibility of a ‘consultant’ or an ILO officer (who does not work full time on the project) in terms of overseeing the quality of an output (such as research commissioned) can be unclear.

On the other hand, the point was made that whether or not there is a national coordinator should be country specific. In some countries, it can be an advantage not to have a national officer, as consequently ILO must work through migrant community centres, or Foundations/NGOs working directly with MDWs.

6.3 Project Management

The project had a high level Steering Committee with external ILO partners. This Committee was helpful initially for endorsing project activities, but was unable to address any of the human resource structural problems inherent in the project design. Whilst some partners such as IDWF felt ‘ownership’ of the project, including by their membership on the Steering Committee, other partners such as OHCHR would like to have felt more engagement through the Steering Committee (i.e. been involved in commenting on the research design, consultation on what is happening in the migration corridors).

The ILO has an office-wide “*Strategy for action towards making decent work a reality for domestic workers worldwide*” (2011), comprising a headquarters-working group convened by INWORK. The global strategy (DW4DW) is attempting to unify support and outline practical

³⁶ the person hired had been a national coordinator for the migration and skills project

approaches to address challenges in the sector.³⁷ Included in this strategy is a web-based knowledge sharing platform, which is a mechanism for collaborative development of products to share information sharing between headquarters and the field.

An interdepartmental implementation group closely linked to the headquarters DW4DW working group were supposed to meet regularly to provide guidance to the GAP-MDW Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) and ensure smooth coordination and consistency with related ILO activities at field and global level. However many interviewed in ILO headquarters had views on how the GAP-MDW project linked to the DW4DWs office-wide institutional framework. In general it was mentioned that coordination on technical projects such as GAP-MDW, which span across different headquarters and field units could improve in their collaboration with regular staff work. It was reported that after the first year, interdepartmental meetings with GAP-MDW rarely occurred, resulting in limited opportunities to share experiences, gain insights from other departments and balance diverse views. This group could have provided a stronger oversight role. Indeed a stocktaking report (December 2015) on DW4DW reviewed this working group in very positive terms, stating that it had actually put in practice and exemplified what can be achieved in building multidisciplinary collaboration and breaking down of silos in the ILO.³⁸ Some headquarters staff reported that ownership of the GAP-MDW project rested mainly with the core project group and other parties involved did not have a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities. In fairness, the project was late starting and was under time pressure to achieve the many outputs in the log frame. For example correspondence and details for over 100 ex-collaboration contracts were put in place during the project. In retrospect, collaboration with GAP-MDW should have started when drafting workplans, rather than mainly sharing information on the implementation of activities across the migration corridors.

As the GAP-MDW project was a headquarters management project, it had a disadvantage of being perceived to be top down by the field offices, regardless of whether the project was implemented in a consultative way or not. Being managed from Geneva meant that there was less time to discuss the content and timing of certain expected field activities and outputs. In many countries, there is a need to sit down and discuss these issues with various stakeholders (and this process may results in the same expected activities planned, but partners feel more ownership). This may have occurred to a larger extent in some countries than others. In terms of some of the background research paper, the South African government reported they are not happy with the research results. It could be argued that if the ILO Pretoria office had editorial control; the political tone of the points made in the final research paper may have come across in a more constructive way (still using the same evidence from the research).³⁹ A Project Research Committee was set up to review qualitative and quantitative research elements and plans for the Global Flagship Report on MDWs. An ILO peer review process put in place, but the project was at the behest ILO staff time to review the research produced through GAP-MDW.

In selected countries, the GAP-MDW project was to liaise with a tripartite steering committee or project advisory group, (involving a representative of the local EU delegation) who were to endorse country strategies and ensuring ownership and sustainability of results. The extent to which these country steering committees provided guidance to the project team on policy and

³⁷ This global strategy serves as a unifying framework for ILO action at country, regional and global levels on domestic work. The strategy focuses at many different levels. It requires funding from ILO's regular budget as well as from donors.

³⁸ The dedication and passion of those involved in this multidisciplinary collaboration, as well as the fact their team was valued technically and respected helped to sustain this collaborative approach. Funds were shared across the Working Group and to the most active staff in the field was mentioned as significant in this stocktaking report. The stocktaking report recommended that a DW4DW workplan would help to focus attention and sustain the efforts.

³⁹ Nevertheless it was noted by a few interviewed, that even if a government does not visibly and fully endorse research results; this does not mean the government is not listening to issues being raised around migrant domestic workers and their rights.

programme priorities is unknown. How effectively project performance and results were monitored are described under the Coherence section above. Overall the project monitoring and evaluation system could have been more effective. The CTA for the project did not have line-management reporting authority to directly request monitoring information from field activities, field offices and colleagues. No staff was reporting directly to her. Bearing in mind that the GAP-MDW project in many cases was an addition to field staff's existing reporting workload, monitoring information back to Geneva was not always systematic. The mid-term evaluation suggested that donors could consider more flexibility in approved project designs to allow for changes in project direction and outcomes as needed.

Table 13: Collaboration (internally within ILO headquarters and in the field)

Corridor	ILO field projects/ Office	ILO HQ backstopping
Zimbabwe, Lesotho → South Africa	Staff at Pretoria Regional Office and ILO country office for Zimbabwe provided inputs. Workers specialists in ILO Pretoria office provided support. ILO Officer hired for specific activities	GAP-MDW CTA MIGRANT
Paraguay → Argentina	UN Women commissioned to produce a country/corridor overview in MDWs; organise a national and binational consultation workshops. National officer hired for some months in Argentina	GAP-MDW CTA MIGRANT
Indonesia → Malaysia	Staff at the ASEAN Triangle project, the GMS Triangle Project, PROWD, <i>Work in Freedom</i> A national officer hired for a number of months (6) in Indonesia co-financed through with INWORK/GAP-MDWs	33% of time of INWORK officer (although in practice more time was allocated by the INWORK officer) CTA MIGRANT had overall management responsibility
Nepal → Lebanon	Collaboration with <i>Work in Freedom</i> project CTA and NPO for PROWD. Gender Specialist in Regional Office Beirut also supported in Lebanon. Collaborated with the "Promoting the Effective Governance of Labour Migration from South Asia through Actions on Labour Market Information, Protection during Recruitment and Employment, Skills, and Development Impact" UN Women collaborated.	20% of time of SAP-FL officer Intern from Nepal with statistical background CTA MIGRANT had overall management responsibility
Ukraine → Poland	Support from ILO Decent Work Technical Support Team and Country Office for Central and Eastern Europe ILO National Coordinator for Ukraine supported GAP-MDW Consultant (ex-ILO project staff) hired over a series of contracts to assist ILO NC in implementation; liaise with the project stakeholders; organize and carry out Advisory board meetings; assist tender procedures for research; organise a TOT; Develop TU training materials; Draft the MDW passport; organise /co- facilitate 3 workshops for TUs; organise validation workshop for research; support translation/communication/ dissemination strategy; concept for bi-national workshop; report to the CTA.	GAP-MDW CTA MIGRANT Intern Ukrainian (doing M&E) supported some activities

In summary, although an ILO office-wide institutional framework for DW4DWs existed, many headquarters staff reported that in effect they felt that the GAP-MDW project was managed by the core GAP-MDW team within ILO, and they lost ownership and voice within the project. They would have liked better coordinated institutional management of the project. Managers at ILO

reported that the GAP-MDWs project provided a lot of learning on how to collaborate and operate which are now occurring due to the new structures set up by ILO. ILO management staff reported that they have improved and learned a lot about how to work better across units. Going forward all individual workplans must now be linked to unit workplans and to one of the ten ILO outcomes, which should enhance collaboration. However at the start of the GAP-MDW, these processes were only evolving.

6.4 Communications

With such a global project, and such vast geographical coverage, communication between the project team and field offices is bound to be tricky. There were differences in opinion with regard to management decision-making or administrative delays from ILO Geneva. Most invoices are paid from headquarters and not decentralized to country level. Ukraine reported for example that everything was very well organised with no delays, and the GAP-MDW project team was very responsive and available to those working at the national level.⁴⁰ Some headquarters staff reported frustration with regard to moving ahead with the initiatives in the corridor they were supporting, particularly as they did not always know the size of their budget.

In terms of how the GAP-MDWs project disseminated knowledge, a lot of efforts were made to share research results through workshops in country; using the ILO Domestic Workers Website; the GAP-MDW website; and of course; the Knowledge Sharing Platform set up by IDWF. A number of interns provided valuable inputs with regard to communications using up a Twitter account, and Twitter feed. For example Tweets linked MDW rights to other discussions and statements made at the ILC conference. They designed info graphics and presenting summarized results of the baseline and qualitative research reports. All these inputs formed part of the awareness raising campaign strategy. Those working on info graphics worked closely with IDWF and ITUC, who provided comments and validated some of the info graphics before they were posted on the ILO and IDWF platforms. In collaboration with ILO DCOMM press releases were prepared and posted on most major activities or results. These were tagged by country, topic and region, so all articles could be linked under different categories.

According to the national consultant in Ukraine, the ILO Geneva Department of Communications was involved in supporting aspects of the project. For Ukraine, an official in Geneva, and an intern in the European Regional Office (Budapest) were helpful in using social media during the bi national and other workshops. On another note, interviews with trade union members were conducted in Ukraine, but those interviewed were unclear as to where interview were broadcast (and if they were).

⁴⁰ For example, the national consultant collected proposals for instance for holding capacity building events sent proposals and was given approval quickly from Geneva.

Conclusion efficiency

The GAP-MDW achieved a significant amount given the number of full time staff, and the resources available. Annex 10, which evaluates the different activities that took place in corridors, also highlights synergies with other interventions.

In some corridors different ILO projects attempted to coordinate different initiatives towards the protection of MDW and to improve coordination between related ILO projects. Because of the way the project was designed there was less time for planning at the country level, hence some synergies with national strategies may have been missed. Considerable efforts were made to cost sharing many initiatives. The GAP-MDW project could have benefited from better ILO headquarters interdepartmental relations, sharing ownership more carefully across units and linking to the DW4DW working group for better coordination and information sharing.

Clearly GAP-MDW staff working on communications played an innovative role in knowledge sharing and were important for the communications aspects of the GAP-MDW project.

7. Sustainability

7.1 Sustainability Strategy

The project document for GAP-MDW did not outline a comprehensive sustainability strategy that involved tripartite constituents and development partners, but rather assumed sustainability because of the partners involved.⁴¹ The GAP-MDW project design was anchored in existing priorities of the ILO as described in 3.1 and 3.2 above, and its partner organizations (especially OHCHR, UN Women, IDWF, ITUC who have related mandates on either domestic work, human rights or migration issues). Such linkages were expected to help sustain the impact of the project. Thus the project attempted to build on partnerships and networks for the sustainability of the initiatives; and use existing knowledge sharing channels and build new ones (such as the dedicated Knowledge Sharing Platform and Community of Practices on migrant domestic work at IDWF).

In many ways GAP-MDW attempted to promote the better representation and organisation of MDWs mainly through trade unions (and bringing representatives to highly visible events) expecting this process to continue after the project. Capacity development (through ToT provided through the project and other means) for trade unions was another strategy that was expected to be sustainable. The further replication of training activities by trade unions and domestic workers' organisations actively involved in the campaign for the promotion of decent work for domestic workers cannot be guaranteed, but those interviewed who received training reported they have capacity to continue. Many constituents interviewed in South Africa and the Ukraine would like to continue with a second phase of the GAP-MDW project, as they felt they

⁴¹ The GAP-MDW project document stated that a sustainable solution to irregular migration, exploitation of migrant workers and trafficking in human beings requires a comprehensive approach addressing the social and economic causes of these phenomena.

were only getting up and running towards the end of the project (and time was too short).⁴² Trade unions in the Ukraine reported that the global campaign on migrant domestic workers has helped trade unions in the Ukraine to keep the issue of domestic workers on the agenda. They reported that they will continue a campaign in relation to the ratification of C189. In addition, they will continue to enhance the skills of trade union staff to address the issue of migrant domestic workers. Certainly there has been more effective cooperation between trade unions and domestic workers' organizations in South Africa, which should sustain a stronger coalition around the objective of protecting and promoting decent work for domestic workers. The domestic workers unions in South America had a relatively stronger empowerment focus than in other corridors.

Further support for domestic workers unions is still required, either through bottom up capacity development, or sensitization of larger trade unions to take the issue of migrant domestic workers on board. SADSAWU have developed a plan of action to reach out to migrants in South Africa, but may require support to implement it. The Domestic Workers Union in Lebanon, requires further support to ensure that a solid cohesive MDW Union is in place.

Apart from awareness targeted towards employers and recruitment agencies and capacity building measures, the GAP-MDW project acknowledges that a sustainable strategy must also attempt to foster the empowerment of those at risk. GAP-MDWs was able to conduct pilot 'community development' initiatives in four regions of Indonesia, and some in Nepal and South Africa. Although some efforts were made, empowerment type activities were not really within the range and budget of what the GAP-MDWs project was overall attempting to do. Where the project fed directly into the priorities and requests of governments there was an increased the likelihood of the project continuing after funding ceased. It is worth highlighting that many of the contentious issues that ILO address (forced labour, child labour, sexual harassment in the workplace, the rights of migrant workers) are not issues that social partners, particularly governments always wish to put on the agenda. In many cases, the issue of domestic workers is not recognized as an issue, particularly as all categories of social partners themselves employ domestic workers in their own households (government officials, employers and trade unionists). Needless to say without reminders and constant pressure, governments may not continue with actions to protect migrant domestic workers. Some government in fact question that why should they single out one type of migrants, rather than others.

A further issue with regard to sustaining and following up on GAP-MDW project activities, is that funding agencies often prefer to work directly through civil society organizations. However civil society organizations can only go so far with advocating for the rights of domestic workers. For sustainability and labour law, those who negotiate labour laws in a country must take on the issue.

One issue mentioned by many interviewed in ILO headquarters was that the project had so many activities right up to the 31st July 2016, that there was less time to properly wind down the project or develop coherent hand-over notes. For example there is an extensive database of all contacts for each corridor and globally, that should be annotated and shared with new related projects or migrant/domestic workers initiatives now underway.⁴³ Records of what has been

⁴² The representatives from the Migration Unit at the Ministry of Social Policy in Ukraine reported a phase II or extension of the project would allow the government to contact and consult counterparts in countries where C189 not ratified, and where Ukrainian migrants are working.

⁴³ For example the CTA from a related project (Development of a Tripartite Framework for the Support and Protection of Ethiopian and Somali Women Domestic Migrant Workers to the GCC States, Lebanon and Sudan) was represented at the meeting in Madagascar and may benefit from the GAP-MDWs contacts in Lebanon.

achieved are not easily accessible within ILO, as the GAP-MDW administrator no longer has easy access to the files.

7.2 Examples of Initiatives that are likely to Continue

Some examples of initiatives undertaken via GAP-MDW that should be sustainable:

- The domestic work bill that passed into legislation in October 2015, and the Argentine new national migration policy, which allows MDWs from Paraguay to have their pension paid in Paraguay.
- The government in Malaysia has now endorsed the draft guidelines on employing domestic workers, and have committed that the Minister of Labour would launch them, will translate them and share with other government ministries. This is a change in attitude from when GAP-MDW project started in Malaysia. The guidelines may evolve into regulations in the near term.
- Methodologies/statistical and other tools are now available to conduct a labour force survey that accounts for domestic work (Zimbabwe). The Zimbabwean Labour Force Survey is conducted every four years. It is unknown whether the module to collect labour migration data will actually be administered again 2018.
- Importantly, the Zimbabwe labour force module with the migrant workers module was adopted as a guiding tool for the SADC's *Labour Market Information System*, complementing the already adopted module on immigration. The methodology is to be implemented by the 15 member states. It will be interesting to see which countries include the migration module in their next scheduled labour force survey.
- GAP-MDW developed three manuals in the Paraguay to Argentina corridor that are contributing to the professionalization of the care economy: one on housework; child care; and one on elderly care.⁴⁴ ILO, Gender Equality and Diversity branch (GED), has recognised that these practical manuals are replicable and is adapting them for other regions. Thus an output from this corridor is that these manuals can be translated into generic manuals; then piloted in Arabic, and they will be used in refugee situations in Jordan, Lebanon and Egypt. Work began in October 2016; and piloting will start in 2017. Thus a direct output from the project is immediately being adapted and used.
- Hosting the Knowledge Sharing Platform and Community of Practice at the IDWF was essential to ensure future sustainability of an electronic platform set up under GAP-the MDWs project. Maintaining the community was an essential component of the internal and external communications strategy, and at the same time strengthens IDWF capacities to reach domestic workers (migrants and nationals) in all regions. This practice is sustainable.
- The awareness raising packages such as the information brochures that were developed during the project are highly likely to be used beyond the project. Funds and responsibilities for updating them should be discussed with stakeholders for related projects.
- As a membership-based global organization, the IDWF will continue to represent the interests of domestic and household workers. IDWF will continue to strengthen itself as a strong, domestic/household workers global organization to protect and advance domestic workers' rights. As of July 2016, IDWF had 59 affiliates from 47 countries, with 500,897 domestic workers organized. Most of these are trade unions and others are

⁴⁴ Trayecto Formativo: Servicios en casas particulares. Material de apoyo para la formacion del personal de casas particulares ii) Cuidado y atencion de ninos y ninas; Material de apoyo para la formacion de ciudadprás y cuidadores de ninos y ninas.

associations and workers co-operatives. Working through and developing capacities of IDWF was certainly a sustainable strategy.

- In recent months there have been a number of new projects on migration formulated in Lebanon and the gulf region. According to an ILO specialist in Beirut, many include a domestic workers or a fair recruitment component. Discussions with donors have resulted in a component on working with employers; and scaling up the pilot approach in GAP-MDW that worked with bank staff as employers of migrant domestic workers.⁴⁵ Thus the employers' initiative in Lebanon although a pilot, evolved further.
- The trade unions in the SADC region will continue to work on the issue of domestic workers, if not migrant domestic workers beyond this project.⁴⁶ Migrants are a very topical issue in the region. There is also a growing concern regarding the 'export' of domestic workers to the Middle East, and the related growth of recruitment agencies.
- In Ukraine, the national consultant reported on the dissemination plan that has been organised. The ILO office in Kiev is sending the research and the passport for migrant domestic workers produced during the GAP-MDW project to trade unions; to parliament; IOM; UNFPA; and UN Women. Products produced by the project will also be disseminated nationally through the trade union websites, who have already asked for .pdfs of these documents. During the field visit to Ukraine, two trade unions showed the evaluator their website where details and news of the bi national workshop were clearly visible. At least one trade union had included photos of the workshop and a report in their newspaper/newsletter, which is distributed to all members. Thus it can be concluded that the trade unions in Ukraine are keen to continue for the moment to disseminate information. One trade union, TUESWU, in the Ukraine for example will try to ensure they cover updates or stories of change with regard to MDWs.⁴⁷
- According to a member of the Pan European Regional Council (PERC) of the ITUC in Ukraine, a PERC Experts' Workshop *Challenges of Migration in Europe: Building a Pan-European Response* was organised in Brussels, in May 2016 with the support of the ILO-ACTRAV and others. They will have a targeted meeting on migration and will discuss labour rights, protection and so on. In September 2016. PERC have three priorities – transnational workers, migrants and solidarity and labour rights protection in general. It will be interesting to note if domestic workers are on the agenda.⁴⁸
- The ILO Strategy on decent work for domestic workers, which includes migrant domestic workers, will also continue to operate and mobilize resources.

⁴⁵ The intention is to come up with some messages around decent work for MDWs, for instance "you are an employee; but also an employer".

⁴⁶ According to an ILO staff member who is involved in workers rights

⁴⁷ TUESWU get at least 2000 hits on their website daily.

⁴⁸ The Pan European Regional Council (PERC) consists of 89 national centres affiliated to the ITUC. PERC contains networks of ITUC affiliates, and cooperates with the Global Union Federations on specific initiatives, subjects and countries. The PERC sets up different task forces to fulfil its objectives and works with various sub-regional and transnational trade union forums and networks

7.3 Global Report on Migrant Domestic Workers

The Global Report on Migrant Domestic Workers, mentioned in 4.1 above, was expected earlier in the project's lifespan. Launched in November 2016, it shares both qualitative and quantitative knowledge. The report is of interest to ITUC and IDWF in particular but also a much wider constituency. The report tells the story of what the project achieved, but also provides information on many other initiatives on MDWs. Apart from ILO, IDWF and ITUC are important for ensuring the wide dissemination of the Global Report on Migrant Domestic Workers. Short extracts and policy briefs should be developed using Twitter, WhatsApp and other social media.

Conclusion sustainability

This section examined whether the project had a sustainability strategy and found that the project assumed sustainability because of the partners involved. A key issue for coordination within ILO is how to ensure the momentum of projects such as this, once they have run their course and funding finishes. For example to sustain the activities with trade unions, they may require reminders from ILO from time to time, via ACTRAV or other related projects. The Global Report on Migrant Domestic Workers is a significant product for ensuring the plight of domestic workers remains on a wider public agenda.

Many individuals within ILO have a mandate on MDWs, migration or domestic work in their workplan, and are inspired to continue to follow up. However extra budgetary funds are still required. For example it would be important that ILO follow up on points raised at the inter regional meeting in Madagascar. The project finished without tying up many of loose ends, so some activities and loose ends still require continuation, which is currently being undertaken by the MIGRANT unit in ILO. The challenge of mobilizing extra budgetary funds extends to the ILO's overall work on domestic work.

8. Conclusions

The evaluation concludes that the GAP-MDW project was beneficial for raising the profile of domestic workers as migrants. However it is difficult to assess to extent to which decent work opportunities for migrant domestic workers themselves were enhanced, or the numbers of domestic workers whose vulnerability to exploitation was reduced or how families of MDWs were reached. MDWs rights are complex. This project anchored its approach in research on MDWs throughout the migration cycle, across five migration corridors. Country based interventions along with selected migration corridors informed the global and regional levels on what is required, what actions on the ground seem to work, what more needs to be done. Many workshops for trade unions, governments and other partners took place to discuss the policy context and what realistically could be done for this sector of migrants. Intra-regional and inter-regional exchanges were particularly good to stimulate discussions. When countries of origin come together and develop a common position on domestic workers migrating, their negotiation position is strengthened, and they avoid competition and a 'race to the bottom' in terms of labour standards.

The necessity of a global project such as this one with management from ILO headquarters was deliberated by many interviewed. Some felt that these types of projects must be global in nature, to learn from experiences across regions, particularly as some regions such as Asia and South America are to the fore in advancing rights for domestic workers; whereas other regions are increasing the numbers of MDWs being sent to other regions (Africa). Paraguay to Argentina has completely different migration patterns to the Kafala system in the Gulf States, although perhaps some similarities in the circular migration patterns between Ukraine to Poland. Some countries such as Nepal had imposed an age ban on domestic workers migrating to particular countries, and it was important to review the effect of such a ban. Sharing of bilateral labour agreements was considered very useful for those countries that are in the process of negotiating such agreements. If experiences are shared early on, countries can consider measures that should be negotiated or the best protections that must be in place. ILO through the GAP-MDW project provided an excellent facilitating role in knowledge sharing across regions.

The momentum to ensure domestic workers enjoy human and labour rights is growing. The Internet and social media have a lot to do with this. The IDWF electronic platform for knowledge sharing supported by GAP-MDW has facilitating dialogue and is catalyzing new thinking and approaches to domestic work, particularly in the Asia Pacific region. The global work and collaboration with OHCHR, contributed to a strengthened multilateral rights-based labour agenda on migration, but such relationships need to be sustained and nurtured. The GAP-MDW project was relevant to ILO's strategy on making decent work a reality for domestic workers.⁴⁹ Collaboration was excellent with outside partners, particularly with IDWF and ITUC building global advocacy on the MDW sector, but more mixed inside ILO Geneva. The Global Report on Migrant Domestic Workers outlines lessons with many examples of approaches. To a certain extent in some countries, the project kept migrant domestic workers on the agenda amongst ILO officials promoting the issue of fair migration schemes in regional integration processes, such as SADC in Southern Africa or via MEROSUR in South America. Further short policy briefs could be drawn from the project. The project had at its core the promotion of social dialogue mainly involving ministries of labour and trade unions. Pilot initiatives worked better in some countries than others. The lack of ILO presence or the lack of dedicated country level staff was unanimously stated as the reason why initiatives were not optimized in some countries. A lack

⁴⁹ The text of the Resolution, adopted at the 100th Session of the ILC in June 2011, is available at http://www.ilo.org/ilc/ILCSessions/100thSession/texts-adopted/WCMS_162049/lang--en/index.htm

of a coherent monitoring framework that focused on impacts towards the overall objective was noted.

Funding from the EU along with funding from ILO's regular budget was most welcome for implementing the GAP-MDW project. The project put a spotlight on domestic workers who migrate along certain corridors. Decent work for domestic workers as linked to Convention 189 underlay all project activities. In the final analysis it can be concluded that although the GAP-MDW project faced many challenges, it helped to build the momentum towards labour and human rights for MDWS. A global project like GAP-MDWs is necessary, and it is relevant that it is managed from Geneva, provided provisions are made for national level officers and better ILO internal coordination is in place. More resources are required at the country level and more human resources are required to manage a complex large project such as this type of project. The particular challenges faced by migrant women, who work as MDWs is one that must continue to stay on the agenda. As one evaluation questionnaire respondent wrote:

“it is imperative that the UN system continue to invest in MDWs rights and institutions and organizations that defend their rights.”

9. Recommendations

Recommendations arising from the GAP-MDW project emerged from the results achieved as outlined in this evaluation report, and stem from discussions with those interviewed for this evaluation. Important conclusions reported in the knowledge sharing fora were also considered. The 36 GAP-MDW stakeholders also suggested recommendations. These questionnaire respondents were close to aspects of the GAP-MDW project on the ground and provided suggestions for how they felt positive outcomes from the GAP-MDW project could be scaled up; and suggestions for the improved implementation of policies for MDWs. All recommendations have been grouped together by theme to provide coherent messages below. It is important to highlight that some recommendations outlined below, may already be in process at ILO or taking place through other technical cooperation projects.

Table 15: Recommendations arising from evaluation

Issue raised/noted during evaluation	Recommendation	Responsibility	Priority	Time frame
1. Corridor Focus				
<p>Much knowledge has been generated on MDWs through this GAP-MDW. The importance of adopting a migration corridor approach was tested, and produced interesting lessons on how to work across migration corridors. It would be interesting for ILO to continue to expand the scope, or geographic coverage of work in this sector. Many interviewed recommended a follow up project run through ILO. A component would be to carefully examine countries that have made significant steps and connect workers organizations with organizations that are struggling to move forward with rights for migrant workers, domestic workers (or both). A link with other home based workers may also broaden the focus.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to systematically go through issues that require follow up from the GAP-MDW project and link to relevant ILO offices (<i>e.g. promoting the module on migration if invited to contribute to SADC's Labour Market Information System discussions, promoting the practical vocational manuals that professionalise domestic work, developed in Argentina in other regions</i>). ▪ Continue to promote a corridor approach with regional dialogues and inter regional workshops. ▪ Expand the corridor focus on MDWs to other migration or informal workers areas. Consider extending the corridor approach (sensitizing trade unions and governments) to other major sending countries within SADC (Malawi, Mozambique for instance) as well as receiving countries. 	MIGRANT/ INWORK	High	Immediate

Issue raised/noted during evaluation	Recommendation	Responsibility	Priority	Time frame
2. Gender Focus				
<p>The Sustainable Development Goal (SDGs) are now framing the global agenda up to 2030. Goal 5 aims to end discrimination against women and girls everywhere. SDG 8 concerns <i>Decent Work for Economic Growth</i>, and has a target on formalization of work.</p> <p>Domestic workers are important stakeholders for debates and investments in the care economy. The unequal division of unpaid care and domestic work is a huge barrier for achieving SDG 5 and SDG 8. Other linkages between Goal 5 and Goal 8 are being made by ILO (e.g. if DWs have rights & good wages, they are more likely to send their children to school, and break cycles of poverty.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use migrant domestic workers as case examples for a continued focus on the implementation of labour standards in advocacy campaigns on gender equality organised through ILO. ▪ Construct a (new) narrative for DW4DW around the SDGs. Ensure MDWs are visible in the framework for Alliance 8.7 forced labour, modern slavery and human trafficking. 	GED MIGRANT/ INWORK	Medium to low	Continuous and existing ILO staff at HQ
3. Awareness Raising				
<p>Advocacy is required to push for the recognition of domestic work as work. Research results and good practices needs to be disseminated back to all relevant parties. Have domestic workers union received copies of final reports, which would have been useful for their work? A database tracking system would be helpful, also linking trade unions and other stakeholders for other projects. Human resources in ILO offices who can undertake such monitoring and follow up.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More examples of innovative ways of reaching employers of domestic workers should be documented, and widely shared with ILO staff, ACTEMP, ILO partners including UN agencies, IDWF and ITUC. For example current work in ILO Lebanon with employers should be followed, documenting lessons learned for replication elsewhere. ▪ Consider how to ensure broader awareness campaigns reach in popular media. Consider how the documentary movies are being used. Continue to promote <i>My Fair Home Campaign</i> (which will also strengthen the collaboration between the ILO and the IDWF.)⁵⁰ 	DCOMM DWDW working group	High	Continuous and existing ILO staff at HQ
4. Interregional Policy Focus				

⁵⁰ The *My Fair Home*⁵⁰ campaign encourages employers to pledge for instance that they will pay fair wages to domestic workers in their home (at least the minimum wage). Pledges align with C189 (reasonable work hours and time to rest; written agreement on terms of employment; healthcare; a work environment that is free from abuse; privacy; and free time).

Issue raised/noted during evaluation	Recommendation	Responsibility	Priority	Time frame
<p>Many interviewed praised the knowledge sharing forums. The recommendations arising from these meetings are significant. Members of domestic workers unions feel that they can share their experiences on mobilizing migrant domestic workers in knowledge sharing fora.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Create more opportunities for international and inter regional exchange of experiences (focusing on initiatives in other regions, national trends regarding laws, strategies put in place elsewhere). Place domestic workers on the agenda of existing regional and interregional dialogues (Abu Dhabi dialogue and Colombo process), and extend participation to Africa. ▪ Lessons learned in the MDW sector could be presented in the framework of the ILO support to regional migration action plans. For example the main outcomes of GAP-MDW should be presented at the SADC Employment and Labour Sector April 2017 meeting. Continue to work with or link to regional bodies such as the <i>South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC)</i>, SADC and the Gulf countries. 	<p>PARDEV FUNDAMEN TALS MIGRANT</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Ongoing, using existing ILO country Office staff and ILO HQ staff</p>
5. Voices of Domestic Workers at the Heart of Initiatives				
<p>Broadly supporting the involvement and empowerment for MDWs needs to be kept a central focus. Putting MDWs themselves at the centre may need to start with more support services for MDWs on the ground (using the MDW information products produced through GAP-MDW). It also requires a strong 'community development' approach via ILO partners.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continue to improve and update the knowledge products produced through GAP-MDW such as the information brochure/passport for migrant domestic workers. ▪ Explore possibilities for peer exchange of domestic workers unions or representative bodies to view other projects or see what is happening in other regions. ▪ Encourage governments to extend professional skills for domestic workers to NGOs and government training centres. ▪ Encourage partners to adopt community development approaches in their work with MDWs. 	<p>IDWF MIGRANT/ INWORK</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Continuous ILO country offices</p>
6. Measuring ILO Policy Influence				

Issue raised/noted during evaluation	Recommendation	Responsibility	Priority	Time frame
<p>Much of the policy influence work undertaken for GAP-MDWs is difficult to document. This type of work requires a permanent dialogue with government and social partners at both political and technical level. Some exchanges are formal, others informal. Constant dialogue on topics such as migrant workers is best maintained when there are national ILO representatives who are regularly interfacing with the government on many issues. Reviews of policy processes demonstrate that it is necessary to generate advocacy coalitions to address an issue, and important to examine the roles and platforms of diverse groups both within government and outside government.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If starting a similar global type project ensure there is adequate time for national level consultations to determine views, even if such a process takes time and is difficult when under pressure to initiate a project that is time bound. ▪ Mainstream the issue of migrant domestic workers, safe migration, and information dissemination (and so on) into all activities of an ILO country or regional office or unit. ▪ Ensure ILO technical staff also has a deep understanding of policy processes and the need to involve broad advocacy coalitions. See Annex 8: <i>Resources for Measuring Policy Influence</i>. ILO Staff who can work across more than just one ministry are required, as MDW issues are spread across several jurisdictions – human resources, immigration, legal, and economic planning. The objective would be get major ministries to take ownership of the problem, and allocate resources to addressing the challenge. 	<p>ILO Management MIGRANT</p>	<p>High</p>	<p>Ongoing ILO HQ Technical staff, and ILO DWCP teams</p>
7. Management				
<p>Responsibilities for complex projects such as GAP-MDW require careful delegation and clarity of roles and responsibilities for all involved. For example the responsibility for the different migration corridors could have been totally assigned to a person/ unit within ILO. Inadequate M&E systems were in place for this GAP-MDW project. Results and project performance were difficult to consolidate.</p> <p>The mid-term evaluation for GAP-MDW took place close to this final evaluation, and the evaluability assessment results were not really utilised. Evaluation results must be used. The Manager of the unit responsible for the project is also responsible to ensure that any evaluation, review or assessments are taken seriously.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For future projects of a global nature, consider human resource requirements more carefully. ILO, in all its Technical Cooperation, should ensure that existing institutional structures in place such as the DW4DW working group are used fully and more integrated into planning and operation of technical cooperation projects. ▪ In future projects define adequate M&E procedures using existing ILO procedures and tools; establish a functioning supervision body and mechanism to better monitor performance, budget allocations and planning. Ensure timing on the ground is more realistic to achieve what needs to be achieved. ▪ Ensure that evaluation results (such as the evaluability assessment conducted during this project) are comprehensively discussed and the most appropriate recommendations put in place. An ILO management response is always helpful, to ensure challenges and recommendations are brought to the steering committee in an attempt to find a solution, or alternative pathways are proposed. 	<p>PARDEV EVAL</p>	<p>High to Medium</p>	<p>Immediate ILO Management ILO HQ staff and those who design projects for ILO</p>

Issue raised/noted during evaluation	Recommendation	Responsibility	Priority	Time frame
8. Funding				
<p>A range of agencies work on domestic workers and migration. ILO could work with a number of key bilateral agencies to create a common fund to address migrant domestic workers needs and contribute to institutional strengthening in countries receiving migrant domestic workers. This fund could focus on how the particular needs of migrant domestic workers can be met under goals 5 and 8 of the SDGs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Explore opportunities for funding through the International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD),⁵¹ and in line with the Valletta Action Plan to make migration better. The ‘Africa Trust Fund for stability and addressing root causes of irregular migration and displaced persons’ may be another source.⁵² ▪ Tap into South-South funding for sharing experiences on MDWs. Explore the possibility of a regional programme with IOM and other partners in Southern Africa on labour migration and include migrant domestic workers as part of this regional initiative. 	PARDEV	Medium	Ongoing ILO Management

⁵¹ ICMPD serves as a support mechanism for informal consultations, and to provide expertise and efficient services in the newly emerging landscape of multilateral cooperation on migration and asylum issues.

⁵² The EU has pledged 1.8 billion EUR and may be interesting for scaling up some GAP-MDW initiatives.

10. Lessons learned and emerging good practices

10.1 Lessons learned

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Global Action Programme on Migrant Domestic Workers and their Families (GAP-MDW)

Project TC/SYMBOL: DCI-MIGR/2012/283-032

Name of Evaluator: Una Murray **Date:** 14.12.2016

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	<p>Implement a corridor approach is challenging, but is important for ensuring both destination and receiving countries are aware of the situation of MDWs. Implementing a corridor approach allows for a focus on the complete migration cycle (pre departure, destination, return). With the focus on both the country of origin and the destination country, a deeper more complete analysis takes place. If a corridor approach is well implemented, it can bring achievements in terms of advancing bilateral relations between two countries.</p> <p>Thus a corridor approach is important for linking research results or field based realities of migrant domestic workers to policy in both countries. A corridor approach based on knowledge/lesson sharing vision requires strong and definite coordination arrangements between country offices, regional offices and headquarters of ILO with other stakeholders. However involving a wide range of stakeholders in the corridor approach helps to ensure the results of research on migrant domestic workers can be made accessible for use with policy makers. The GAP-MDW project demonstrated that for research to be used, a wide range of stakeholders must be involved in the research planning from the start. This will help to ensure the research fills in the gaps and goes in the direction that various (and diverse) stakeholders along the corridor feel are important. In some instances, this may slow down the process of initiating the research. On the other hand, it ensures buy-in and relevance.</p>
Context and any related preconditions	<p>Coordination for policy advocacy related to evidence on migrant domestic workers should include a focus on a corridor approach in the terms of reference for the research. Within ILO itself, for a corridor approach to work, who reports to who and where coordination and knowledge is shared must be clearly worked out.</p>
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	<p>Governments and those involved in migration issues, those engaged in research on migration.</p>
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	<p>It can be difficult to ensure that receiving countries along a migration corridor accept the results from research. To ensure research informs policy, it is important to balance the need for independent critical research with researchers who are independent, critical and respected nationally.</p>

<p>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</p>	<p>If the government(s) in the corridor respects researchers, research results and knowledge generated (that has important policy implications) will be noticed. If the government is not fully on board from the start and is not involved in choosing the researcher, there may be problems. Presenting research results that are critical of government is tricky (but necessary). Presenting a range of forward-looking alternatives and options that reflect the likelihood of change in the future is important (rather than desired change overnight).</p> <p>ILO is often operating in policy contexts that are characterised by complexity and uncertainty with many competing ends and means. Although some change requires immediate action, policy on migration is a process, and advice to governments is ongoing and open ended. Research results should also be presented back to domestic workers. Annex 8 contains policy influence resources</p>
<p>ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)</p>	<p>For research results to link to national policy, support from ILO staff in the destination and receiving countries is important, particularly for a headquarters managed project such as GAP-MDW. For instance, Decent Work Country Teams must be strongly linked with headquarters and different headquarters units and all linked to the ILO DW4DWs strategy. ILO Directors must feel that they have the staff on the ground to ensure that the research undertaken through a project can be “overseen”.</p>

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Global Action Programme on Migrant Domestic Workers and their Families (GAP-MDW)

Project TC/SYMBOL: DCI-MIGR/2012/283-032

Name of Evaluator: Una Murray **Date:** 14.12.2016

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

LL Element	Text
<p>Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)</p>	<p>High-level initiatives always require that migrant domestic workers voices remain a central focus (as the ultimate beneficiaries, or rights holders). It is imperative to always ensure project elements that provide support for Domestic Workers to organise</p> <p>The process of organizing domestic workers itself is extremely important for efforts to be sustained. This lesson learned came from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SADSAWU in South Africa; ▪ reports form earlier participatory action research with the Domestic Workers Union in Lebanon; and ▪ interviews with the Migrant Rights Council of Ireland (MRCI). <p>Evidence points to the importance of adapting a ‘community development’ perspective when bringing domestic workers together at the early stages of setting up structures to support them to organise. Where the project worked with domestic workers unions (SADSAWU in South Africa); considerable opportunities were in place to strengthen these unions or organisations. However it is worth remembering that global projects must target the organizations/institution that can contribute to policy change and potentially impact large numbers of women. To whatever extent a project bidding process allows, planning should be done in consultation with those organization that represent domestic workers or directly service them. Evidently, interaction with organization that represent domestic workers or directly service them should continue throughout project implementation to ensure the project remains on the right track, and continues to address the key issues affecting the ultimate beneficiaries.</p>

Context and any related preconditions	<p>Putting MDWs at the centre requires a ‘community development’ approach, which in turn involves a process where community leaders/ members come together to take collective action and generate solutions to common problems, often through a process of critical thinking. Some interviewed for this evaluation reported that to organise domestic workers, or to set up a domestic workers union, it is important to work first with NGOs or associations that migrants trust (such as a migrant centre, organizations that deal with gender based violence). Domestic workers, and in particular migrants will not trust unions, unless the organizations that directly help them collaborate, trust and align with unions. Support through a project such as GAP-MDW should be to facilitate such a process, with an acknowledgement that building trust takes time. Community work, although a slow and deep process of politicization with marginalised groups requires investment (in addition to skills, knowledge and practical experience).</p> <p>In South Africa, SADSAWU have good experiences to share regarding mobilizing and contacting domestic workers including migrant domestic workers and work closely with facilitators who adopt a community development approach. They have a target to reach 5000 domestic workers but the end of 2016. The Global Report on Migrant Domestic Workers provides more detail on how SADSAWU operates in practice.</p>
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	Trade Unions or organisations that support MDWs.
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	<p>Sometimes capacities within trade unions to organise informal workers is weak. Interviewees reported that the capacity of trade unions to address migration issues amongst their members varies a lot from union to union. For instance trade unions in Asia are more familiar with migration issues. In Africa the issues of rights for migrant workers is more recently on the political agenda, often with negative connotations. Although the ILO in Africa has created some platforms for migrants, their existence needs to be disseminated more. Others reported that in initiatives that focus on migrant domestic workers, the voices of domestic workers at the international platforms particularly in trainings, in the trade union movement, and in international events could sometimes be made more visible.</p> <p>Interviewees reiterated how difficult it is for domestic workers unions to keep members, nationals or migrants. Many reported (for example in South Africa staff from the PTAWU union & SADSAWU) that domestic workers are scared to join trade unions. Members tend to join and leave, or only turn to the trade union in time of crisis. Fear amongst migrant domestic workers (particularly irregular workers) is the biggest hindrance for union membership. They are afraid that if their employers’ find out they attended union activities, they will lose their job. In South Africa for example, migrants fear unions are too militant.</p>
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	<p>SADSAWU managed to increase their migrant domestic union membership. To reach out to MDWs SADSAWU organized cultural evenings, where migrant domestic workers demonstrated food, theatre, songs or cultural issues that may differ from South Africans. Music/songs were reported as good for solidarity.⁵³ SADSAWU set up a committee for organizing MDWs and focused on how to actually do it. Tools provided through the GAP-MDW provided practical advice on how to organise. SADSAWU combined organizing MDWs with other union activities, such as the ‘<i>My Fair Home Campaign.</i>’ They organised a visit to Zimbabwe to understand the situation the migrant domestic workers were coming from.</p>
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	<p>An investment towards ‘Community Development’ approaches requires funds and patience and will not occur overnight. If time and funds are allocated there will some domestic worker leaders continuing to be engaged and involved in social justice issues for domestic workers at different levels demonstrate sustainable impacts as.</p>

⁵³ For example according to one union in South Africa (PTAWU) songs such as *my mother was a kitchen girl, my father was a garden boy, that's why I'm unionist* touch domestic workers

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Global Action Programme on Migrant Domestic Workers and their Families (GAP-MDW)

Project TC/SYMBOL: DCI-MIGR/2012/283-032

Name of Evaluator: Una Murray **Date:** 14.12.2016

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.

LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	<p>Building teams for coordination is an important project management issue, as is the need for careful planning for typical delays inherent in a global project with so many collaborations and partnerships. Building teams and ensuring there are realistic time frames set is an important lessons learned.</p> <p>Good practice in project design and development focuses more and more on the project team and personal. When interviewing non-ILO project stakeholders in both the Ukraine and South Africa, many raised the fact that the ILO intermediary who interfaced with project partners had to be well trusted for the project to progress. Thus a lessons learned is that apart from their technical competence, there should always be a strong focus on the team and how they interact with project partners.</p> <p>A related project management issue is that this project experiencing implementation delays (although most outputs were delivered with the project extension). Although many issues were political and outside the control of project management, some could have been better planned for. For example collaboration between project partners (OHCHR and UN Women) and project associates (ITUC and IDWF) takes time for consultation and planning. A lack of national staff produced delays in the implementation of activities. The appointment of the CTA was delayed. Research took much longer than anticipated.</p> <p>In general, the primary focus should be on the ability of the project team to deliver ensuring that what is within the control of the project is delivered in a timely manner, anticipating delays.</p>
Context and any related preconditions	<p>ILO should at this stage be fully aware of how long it takes to set up partnership initiatives (such as collaboration with research institutions). Known and typical delays inherent in a project of this nature should be carefully planned for from the start. Most delays were outside the control of the project and could not have been avoided. The unstable political situation in Lebanon and Ukraine with the accompanying influx of displaced persons or refugees took from a focus on migrant domestic workers. Elections often mean that some stakeholders find it difficult to engage in projects (for example KSBSI in Indonesia in July 2014); or in Paraguay elections led to a change in the ruling coalition in August 2013 with a less harmonious relationship between the government and trade unions. In Nepal there was a horrific earthquake. The EU delayed in the transfer of funds until November 2014.</p>
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	<p>ILO – and their project design teams.</p>

<p>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</p>	<p>Some headquarters staff felt less ownership on the project due to not having budget and overall managerial responsibility for the corridors they worked on. Team and personnel are also important when working with partners.</p> <p>As mentioned many delays were outside the control of the project, yet were typical. The research cycle includes drafting and circulating the research terms of reference for comments, selecting research bodies/ researchers, elaboration of progress reports, circulating drafts for comments, validating reports, incorporating recommendations into a final report. This takes 8 months at least (depending on quality of researchers) rather than the anticipated 4 months. In Lebanon for instance, a bidding process was put in place to conduct a survey of employers of migrant domestic workers. A second call had to be issued, delaying the process by 5 months.</p> <p>In terms of project teams, this project was managed from ILO headquarters without adequate field staff. Headquarters staff generally provided continuous guidance, and responsive decision-making regarding arrangements or judgement that can only be made by headquarters. Many ILO field staff felt unable to take responsibility for deliverables, without a national coordinator. At least ten field or regional ILO offices were involved. GAP-MDW only has two full time designated GAP-MDW staff persons (a project coordinator and a project administrative /financial assistant). Team structures and clear reporting channels should be carefully worked out.</p>
<p>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</p>	
<p>ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)</p>	<p>More attention to team building and anticipating delays in project management</p>

10.2 Emerging good practices

ILO Emerging Good Practice Template

Project Title: Global Action Programme on Migrant Domestic Workers and their Families (GAP-MDW)

Project TC/SYMBOL: DCI-MIGR/2012/283-032

Name of Evaluator: Una Murray **Date:** 14.12.2016

The following emerging good practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.

GP Element	Text
<p>Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)</p>	<p>A corridor approach a useful pathway to tackle migrant domestic workers issues</p> <p>A corridor approach allowed a specific examination of the situation in a country of origin and the destination country with regard to how domestic workers are treated (both when they stay in the country and when they migrate). A corridor approach also allowed for a deeper examination of the migration processes path.</p> <p>This project necessitated a global headquarters approach, in that ILO wished to understand what it means to address domestic work challenges from a migration corridor perspective, and how that differs across different corridors. However a corridor approach proved to be a useful mechanism to approach the rights of domestic workers and to protect, support and empower migrant domestic workers at all stages of the migration cycle (in particular in the Paraguay to Argentina corridor).</p>
<p>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</p>	<p>To put in place this fairly innovative approach, learning across corridors had to occur and this took place to a certain extent. How the corridor approach has been implemented is outlined in the Global Report on MDW. Implementation had to be grounded in the context of national labour law, specific MoUs that set out the roles and responsibilities of employers, domestic workers, and recruitment agencies in both countries of destination and countries of origin. The project demonstrated that it is equally important to have strategies in the country of origin (tackling the causes of migration) as well as in destination countries (labour protection, working conditions, compliance negative perceptions towards migrants). However a corridor approach with a focus on 2 countries presupposes that MDWs only follow one migration path. International migration policies and the Convention 189 formed the backdrop to this emerging good practice.</p>

<p>Establish a clear cause-effect relationship</p>	<p>The corridor approach in the GAP-MDW project also highlighted that the experience in one corridor depends very much on the socioeconomic, cultural and policy contexts. The ILO inter-regional knowledge sharing forum workshop⁵⁴ held in Madagascar in May 2016, on promoting international cooperation and partnerships to realize a fair migration agenda for migrant domestic workers in Africa, the Arab States and Asia, was reported as helpful for encouraging joint interventions, including across corridors. More meetings such as this one should be organised in the future.</p>
<p>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</p>	<p>The ILO has demonstrated that bi-national workshops between countries of origin and countries of destination can yield dialogue and some results. With constant attention to the issue of migrant domestic workers through evidence from research, dialogue, and sharing experiences, change can happen.⁵⁵</p>
<p>Potential for replication and by whom</p>	<p>Yes, The situation of migrant domestic workers cannot be addressed without looking at both origin and destination countries. However the focus has to be on the push factors in countries of origin, as well as the conditions of work for migrants in destination countries.</p> <p>Any large conference on migrant domestic worker should strive to continue to move beyond framing the problem and should have at its heart the sharing of good practices and innovations for protecting domestic workers among countries of origin, transit and destination. It should focus on core principles for decent work for domestic workers and focus on examples of consensus building between countries of origin and destination countries. More analysis of the results of interregional dialogue could help to demonstrate the value and viability of joint interventions in both origin and destination countries to protect migrant workers.</p>
<p>Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)</p>	<p>Some CPOs on domestic work also target migrant domestic workers although not all are funded. When migrant domestic workers are supported by TC projects on migration then resource allocations may be adequate. Much depends on linkages made at the country level.</p>
<p>Other documents or relevant comments</p>	

⁵⁴ organised jointly by ILO's Labour Migration Branch (MIGRANT) of the Conditions of Work and Equality Department (WORKQUALITY) and Fundamental Principles of Rights at Work Branch (FUNDAMENTALS) of the Governance and Tripartism Department, in collaboration with ILO's Regional Offices for Africa, Arab States, and Asia Pacific

⁵⁵ An example of reform attributed to many actors advising, lobbying and related advocacy work: Qatar will replace the Kafala (sponsorship) system with a new residency law with a contract-based system in 2016. A ministerial decree in 2016 in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) could help protect low-paid migrant workers from a practice that can contribute to forced labour (the first measure of its kind in Gulf Cooperation Council countries, but it lacks details on implementation and enforcement and does not apply to domestic workers).

ILO Emerging Good Practice Template

Project Title: Global Action Programme on Migrant Domestic Workers and their Families (GAP-MDW)

Project TC/SYMBOL: DCI-MIGR/2012/283-032

Name of Evaluator: Una Murray **Date:** 14.12.2016

The following emerging good practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report

GP Element	Text
<p>Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)</p>	<p>The project had a strong focus on contributing to the global care agenda and moving this agenda forward</p> <p>Care work is broadly defined as looking after the physical, psychological, emotional and developmental needs of one or more other people.⁵⁶ The GAP-MDW focused the plight of domestic workers within the context of the global care agenda. This linkage broadens the debate towards gender equality issues, the gender division of labour, demographics and links to migration. Domestic worker if viewed within the context of care work, which is seen both as a potential area of employment growth, as well as a means of supporting women’s equal opportunities.</p>
<p>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</p>	<p>The ILO recognizes that the world of work is undergoing a major process of change and has launched a "Future of Work initiative, structured around four centenary conversations. I) Work and society; ii) Decent jobs for all; iii) The organization of work and production; and iv) The governance of work. ILO is including a focus on care and jobs.</p> <p>The GAP-MDW had improving the knowledge base on MDWs at its core. Research conducted through the GAP-MDW has brought new light to issues on the <i>Global Care Economy</i>, and the need to review the place and conditions of women in the world of work. The research reports from GAP-MDWs feeds into a range of care issues (aging, demographic shifts, women getting into the workplace. For example ILO has undertaken a <i>Global Mapping of the Provision of Care through Cooperatives</i>. Further dialogues are planned with regard to the Care Economy in 2017. This is an example of a project feeding into the ILO Flagship Centenary initiative, and is a good practice in linking ILO mandates and strategies towards a coherent ILO message.</p> <p>On the whole, many lessons were learned about decent work and the care economy, which will feed into the ILO Women at Work centenary initiative. For instance through work in Argentina to develop a vocational training programme for domestic workers to professionalize their occupation.</p>

⁵⁶ Presentation on the Care Economy, prepared by Susan Maybud, GED, ILO

<p>Establish a clear cause-effect relationship</p>	<p>ILO made clear linkages between the feminization of migration and domestic work. This was emphasised in many documents stressing how the movement of women fill the deficit in the care economy in industrialized economies. The project used as many occasions as possible to highlight how unpaid care and low wages in the domestic work sector present a direct obstacle to accessing and progressing through the labour market. Throughout the implementation of the GAP-MDWs project, wherever appropriate, emphasis was placed on how traditional gender roles dictate that women are primarily responsible for household chores and family responsibilities.</p>
<p>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</p>	<p>GAP-MDW developed three manuals in the Paraguay to Argentina corridor that are contributing to the professionalization of the care economy: one on housework; child care; and one on elderly care.</p> <p>GAP-MDW and the ILO regional office should have data on those who directly benefitted from training in Argentina: Servicios en casas particulares. Material de apoyo para la formacion del personal de casas particulares ii) Cuidado y atencion de ninos y ninas; Material de apoyo para la formacion de ciudadprasy cuidadores de ninos y ninas.</p>
<p>Potential for replication and by whom</p>	<p>Products from the project are already being used in other ILO work. GAP-MDW developed three manuals in the Paraguay to Argentina corridor that are contributing to the professionalization of the care economy: one on housework; child care; and one on elderly care. ILO, Gender Equality and Diversity branch (GED), has recognised that these practical manuals are replicable and is adapting them for other regions. Thus an output from this corridor is that these manuals can be translated into generic manuals; then piloted in Arabic, and they will be used in refugee situations in Jordan, Lebanon and Egypt. Work began in October 2016; and piloting will start in 2017. Thus a direct output from the project is immediately being adapted and used.</p>
<p>Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)</p>	<p>This is an example of a project feeding into the ILO Flagship Centenary initiative, and is a good practice in linking ILO mandates and strategies towards a coherent ILO message. The unequal division of unpaid care and domestic work is linked by ILO as a barrier for achieving SDG 5 and SDG 8.</p>
<p>Other documents or relevant comments</p>	<p>Material de apoyo para la formacion del personal de casas particulares ii) Cuidado y atencion de ninos y ninas; Material de apoyo para la formacion de ciudadprasy cuidadores de ninos y ninas.</p>

Annexes to Evaluation

Annex 1: Terms of reference for final evaluation

**Global Action Programme on Migrant Domestic Workers and their Families
(GAP-MDW Project) - DCI-MIGR/2012/283-032
Final Independent Evaluation
Terms of Reference**

Project Title:	Global Action Programme on Migrant Domestic Workers and their Families
Type of Evaluation:	Final independent evaluation
Countries:	Global, with pilot action in countries along five selected “migration corridors” in Europe, Africa, Middle East, Asia and Latin America- (Nepal-Lebanon, Zimbabwe-South Africa (Lesotho was subsequently incorporated into the latter corridor), Paraguay-Argentina, Indonesia-Malaysia and Ukraine-Poland.
Project End:	31 July 2016 (The project was originally scheduled to end on January 31, 2016. A six-month extension was approved by EU in July 2015)
Evaluation Manager:	Natalia Popova
Technical Unit:	MIGRANT
Collaborating Units:	Collaborating Units: INWORK, SAP/FL, ACTRAV. ILO offices for Budapest, Pretoria, Harare, Buenos Aires, Santiago, Kathmandu, Jakarta, Beirut, ILO project offices for Paraguay and Malaysia

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The challenges and vulnerabilities of migrants employed in the area of domestic work are manifold. Women account for an estimated 83 per cent of all domestic workers globally. They also comprise the majority of the millions of migrants who move across borders as domestic workers, although men and boys are also significantly represented among migrant domestic workers. In recent years, the situation of these workers has been highlighted as a result of the international debates surrounding the adoption of the ILO’s Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189).

The European Parliament’s May 2011 Resolution on the draft convention, recognized that migrant domestic workers “may be exposed to multiple discrimination, since they often work under poor, irregular conditions... are more likely to be mistreated, paid irregularly or subjected to violence or sexual abuse ... are often unaware of their rights, have restricted access to public services ... have limited knowledge of the local language and lack social networks ...”. The Resolution noted that undocumented workers in particular “do not dare to contact the authorities to seek protection, claim their rights or access health services because they fear being returned to their home country and/or punishment by their employer ...”. The conditions to which migrant domestic workers are subjected are often the result of their de facto or de jure exclusion from rights and protections afforded under domestic law. Moreover, existing legal and policy frameworks are either poorly implemented or inadequate to address the specific needs of migrant domestic workers that arise at different stages of the migration cycle, including recruitment, employment and return.

The ILO participated in an international bidding process called by the EU under its Asylum and Refugees program. The project was elaborated by the ILO in consultation with UN Women, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), the Confederation of Indonesia Prosperous Trade Union (KSBSI), the International Trade Unions Congress (ITUC) and the International Domestic Workers Federation (IDWF). The project is being implemented in partnership with UN Women, OHCHR and KSBSI, in association with the ITUC and IDWF.

The project seeks to address the unique challenges faced by migrant domestic workers through a holistic, participatory and evidence-based approach, taking into account the different needs of migrant domestic workers throughout the migration cycle and targeting a wide range of relevant stakeholders and by combining global and regional action with country-based interventions along five “migration corridors” which reflect different characteristics and regions, but which all have a high incidence of migration for domestic work. The migration corridors include: (1) Nepal-Lebanon; (2) Zimbabwe-Lesotho-South Africa; (3) Paraguay-Argentina; (4) Indonesia-Malaysia; and (5) Ukraine-Poland.

The project’s overall objective is to increase the number of migrant domestic workers worldwide that have access to decent work and human and labour rights protections. The project will result in better protection of migrant domestic workers and enhance their knowledge of their labour rights, strengthened systems to provide services and protection to migrant domestic workers in selected countries, an increased understanding of the rights and contributions of migrant domestic workers by both workers themselves as well as their employers, and an enriched knowledge base about the characteristics and situations of migrant domestic workers and their employers that will form the basis for evidence-based policies.

The specific objectives of the project include:

1. Enhancing research and practical knowledge on migration and trafficking in domestic work across global care chains.
2. Enhancing the capacities of relevant organisations and practitioners to advocate for migrant domestic workers’ access to decent work and human rights and increase the recognition of their role in economic and social development.
3. To pilot test national capacity building approaches to protect, support and empower migrant domestic workers at all stages of the migration cycle (to be implemented in 3 corridors: Paraguay-Argentina, Indonesia-Malaysia and Nepal-Lebanon)

An Evaluability Assessment of the project was carried out in January-February 2015. A mid-term evaluation was carried out during the period December, 2015-March, 2016.

2. OUTCOME STRATEGY

The project’s objectives are aligned with Outcomes 5 and 7 of the P & B 2014-15. The Outcome 5 strategy seeks to strengthen the capacity of member States to establish policies on wages and earnings, working time and other conditions of work that ensure decent standards of living and adequate protecting, including to address domestic workers’ vulnerabilities. It is grounded in the International Labour Conference 2011 Resolution concerning efforts to make decent work a reality for domestic workers worldwide (The text of the Resolution, adopted at the 100th Session of the ILC in June 2011, is available at http://www.ilo.org/ilc/ILCSessions/100thSession/texts-adopted/WCMS_162049/lang-en/index.htm).

Outcome 5 has two success indicators:

Indicator 5.1: Number of member States in which tripartite constituents, with ILO support, adopt policies or implement strategies to promote improved or more equitable working conditions, especially for the most vulnerable workers.

Indicator 5.2: Number of member States that, with ILO support, strengthen their institutional capacity to implement sound wage policies.

Outcome 7 aims to ensure that more migrant workers are protected and that more migrant workers have access to productive employment and decent work. Outcome 7 has two success indicators:

Indicator 7.1: Number of member States that, with ILO support, adopt gender-sensitive labour migration policies to protect migrant workers that reflect the ILO Multilateral Framework and the provisions of relevant international labour standards; and

Indicator 7.2: Number of member States that, with ILO support, adopt gender-sensitive labour migration policies and practices that reflect the ILO Multilateral Framework with a view to promoting productive employment and decent work for migrant workers.

In addition, as with all Outcomes under the P & B, particular attention is placed on promoting the gender equality and non-discrimination as cross-cutting issues. This is done by incorporating a gender lens in policy research, development and other forms of capacity-building at the country level. The issues and policy challenges that predominate in domestic work reflect to a large extent gender inequalities in the labour market as well as social norms and values regarding gender roles and division of labour regarding paid work and care (paid and unpaid) work.

3. RATIONALE FOR THE EVALUATION

The ILO/European Commission partnership agreement programme for 2013-2016 supports ILO's on-going work to enhance opportunities for decent work for migrant domestic workers at both the global and country levels. The purpose of this final evaluation is to ascertain what is working, what are the challenges being encountered by the project and identifying risks and corrections that should be made, what has not worked, and the underlying reasons for the successes and challenges identified, both internal and external. The evaluation will also identify contributions made to the ILO's internal learning processes. It will be undertaken in accordance with the ILO's Evaluation Policy adopted by the Governing Body in 2005, which provides for regular systematic evaluations of projects in order to improve quality, accountability, transparency of the ILO's work, strengthen the decision-making process and support constituents in promoting decent work and social justice. The evaluation will also seek to identify how donor funding contributes to the achievement of the project's objectives.

4. PURPOSE AND CLIENTS OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation will comply with ILO evaluation requirements and will be conducted in line with UNEG norms and standards and UNEG ethical guidelines will be followed. The purpose of this final evaluation is to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, and sustainability of the ILO's actions undertaken during the course of the implementation of the project.

The key evaluation clients will be: the European Commission (EC) as project donor; the ILO as executor of the project; and the project management and staff.

5. SCOPE

The project has a total budget of Euro 4,375,000 (approximately USD \$4.8 million). The EC's contribution is Euro 3,507,423 (approximately USD \$3.9 million). The ILO has committed a contribution of Euro 867,577 to cost-share its activities (20% of the cost of the project, equivalent to approximately USD\$ 960,000 as required by the bidding process). Partner institutions have not committed to contribute or cost-share.

The project aims to enhance decent work opportunities for migrant domestic workers (MDW) by reducing their vulnerability to exploitation and abuse and by mitigating the adverse impact of migration on families left behind. This final evaluation will look at whether the project has achieved the objectives as originally contemplated in the project document (including the identification of pilots that can be documented as good practices). It will further assess whether the adjustments or corrections made during the course of the implementation have ensured that the project has reached its objectives by 31 July 2016. The final evaluation will also provide lessons and insights on the European Commission/ILO partnership.

6. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

In order to analyse the evaluation data compiled and drawing conclusions about the relevance and strategic fit of the project, as well as the validity of its design, impact orientation and sustainability, the following questions have been identified. The evaluator, upon completing his/her initial desk review phase, may refine or propose further key questions in the inception report. The final key evaluation questions will be agreed between the evaluation manager and the evaluator.

All aspects of this evaluation shall be guided by the ILO evaluation policy which adheres to the OECD/DAC Principles and the UNEG norms and standards. The evaluation will be based on the OECD/DAC criteria of

relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability through the analysis of the project implementation and outputs.

Relevance

- To what extent is the design of the project relevant to national policies and programmes on fair migration, and ILO's strategy on making decent work a reality for domestic workers?
- To what extent are the interventions aligned with the ILO Domestic Workers Convention, 2011 (No. 189) and the Domestic Workers Recommendation (No. 201).
- To what extent is the project design aligned to Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCPs) and United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs) (if/when applicable)?
- To what extent is the project design aligned to the ILO Outcomes 5 and 7 mentioned above and to their relevant indicators?

Coherence

- How appropriate and useful are the indicators described in the project document in assessing the project's progress?
- Are the indicators realistic and can they be measured and tracked? Are indicators gender-sensitive? Are the means of verification for the indicators appropriate?
- Are the project indicators useful in measuring progress or change? What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives?
- To what extent are the various activities in the project's strategy coherent and complementary (in its design and implementation) with regard to global and country-level interventions?
- How do current efforts build on previous experience and/or maximize synergies realized with other ILO interventions and sources of funding?
- How are issues relating to decent work mainstreamed in the project's implementation?

Effectiveness

- Have the project outputs been effective in supporting the achievement of the project objectives? (Examine if the best approach was taken, and if it was optimally executed).
- How have stakeholders been involved in project implementation? How effective has the project been in establishing national ownership? Is the project management and implementation participatory and is this participation contributing towards the achievement of project objectives? Has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
- Has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, and/or institutional changes in the project environment?
- How effective have the project interventions been in targeting women, in particular?
- To what extent has the project created a dialogue between ILO constituents and organisations representing domestic workers to enable their concerns to be voiced?
- What activities has the project undertaken to increase awareness of ILO constituents and national stakeholders, and are they the right activities?

Efficiency

- Have resources been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
- To what extent are the project's resources (technical and financial) being used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
- Assess how the project has leveraged other funds at the country level.
- Have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
What means have been used to create, share/disseminate knowledge?
- Has the management capacity of the project been adequate?
- Has the project management facilitated good results and efficient delivery? Have all parties involved had a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities?
- Has the communication between the project team and the ILO field offices and other partners been effective?
- How effectively has the project management monitored project performance and results? Has the project M&E system been effective?

Sustainability

- Does the project have a sustainability strategy that involves tripartite constituents and development partners to establish synergies that could enhance impact and sustainability?

Gender equality

- Were there sufficient capacities in place to gather gender-responsive information and conduct a gender analysis?

- While, conducting the work on the above listed evaluation questions, the evaluator should pay specific attention and carry out in-depth inquire on issues such as identified challenges and analysis of the solutions implemented, positive outcomes of the programme, innovative processes implemented, possible improvements and opportunities for scale up.

7. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The final evaluation will consist of a desk review of relevant project documentation; briefings at ILO Geneva; field visits to 2 selected countries which will be decided by the evaluator in coordination with the evaluation manager; and compilation of information on progress in other countries through other methods (e.g. phone/skype interviews, questionnaires, online surveys). The countries to be visited should be different than those visited during the mid-term evaluation in order to provide a wider geographical coverage to the evaluation process.

Key questions to be posed to all relevant country offices will be prepared by the evaluator and once agreed with the evaluation manager, a questionnaire will be prepared and sent out to relevant field offices. This will be established in the evaluation inception report. The evaluator will then undertake a field visit to the selected countries to conduct the field evaluation mission to gather country-level case studies and undertake consultations with constituents and partner organizations. Where possible, a sample of beneficiaries will be interviewed to determine their views on the impact of interventions. All data should be sex-disaggregated in the report or provide estimates to this effect, and any gender-based needs and concerns of women and men targeted by the programme should be considered throughout the evaluation process and integrated throughout the final evaluation report. The evaluator will submit a draft report which will be circulated for comments to project team and relevant stakeholders. The comments will be consolidated by the Evaluation Manager. A final evaluation report, incorporating the comments (if/when applicable) will be submitted by end-September 2016.

8. MAIN OUTPUTS/DELIVERABLES OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation process will yield the following outputs:

1. An inception report with an agreed evaluation design (methodology, evaluation questions).
2. A draft report.
3. A final report including lessons learned, emerging good practices and recommendations per ILO guidance and templates.
4. An Executive Summary according to the ILO guidelines and template.

9. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The evaluation will be managed by an Evaluation Manager, an ILO staff member who has not been involved in either the design or implementation of the project. The person selected meets the independence criteria set forth in the ILO's Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation. The MIGRANT Labour Economist has been selected for this purpose.

An external consultant will be selected, who will be the evaluation team leader, with responsibility for the timely submission of deliverables, including the final evaluation report which should comply with ILO evaluation policy guidelines.

10. PROPOSED TIMEFRAME AND WORKPLAN

The timeline of the evaluation process from the desk review to the submission of the final report will be July 2016 – September 2016. It is proposed that the desk review and the field work will take place July 2016, with a draft report by beginning of September 2016 and the final report by end September 2016.

The evaluation consultant will be engaged for 35 working days, of which 12 days to conduct visits to ILO Geneva and to two countries covered by the project to be decided by the evaluation team in consultation with the evaluation manager.

Phase	Tasks	Timeframe
I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Draft, circulate, revise and finalize TORs ▪ Recruit external consultant 	June 2016

II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Telephone briefing ▪ Desk Review ▪ Consultations with ILO staff ▪ Inception report with Evaluation questionnaire based on desk review and consultations 	July 2016
II	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Circulation of questionnaire to ILO staff and national partners in different countries, to gather feedback. ▪ Field visits to intervention sites in selected countries ▪ Consultations with national partners 	July 2016
III	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Draft report based on consultations from field visits, desk review and responses to questionnaire survey 	Beginning of September 2016
IV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Circulate draft report to key stakeholders ▪ Consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to evaluator 	Mid-September 2016
V	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Finalize the report including explanations on why comments were not included 	End September 2016

Dates

The contract will start on *1 July 2016* and will end on *30 September 2016*.

Annex 2: List of those interviewed

The following is a list of those interviewed for the final evaluation of the ILO *Global Action Programme on Migrant Domestic Workers and their Families*

	GAP-MDW staff	
1.	Marie Elena Valenzuela	ILO CTA for GAP-MDW
2.	Maria Gallotti	MIGRANT
3.	Ivon Garcia	Ex GAP-MDW now REPRO
4.	Marie José Taya,	MIGRANT
5.	Leanne Melnyk	Ex-SAP FL and Workers in Freedom project (now Better Work)
6.	Claire Hobden	INWORK ILO Geneva
7.	Jared Bloch	GAP-MDW Communications specialists/intern August 2015-2016
8.	Olena Vazhynska	Ex-GAP-MDW Intern on Monitoring & ExCol on communications, now at ITCILO
	GAP-MDW partners/Associates	
9.	Elizabeth Tang	IDWF
10.	Marieke Koning	ITUC
11.	Pia Oberoi	Advisor on Migration and Human Rights Research and Right to Development Division Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights OHCHR
	Ukraine	
12.	Sergiy Savchuk	ILO National Coordinator for Ukraine
13.	Tetyana Minenko	ILO GAP MDWs Project Consultant for Ukraine
14.	Yuriy Kurulo,	Vice-President All-Ukrainian Workers' Solidarity Trade Union (VOST VOLYA)
15.	<i>Taras Simak,</i>	<i>Head of Migration Unit, Department of Employment Ministry of Social Policy</i>
16.	Natlalya Levytska,	Deputy Head of the Confederation of Free Trade Unions of Ukraine (CFTUU), Vice President of PERC, member of PERC Women's Committee at the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC),
17.	Petro Tuley,	First Deputy Head of the CFTUU,
18.	Olena Stoyan,	CFTUU member
19.	Rodion Kolyshko,	Director of the Workforce Development and Corporate Social Responsibility Department at the Federation of Employers of Ukraine.

20.	Oksana Kisselyova	UN Women Coordinator in the period of 2013-2015, Project Advisory Board member
21.	Olena Malynovska,	National Institute of Strategic Research at the President Office, PhD in Public Administration
22.	Gulbarshyn Chepurko,	National Institute of Sociology, PhD in Sociology Research (Country for migration Corridor Ukraine-Poland)
23.	Gergiy Trukhanov,	Head of the Trade Union of Education and Science Workers (TUESWU),
24.	Sergiy Kurilin,	Head of the Legal Department TUESWU,
25.	Kateryna Maliyuta	Head of the International Department, (TUESWU)
26.	Iaryna Khomtsii	Zaporuka a Ukrainian National Charitable Foundation
	South Africa	
27.	Zaheera Jinnah	African Centre for Migration & Society, School of Social Sciences. University of the Witwatersrand
28.	Getrude Mtshweni	COSATU
29.	Jane Barret	Director, Organization and Representation Programme. Women in Informal Employment Globalizing and Organising (WIEGO) formally from COSATU
30.	Sipho Ndebele	Department of Labour, Government of South Africa
31.	Felicity Phengu	Professional Transport and Allied Workers Union PTAWU
32.	Opinah Mahlodi	Professional Transport and Allied Workers Union PTAWU
33.	Joni Musabayana	ILO Director Pretoria
34.	Emmerentia Erasmus	Migration Consultant – formerly of International Centre for Migration Policy Development (ICMPD)
35.	Auriela Segatti	Consultant ILO office Pretoria
36.	Saliem Patel	Formerly Labour Research Institute, currently International Federation of Workers’ Education Associations
37.	Arno Schaefer	Minister Counsellor, Head of Cooperation. Delegation of the EU to the Republic of South Africa
38.	Aquilina Mawadza	EU South Africa
39.	Sindle Moise	Senior Programme Officer ILO Pretoria
40.	Inviolata Chinyangarara	Decent Work Team, ILO Pretoria
41.	Ayanda Mvimbi	UN Women South Africa
42.	Myrtle Witboo	SADSAWU, General Secretary
43.	Sindiwsa Ningiza,	SADSAWU, Provincial Organizer
	ILO Geneva	

44.	Natalia Popova	MIGRANT, Evaluation Manager
45.	Martin Oelz, GED	GED Indigenous Peoples focus C189
46.	Manuela Tomei,	Director, WORKQUALITY
47.	Philippe Marcadent,	Chief, INWORK
48.	Michelle Leighton,	Chief, MIGRANT
49.	Susan Maybud,	GED (Centenary initiative)
50.	Poem Mudyawabikwa	Labour attaché, Zimbabwe,
51.	Maria Gallotti	MIGRANT
52.	Ivon Garcia	Ex GAP-MDW now REPRO
53.	Victor Hugo Ricco,	ACTRAV
54.	Peter Radmaker	ILO PARDEV
55.	Craig Russon	ILO EVAL
56.	Emanuela Pozzan	Gender Specialist ILO Regional Office, Beirut
57.	Bharti Pfluf	Senior Programme / Operations Officer FUNDAMENTALS. Project Director, GAP 11
	Other ILO projects	
58.	Zeina Mezher	ILO Lebanon. National Project Coordinator (NPC) PROWD. Now NPC Work In Freedomork in Freedom and Migration
59.	Igor Bosc	CTA ILO Workers in Freedom Project, Regional project but based in New Delhi
	Others	
60.	Marta Jaroszewicz	European Commission. Support Group for Ukraine. Team Justice and Home Affairs, including anti-corruption
61.	Aoife Smith	Domestic Workers Campaign. Migrant Rights Centre Ireland.

Annex 3: Evaluation questionnaire

Final Evaluation of the ILO GAP-MDW Project July 2016

Please return by August 24th to unamurray@gmail.com

The Global Action Programme on Migrant Domestic Workers and their families (**GAP-MDW**) aimed to increase the number of migrant domestic workers that have access to decent work, and human and labour rights protections. GAP-MDW had 3 objectives:

1. Enhance **research and practical knowledge on migration and trafficking in domestic work** across global care chains.
2. Enhance capacities of organisations and practitioners **to advocate for migrant domestic workers rights**, and increase the recognition of their role in economic and social development.
3. To **pilot test national capacity building approaches to protect, support and empower migrant domestic workers** at all stages of the migration cycle.

We would be most grateful if you could take 15 minutes to provide us with your feedback on the GAP-MDW project by filling in this questionnaire for the final evaluation of the project. Your feedback will be treated confidentially and analysed anonymously.

Use your computer to place an X in the relevant boxes below or to provide text responses where appropriate.

Are you:

Female	<input type="checkbox"/>	Male	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------	--------------------------	------	--------------------------

Is your organisation?

A Domestic workers union	<input type="checkbox"/>	A regional or International domestic workers Organisation	<input type="checkbox"/>	Representing employers	<input type="checkbox"/>
A national trade union	<input type="checkbox"/>	The ministry of labour/ employment	<input type="checkbox"/>	The ILO	<input type="checkbox"/>
An International or regional trade union	<input type="checkbox"/>	Another government body	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Other , please specify					

Where are you located?

Argentina	<input type="checkbox"/>	Lebanon	<input type="checkbox"/>	Poland	<input type="checkbox"/>
Geneva	<input type="checkbox"/>	Malaysia	<input type="checkbox"/>	South Africa	<input type="checkbox"/>
Indonesia	<input type="checkbox"/>	Nepal	<input type="checkbox"/>	Ukraine	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lesotho	<input type="checkbox"/>	Paraguay	<input type="checkbox"/>	Zimbabwe	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other , please specify where you are located					

What activities have you been involved in with the GAP-MDW project?

--

Question 1

What do you consider have been the most **positive outcomes** to date from the GAP-MDW project?

1.
2.
3.

Question 2

Can you give examples of GAP-MDW **approaches** you consider were **most effective**, including why?

Question 3

Do you have any suggestions for how **positive outcomes** of GAP-MDW can be **scaled up** or **scaled out**?

Question 4

Can you list any **innovative approaches** (new methods, new ideas; original and creative thinking) that the GAP-MDW put in place? Did they work? Why or why not?

Innovative approaches	Did they work?	Why, or why not?
1.		
2.		
3.		

Question 5

In your experience, what **challenges** arose during the GAP-MDW project? For example, what has not worked or could have been improved?

1.
2.
3.

Question 6

Can you give any examples of how particular challenges were overcome during the GAP-MDW project?

Question 7

For the future, have you additional suggestions for overcoming challenges when working on decent work for MDW?

Question 8

Based on your experience of the GAP-MDW project, do you have suggestions for improved implementation of policies on migrant domestic workers in:

- a) Their country of origin
- b) Their destination country

Question 9

Do you have any further suggestions for improving a future programme on migrant domestic workers?

Question 10

On a scale of 1-5 with 5 being the highest, and 1 being the lowest rating, how well do you consider that staff capacity has been built in your organisation (on migrant domestic workers)?

5 Definitely	4 Probably	3 Possibly	2 Probably not	1 Definitely Not

Question 11

On a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the highest, and 1 being the lowest rating, how would you rate any research on domestic workers that was conducted for this project for your migration corridor?

5 Very high	4 Above Average	3 Average	2 Below Average	1 Low rating

Question 12

On a scale of 1-5, do you think that the research results has reached who it should reach (to be enacted upon)

5 Definitely reached those it should reach	4 Very probably reached them	3 Possibly reached those it should reach	2 Not yet reached those it should reach	1 Don't know

Question 13

On a scale of 1-5 do you think that the advocacy and information awareness work through the project has fostered change?

5 Definitely fostered change	4 Probably fostered change	3 Fostered some change	2 Not at all	1 Don't know

Question 14

If you were rating the GAP-MDW project on how it implemented approaches with regard to decent work for migrant domestic workers, how would you rate it?

Please return by August 24th to unamurray@gmail.com

a) In your country:

Very good	
Good	
Poor	
Very poor	

b) The overall global project approach:

Very good	
Good	
Poor	
Very poor	

Thank you for taking the time to respond to this questionnaire

Annex 4: Evaluation questionnaire respondents

A total of 36 questionnaires were returned. Twenty-two female respondents completed the questionnaire and 13 males, with one further questionnaire from an organization. The geographic breakdown is outlined in Table 2 below:

Table 2: Migration corridors and Respondents to questionnaire

Corridor	Respondents working in/ or representing:	No. of questionnaire responses	Total responses for this corridor
Paraguay → Argentina	Argentina	2	6
	Paraguay	4	
Ukraine → Poland	Ukraine	1	2
	Ukraine-Poland	1	
Nepal → Lebanon	Lebanon	3	7
	Nepal	4	
Indonesia → Malaysia	Malaysia	5	9
	Indonesia	2	
	Both Indonesia-Malaysia	2	
Zimbabwe & Lesotho → South Africa	South Africa	2	10
	Zimbabwe	6	
	Lesotho	0	
	Both Zimbabwe & South Africa	2	
Global program	Global	2	2
Total		36	36

The largest number of responses to the evaluation questionnaire represented the Zimbabwe to South Africa migration corridor. There were no questionnaire responses from Lesotho. The second highest number of questionnaire responses came from the Indonesia to Malaysia migration corridor. Fewest questionnaire responses came from the Ukraine to Poland migrant corridor. Many of the stakeholders in Ukraine had been interviewed during a field visit for the final evaluation in July 2016. It is also necessary to outline who questionnaire respondents are representing in their responses to the questionnaire.

Table 3: Who do questionnaire respondents work for

Respondents representing:	No. of questionnaire responses
Domestic workers union	1
International/ regional domestic workers organization	2
National trade union	3
Employers organization	1
Government	5
ILO	13
Other category	11
Total	36

Of the 36 questionnaire responses a sixth (6) represented trade unions. Only 1 respondent came from a national domestic workers union; with two respondents representing regional or international domestic workers organizations. Three respondents came from national trade unions. Only 1 respondent came from an employers organization and 1 from the ministry of labour, with 4 other respondents representing other government sections. A total of 13 respondents came from ILO. The "other" category contained 11 respondents: 4 ILO consultants; researchers or independent professionals, two UN staff; two institutions (research & educational); 2 NGOs (1 for returned migrants) and a law firm.

Annex 5: Outputs from GAP-MDW

Table 5: Results/outputs from GAP-MDWs

Results	Details
Objective 1: Expand through research existing knowledge base on characteristics of migration for domestic work	
11 baseline studies	Baseline studies: Indonesia, Malaysia, Nepal, Lebanon, Paraguay, Argentina, Ukraine, Poland, Zimbabwe, Lesotho, South Africa
6 thematic studies	Thematic studies: returned Indonesian MDWs; needs, preferences and behaviours of employers of MDWs in Malaysia; Migration bans affecting women from Nepal (no easy exit); Pension portability rights of MDWs Paraguay; Impact of vocational training on MDWs and DW in Argentina; the laws on paid domestic work in Latin America.
7 policy briefs	Policy briefs: i) Expanding social security coverage to migrant domestic workers ii) Gender sensitivity in labour migration related agreements and MOUs iii) Protecting Migrant Domestic Workers: The international legal framework at a glance iv) Regulating international labour recruitment in the domestic work sector: A review of key issues, challenges and opportunities vi) Migrant Domestic Workers: Promoting Occupational Safety and Health viii) Migrant Domestic Workers Across the World: global and regional estimates ix) Migrant Domestic Workers, Health and HIV
Validation workshops held in 10 countries	Held in 10 countries where baselines conducted. 2 workshops held in some countries
2 Quantitative studies prepared, one conducted	2 empirical studies supported – Zimbabwe and Nepal. Nepal survey postponed following earthquake The project contributed to the development of a methodology for estimates on MDWs. Global and regional estimates produced.
Global Flagship Report on MDW based on reports, research thematic studies.	Will be launched in October 2016
Objective 2: Enhance awareness of social partners & capacities of relevant organizations to advocate for MDWs access to DW (within broader global campaign)	
Strong collaboration with ITUC and IDWF Global campaign for ratification of C189 reported.	12+12 campaign and other collaboration reported
Technical assistance and seed funding to support the Founding Congress of the IDWF 2013	Congress adopted a constitution and development strategy, 5 year action plan
2 year joint action plan between ITUC-IDWF	Plan adopted to build alliances & strategies to improve the organization of MDWs.
3 regional workshop for campaign for C189	Chile (September 2014), ITUC, IDWF and representatives of DWs organizations from Central and South America Burkina Faso (Oct 2014), IDWF and DW organizations from African countries Bangkok (Sept 2015) exchange of knowledge and experiences in Asia, ITUC IDWF. My Fair Home campaign launched.
Supported representation at the Global Forum Beijing +20	GAP-MDW supported representatives of ITUC and IDWF at the 59 th session of the Commission on the Status of Women to incorporate DWs and MDWs issues in global agenda discussions (March 2015).

Results	Details
Bi-national and a tri-national workers workshop organised in the 5 migration corridors.	Sept 2014, Santiago, Chile; October 2014, Johannesburg, South Africa; November 2015, Jakarta, Indonesia; February 2016, Kathmandu, Nepal; June 2016, Lviv, Ukraine
Tripartite workshops – 2 bi-national tripartite workshops	Strategies for promoting the rights of MDWs April 2015, Asuncion, Paraguay Improving recruitment and protection of MDWs Nov 2015, Jakarta, Indonesia
Mapping of tools, new tools, sharing material for awareness raising and advocacy for TUs, DW organization, MDWs, employers and policy makers	ILO Domestic Work good practices database Tools distributed on IDWF, KSP, ITUC, UN Women, OHCHR WebPages. Promotional & awareness leaflets Paraguay leaflet for employers to pay mandatory December bonus Booklet in Lebanon on forming a trade union Guides – ITUC-IDWF-ILO Guide Domestic Workers Unite: A guide for building collective power to achieve rights and protections for domestic workers was published (March 2016) in English, French, Spanish, Arabic and Russian. Paraguay guide on the new law on domestic work Guide for Domestic workers in Zimbabwe – know your rights and obligations Vocational training skills manuals in Argentina – 3 prepared on care of elderly, children and one on housework
4 Information passport for MDWs printed and distributed	Indonesia – Malaysia, available in Bahasa – Indonesian Paraguay – Argentina, available in Spanish Ukraine – Poland, available in Ukrainian Zimbabwe –South Africa, available in English (to be translated to Shona and Ndebele) One already available in Lebanon
Mobile phone application. GAP-MDW developed a free online mobile telephone application	2 workshops were conducted in the Paraguay – Argentina migration corridor to elaborate the smart phone application which offered a more interactive, easily updated information tool.
4 videos produced that are related to or linked to GAP-MDW	<i>Migrant domestic workers: Ensuring Human Rights and Making Decent Work a Reality</i> launched at Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) in Stockholm, Sweden in May 2014. Migrant Domestic Workers in Action MIGRANT <i>I'm not here</i> was prepared in collaboration with the OHCHR and with funding from Swiss government and GAP-MDW project. Launched during the GFMD thematic meeting on Women Migrants, Geneva (September 2015) A video summarizing main findings of the Global Report <i>Decent Work for Migrant Domestic Workers: Moving the Agenda Forward</i> prepared.

Results	Details
9 Newsletters “Migrant Domestic Workers in Focus”. Dissemination moved from 176 to 1200 targeted mail addresses.	Migrant Domestic Workers in Focus , Issues #1 (31 October 2013), Issue #2 (22 April 2014), Issue #3 (07 October 2014), Issue #4 (26 January 2015), Issue #5-6 (18 June 2015), Issue #7 (7 September 2015), Issue #8 (8 November 2015), Issue #9 . Issues # 7-9 are available in both English and Spanish.
Solid social media efforts made	Mid-2015 outreach via Twitter. Monthly Twitter views increased from 3500monthly to over 23000 in August 2015 and 44,000 to November 2015
Knowledge Sharing Platform (KSP) and Community of Practice (CoP) to disseminate information on MDWs set up	IDWF KSP launched on 16 December 2014 in English, French and Spanish. Registered members increased 17 fold from 2014 to 2015 (603→10,328 registered users); and increased 4 fold up to Dept 2016 (10, 328→ 49,564 registered users). Five discussions were launched on the platform with two summary reports on the discussions. Platform used to promote the <i>My Fair Home</i> campaign and promote the ratification of C189
Assistance by GAP-MDW in preparing position papers	GAP-MDW assisted in preparing position papers with OHCHR on promoting human rights for MDWs in irregular situations (Sept 2015, Bangkok). 70 experts attended. Study <i>Behind Closed Doors: The human rights of migrant domestic workers in an irregular situation</i> prepared by OHCHR as a position paper for seminar.
4 Regional or sub-regional workshops on DW held	<i>ILO Regional Domestic Workers Knowledge Sharing Forum in Africa (28-30 May 2013, Dar es Salam, Tanzania).</i> <i>ILO Regional Domestic Workers Sharing Forum in Latin America (4-6 December 2013, Santiago, Chile).</i> <i>ILO Arab Region Forum on Domestic Work in the Arab States (12-13 October 2014, Istanbul, Turkey).</i> <i>ILO Inter-Regional Knowledge Sharing Forum: Good practices & lessons learned on promoting international cooperation & partnerships to realize a fair migration agenda for MDWs in Africa, the Arab States and Asia. (5-7 May 2016, Antananarivo, Madagascar).</i>
21 Good Practices identified	<i>21 Good Practices under the domestic work field included in ILO’s database under the domestic work field⁵⁷</i>
Objective 3: Pilot test national capacity building approaches to protect, support and empower MDWs	
Worked through CONLACTRAHO (TUs and DWs association) In Paraguay. In Argentina skills recognition and vocational training course moved forward. Also portable pension rights.	Tri partite consultations in December 2014 in Paraguay. The Tripartite Commission on Equal Opportunities of Argentina convened a policy consultation meeting and invited counterpart from Paraguay and common initiatives identified in training and skills recognition & pension portability rights. MoU between both commissions signed. In Paraguay advancement towards approval of legislation on DWs in line with C189 In Argentina, increase participation of Paraguayan MDWs in vocational training courses and move towards a common DW curricula, skills recognition and certification. Recognition in MERCOSUR is the final goal.
In Malaysia, identify ways to enhance institutional and policy frameworks and change	In Indonesia, consultations were held in May 2015 with the Ministry of Manpower regarding national legal framework regarding migration. In Indonesia, the results of research were presented at multi-stakeholder meetings in target communities of origin, and

⁵⁷ Weblink: <http://www.ilo.org/dyn/migpractice/migmmain.listPractices>

Results	Details
<p>the behaviour of employers of migrant domestic workers; in Indonesia, build community based awareness and engagement of trade unions in protecting MDWs pre-departure.</p>	<p>local action plans were adopted to improve awareness of the risk of migration. Done in tandem with building the capacity of trade union, and support for their efforts at awareness raising and organizing in the same target areas.</p> <p>In Malaysia, several (Feb 2014) consultations were held, at times in collaboration with ILO GMS TRIANGLE project, on the regulations relating to domestic work and recruitment. Training was held on the labour dimensions of trafficking to build capacity in identifying forced labour and trafficking in domestic work.</p> <p>In Malaysia, support was provided to the Domestic Work Coalition in general, and in particular to hold consultations regarding bill of rights for domestic workers. A draft prepared and disseminated as an advocacy tool to improve the rights of domestic workers.</p> <p>Development and adoption of the code of conduct for employers of domestic workers in Malaysia (“Guidelines and tips for employers of domestic helpers”).</p>
<p>Initially GAP-MDW was waiting for MDW ban to be lifted in Nepal</p> <p>Worked with other projects in Lebanon</p>	<p>Reliable information to promote a lift in the migration of domestic workers ban provided. Policy consultations in Feb 2014 with Ministry of Labour and trade union confederations, DWs union and NGOs.</p> <p>In Lebanon synergies with EU PROWD, MAGNED and Work in Freedom. Policy consultations</p> <p>Re-activation of Lebanese Domestic Workers Steering Committee.</p>
<p>Bi-national training on labour migration governance with emphasis on female migration and domestic workers</p>	<p>Supported trainees on ToT , Gender, Migration, Development: A Matter of Rights Un Women March 2015</p> <p>Facilitated Lebanese attendees at to gender sensitive training by ITUC</p> <p>Facilitated participation of stakeholders from Indonesia –Malaysia corridor to regional workshop on <i>Labour Dimension of Trafficking in Person in the ASEAN Region (in collaboration with ASEAN TRIANGLE project) Jan 2015 Manila.</i></p> <p><i>In Malaysia</i> GAP-MDW organized a ToT on <i>Identification and prosecution of forced labour and protection of victims</i>, with Labour officers and inspectors of MOHR and other stakeholders (April 2015).</p> <p>In Paraguay, GAP-MDW supported a tripartite training workshop on <i>International labour standards</i> was held (December 2014). A training course on <i>Labour Inspection procedures and rules</i> was held, with Labour inspectors, employers’ and workers’ organizations (July, 2015).</p>
<p>Advice and coaching on International labour standards in 3 corridors</p>	<p>In Malaysia, GAP-MDW supported network of NGOs & MTUC, the Domestic Work Coalition, to prepare strategy towards a Bill of Rights for DWs</p> <p>In Indonesia, GAP-MDW supported a representative of the Ministry of Manpower to training at ITC-ILO on DW4DWs (Oct 2014).</p> <p>In Nepal, the project provided assistance to the Ministry of Labour in review of National Policy of DW to modify the age ban of women MDWs.</p> <p>In Lebanon in late 2014 training workshops for FENASOL & the Domestic Workers Union</p> <p>In Paraguay – Argentina corridor vocational skills training program for DWs. Three modules will be basis for the national vocational training program for DWs run by the Argentinean Ministry of Labour. May also be created in Paraguay</p> <p>GAP-MDWS contributed to passing a new law on Domestic Work –equating DWs rights with wage workers- approved by the Paraguayan Parliament on March 2015. Supported officers from the new Paraguayan Ministry of Labour and Social Security to attend ITC-ILO Labour Migration Academy (May 2015).</p>

Results	Details
KSBSI in Indonesia	Workplan developed with other trade unions for Indonesian migrant workers in target areas.
Engagement with 2 employers organizations	<p>In Lebanon, focus group discussion with women from 4 Lebanese banks (November 2015), testing and validating the results of the findings of the survey on employers' views on the employment of MDWs</p> <p>In Malaysia, the Ministry of Human Resources and ILO hosted a consultation with some 70 employers of DWs to discuss challenges and solutions. As a result the Malaysian Employers' Federation (MEF) prepared the <i>Guidelines and Tips for Employers of Migrant Domestic Workers</i>, information booklet household employers on laws and practices. MOHR launched code of conduct March 2016.</p>
Training workshops with private & public employment agencies	<p>One was held in Nepal (with a skills training of MDWs focus) and one held in Indonesia (Nov 2015)</p> <p>An MOU was developed between the agencies association, government and trade union in Indonesia to reform pre-departure trainings for migrant domestic workers and monitor the placement process in Indonesia.</p>

Annex 6: IDWF report on electronic platform set up under GAP-MDW

The following was prepared by IDWF for this final evaluation to give an indication of their communication network on domestic workers.

Members & Users:

	2016 (date to Sept 30)	2015 (date to Dec 16)	2014 (date to Dec 30)
Number of registered members	40,564	10,328	603

Overview	2016 Jan 1 to June 30	2015 July 1 to Dec 31	2015 Jan 1 to June 30	2014 July 1 to Dec 31
Sessions	16,441	18,850	17,257	6,702
Users	12,401	13,989	12,283	4,214
Pageviews	38,415	55,064	66,950	30,648
New Users	74.21%	73.72%	70.37%	61.59%
Notes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sessions: Total number of Sessions within the date range. A session is the period time a user is actively engaged with your website. Users: Users that have had at least one session within the selected date range. Pageviews: Pageviews is the total number of pages viewed. 			

Top 10 countries	2016 Jan 1 to June 30	2015 July 1 to Dec 31	2015 Jan 1 to June 30	2014 July 1 to Dec 31
1	United States	United States	United States	Hong Kong
2	India	Hong Kong	Hong Kong	United States
3	Russia	Russia	Philippines	Philippines
4	Hong Kong	Mexico	Canada	India
5	Mexico	India	Indonesia	Malaysia
6	United Kingdom	Philippines	India	Canada
7	Spain	United Kingdom	Mexico	United Kingdom
8	Peru	(unknown)	(unknown)	Switzerland
9	Canada	Canada	United Kingdom	Brazil
10	Philippines	Thailand	Peru	Belgium

Discussions:

Published Date	Discussion Topic	Number of comments
2016 Apr 20	What will you do around the 5th Anniversary of C189?	0
2015 Aug 1	Organizing migrant domestic workers	31
➤ Summary Report	IDWF-GAP-MDW E-Discussion, August-September 2015 Summary Report	
2015 May 12	What is the IDWF Communication Network for you? What improvement do you want to see?	4
2015 Mar 28	How to win the minimum wage for domestic workers in your country?	20
2014 Nov 12	Stop Violence Against Domestic Workers	21
➤ Summary Report	IDWF Online Discussion: Summary Report on Stopping Violence against Domestic Workers	

Community:

- A section named [COMMUNITY](#) is created on Feb 6, 2015. [COMMUNITY](#) is a resource centre for members' posting, reading, and sharing about domestic worker activities in their own region. The section is broken up by geography, users can find information tailored to their location.
- Asia Pacific Members are the most active members in sharing their news and activities. There are 52 valid posts which can be found in the [Asia Pacific Members Sharing Area >>>](#)

IDWF Resources:

	2016	2015	2014
E-Newsletter	4	3	5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IDWF e-Newsletter #13 - July 2016 • IDWF e-Newsletter #12 - June 2016 • IDWF e-Newsletter #11 - April 2016 • IDWF e-Newsletter #10 - January 2016 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IDWF e-Newsletter #9 - November 2015 • IDWF e-Newsletter #8 - OCT 2015 • IDWF e-Newsletter #7 - APR 2015 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IDWF e-Newsletter #6 - DEC 2014 • IDWF e-Newsletter #5 - NOV 2014 • IDWF e-Newsletter #4 - JULY 2014 • IDWF e-Newsletter #3 - APR 2014 • IDWF e-Newsletter #2 - MAR 2014
Bulletin	Not applicable	5	Not applicable

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IDWF Bulletin #1 • IDWF Bulletin #2 • IDWF Bulletin #3 • IDWF Bulletin #4 • IDWF Bulletin #5 	
Campaign	1	1	1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My Fair Home 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My Fair Home 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IDWF New Online Communication Network
Publication	1	5	3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IDWF Annual Report 2015 - Build, Organise, Organise! 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IDWF leaflet: Who we are • IDWF Communication Network – Affiliate User Manual • An introduction to the IDWF Communication Network • IDWF-GAP-MDW E-Discussion, August-September 2015 Summary Report • IDWF 5 Year Strategic Plan 2016-2020 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Domestic workers of the World Unite - Report of The founding Congress of the IDWF • IDWF Visioning Event: Building a Community of Practice on Domestic Work • IDWF Online Discussion: Summary Report on Stopping Violence against Domestic Workers

More information:

Information guides on the IDWF Communication Network:

1. [IDWF Communication Network --- Affiliate User Manual](#)
2. [Introduction to the IDWF Communication Network](#)

Annex 7: Views of GAP-MDW stakeholders via evaluation questionnaire responses

The following is an analysis of the evaluation questionnaire responses that asked participants to rate the objectives of the GAP-MDW project and related elements.

4.4.1 Rating the approach to decent work for domestic workers

Questionnaire respondents were asked to rate the GAP-MDW project on how it implemented approaches with regard to decent work for migrant domestic workers: a) in their country; and b) globally. They could rate the approach on a four point scale of very good to very poor.

Table 7: How well GAP-MDW implemented approaches for MDWs

	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor
A) How GAP-MDW responded to decent work for domestic work in your country N=28	8	17	3	0
B) How GAP-MDW responded to decent work for domestic work globally N=30	14	11 + 1 fair	4	0

Seventeen (out of 36) rated that GAP-MDW project as good and 8 rated it as very good in its approach to decent work for migrant domestic workers in the country where the respondents were located see A) above. Three rated it as poor (two respondents from Malaysia and one from Zimbabwe). No respondent rated the project as very poor. In contrast, nearly half of those who rated the project on the global approach (14 out of 30) rated it as very good (B above). Eleven rated it as good. One respondent added in a new category “fair” and 4 respondents rated the project as poor (the same two respondents from Malaysia and Zimbabwe with an additional respondent working on the Indonesia to Malaysia corridor).

4.4.2 Building staff capacity on migrant domestic workers

Questionnaire respondents were asked to rate how well they considered that **staff capacity** in their organization had been built during the project. Three respondents reported that staff capacity had definitely being built; two of these respondents were from ILO Lebanon and 1 from a trade union in Zimbabwe. Twelve stated that capacity on migrant domestic workers had probably been built, with 9 stating possibly. Only four responded that capacity had probably not being built in their organization (two from government bodies and one from an NGO)

Table 8: How well do you consider staff capacity has been built in your organization (on migrant domestic workers)

	Capacity definitely been built	Capacity probably been build	Capacity possibly been built	Probably not	Definitely not
No. of respondents N=28	3	12	9	4	0

Thus over half of the respondents who answered this question in the questionnaire reported that staff capacity on migrant domestic workers had definitely or probably been built in their organization.

4.4.3 Rating the research undertaken

Questionnaire respondents were asked to rate the research on domestic workers that was conducted for the GAP-MDW project. There were 30 responses to this question, with the majority (16 responses) rating the research undertaking as above average, and 5 respondents rating this research very highly (2 from Zimbabwe; 1 from South Africa; 1 from Paraguay and 1 respondent the Indonesia to Malaysia migration corridor). Just under a third of respondents rated it as average. Of the 30 questionnaire respondents, none rated the research undertaken for the GAP-MDW project as below average. Thus over two thirds (21 out of 30) of questionnaire respondents who rated the research undertaken for the GAP-MDW rated it highly or above average.

Table 9: How do you rate any research on MDWs conducted for this project (for your migration corridor)

	Very high	Above average	Average	Below average	Low rating
No. of respondents N=30	5	16	9	0	0

4.4.4 Will the research reach the right people?

A related question in the questionnaire was whether the respondent thought the research results has reached whom it should reach, so that it can be enacted upon. Of the thirty questionnaire responses received for this question, a third of respondents (10 out of 30) reported that they believed the research results had probably or definitely reached those it should reach. A third of respondents (10 out of 30 responses) reported that the research had possibly reached those it should reach; and another third (10 out of 30 responses) felt that the research had definitely or very probably reached those it should reach so that it is enacted upon. Two respondents did not know; and 8 said it had not yet reached those it should reach (2 from Lebanon, 1 from Nepal, 1 from Malaysia, and 4 responses from Zimbabwe). Dissemination research results widely may be an area for further focus if similar research is commissioned by ILO – place significant more effort in disseminating research results.

Table 10: Do you think that the research results have reached those it should reach?

	Definitely reached	Very probably reached	Possibly reached	Not yet reached	Don't know
No. of respondents N=30	5	5	10	8	2

4.4.5 Advocacy and information awareness through the GAP-MDWs project

Questionnaire respondents were asked whether they thought that the advocacy and information awareness work though the project had fostered change. Half of the respondents (15 out of 30) felt that the advocacy and information awareness work undertaken through the GAP-MDWs project had definitely or probably fostered change. Eleven felt that it had fostered some change. Only one respondent (from South Africa) out of 30 felt that advocacy and awareness had not at all fostered change. Three did not know whether or not the advocacy and information awareness work had fostered change, with one indicating that it is too early to determine the change.

Table 11: Do you think advocacy/information awareness work has fostered change? (though the project)

	Definitely Fostered change	Probably fostered change	Fostered some change	Not at all	Don't know

No. of respondents N=30	7	8	11	1	3
----------------------------	---	---	----	---	---

Overall the questionnaire respondents for the evaluation were positive about the GAP-MDW project, considering activities to be worthwhile, with some exceptions.

Annex 8: Resources for monitoring and evaluating policy influence

Suggested resources for developing a system for monitoring and evaluating policy influence:

- The international Initiative for Impact Evaluations (3ie) and the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) 3ie initiatives on measuring policy impact <http://policyimpacttoolkit.3ieimpact.org/>
- Heider, C. *Evaluating Policy: A Perspective from Multilateral Experience* Office of Evaluation, WFP and Vice-chair of the UNEG http://www.europeanevaluation.org/images/file/Conference/Past_Conference/2010_Prague/FullPapers/5_Heider_Caroline.pdf
- Reisman, J., A. Gienapp, et al. (2007). A guide to measuring advocacy and policy <http://www.hfrp.org/evaluation/the-evaluation-exchange/issue-archive/advocacy-and-policy-change/a-guide-to-measuring-advocacy-and-policy>
- Jones, H. (February 2011) *A guide to monitoring and evaluating policy influence* Background Note <http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/download/5252.pdf>
- Weyrauch, V and Langou, G.D April 2011 *Sound expectations: from impact evaluations to policy change* International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3IE) Working Paper 12 http://www.3ieimpact.org/admin/pdfs_papers/Working_Paper_12_Final.pdf
- UNICEF *From policies to results* June 2010 <http://www.mymande.org/?q=virtual>
- A guide to monitoring and evaluating policy influence⁵⁸ (ODI Harry Jones 2011) <http://www.odi.org.uk/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/6453.pdf>
- Tools for Policy Impact⁵⁹ (Daniel Start and Ingie Hovland, 2004) <http://www.odi.org.uk/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/194.pdf>

⁵⁸ <http://www.odi.org.uk/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/6453.pdf>

⁵⁹ <http://www.odi.org.uk/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/194.pdf>

Annex 9: Measuring the GAP-MDW Objectives – comments

Box 3: Comments on measuring GAP-MDW Objective 1

Objective 1 aimed for enhanced research and practical knowledge on migration and trafficking in domestic work across global care chains.

The **indicators for Objective 1**, required that an in depth analysis of the MDW situation be available in the 5 migration corridors, which was achieved, with variable quality. The voluntary ILO peer review process put in place proved difficult to keep on schedule.

Enhanced research and practical knowledge on migration /trafficking for domestic work across global care chains, quantitative and qualitative reports had to be validated and endorsed and this was measured through reports of stakeholder consultations. This objective also required research results and practical knowledge to be made accessible to inform a wide range of stakeholders. For example, indicators related to making research results accessible (output 1.2) included producing a series of policy briefs on specific themes, reviewed by experts, endorsed by stakeholders, widely disseminated, with the assumption that they would be actively used by stakeholders (not measured).

Policy briefs, as a means of verification, was really only an output measure. It might be important in future projects to focus more on the impact of these policy briefs and try to examine how these policy briefs helped to frame debates and get issues on to the political agenda. For example is there evidence that the policy briefs encouraged and promoted the recognition of migrant domestic workers groups and endorsements of Convention 189 or migration instruments. How do we measure this? Were these policy briefs used in processes where policy decisions are made, did they allow for opening up new spaces in policy dialogue? In what way exactly did the policy briefs affect policy content?

Evidently ILO already measures change in policy content and new legislation. Is ILO also measuring budget allocations that accompany such change? Measuring policy impact outcomes can only be developed following a discussion on what type of evidence really influences the different policy actors in different contexts.⁶⁰ However the challenge is how can a time-bound project such as GAP-MDW really measure changes in attitudes of government ministers, trade unionists to get rights for domestic workers issues onto the agenda. Is it possible to measure how the interest and openness of policy makers to domestic workers issues has improved unless adequate baseline information is available? Is it possible to measure which fact sheets, policy briefs or other evidence based material they refer to and consider important. Also as often reported in interviews during this evaluation, key stakeholders for implementing the rights of MDWs are the actual MDW employers.

The GAP-MDW was able to track to a certain extent how different actors in the trade union organizations are working coherently together to change or implement policy. However an important question to ask and measure is whether the necessary structures and incentives are in place for trade unions to continue to support migrant domestic workers beyond the project. For example COSATU in South Africa has supported the domestic workers union SADSAWU, but how strong will their voice be within the priorities of COSATU over time?

Annex 8 above provides some resources for future projects wishing to innovate on how to measure policy influence.

⁶⁰ See for example Tsui, J., Hearn, S., and Young, J. (2014) Annex 8 has more details

Box 4: Comments on measuring GAP-MDW Objective 2

Objective 2 related to enhancing the capacities of social partners of relevant organisations to advocate for MDWs access to decent work.

What is meant by ‘enhanced capacities’ is difficult to measure. Trade unions in South Africa (and Ukraine) and questionnaire respondents from trade unions reported that they are much more aware and supportive of this category of worker. How much more aware is unknown.

The outputs for objective 2 expected strategies to be developed following workshops. The GAP-MDW project distributed a questionnaire after some workshop events and summarized these. Results were used for further planning. For example, in Ukraine results were used to prepare the concept and agenda for a follow up workers workshop, to develop a common strategy. Following that workshop, concrete actions began right away, such as trade unions writing to parliament, providing an example of how monitoring and analyzing workshops informs future initiatives.

An increase in the number of action plans and policy recommendations adopted on MDWs in selected countries was to be measured under Output 2.2. It was expected that the MDWs feature on the policy agendas of national, regional and international bodies. Given that policy recommendations are best understood as a series of documents, and policy decisions are best described as a set of processes, activities or actions with many actors involved, indicators for this output face attribution issues. More interesting indicators, but more difficult to measure would be the extent to which senior officials in trade unions or in government take responsibility for monitoring the implementation of any legal reforms put in place for MDWs. These could be ranked from: completely; to a limited extent or not at all. However this would require baselines on attitudes towards responsibility for this category of workers. In Ukraine, for instance, it was reported that trade unionists did not consider DWs as an important group of workers until after GAP-MDW capacity building and discussions. They then became fully on board pushing for the ratification of C189. Annex 8 contains some resources for monitoring and evaluating policy influence.

The GAP-MDW team at ILO Geneva prepared a series of newsletters with hyperlinks to activities and materials, using the software package MailChimp, which allowed the Geneva team to understand which regions are most interested in which sections of information in the newsletter. This was then discussed at GAP-MDW internal meetings.

Other indicators related to the global campaign for the ratification of C189 having a wider reach, and specific tools for better protecting MDWs. Such indicators are again difficult to measure during a short time frame. It can be shown that those working directly with domestic workers such as members of the South African Domestic Workers Union SADSAWU and the IDWF communication network saw an increase in members (which is relatively easy to measure) throughout the project – see Annex 6.⁶¹ Another indication of the influence of GAP-MDW is that IDWF and ITUC established a methodology for working together. IDWF reported during the evaluation that they felt strong ownership on this project.

⁶¹ IDWF has over 10,000 registered members and most of the IDWF affiliates agree that their communication with the IDWF is good, according to an affiliates survey end of 2015.

Box 5: Comments on measuring GAP-MDW Objective 3

Objective 3 was to pilot test national capacity building approaches to protect, support and empower MDWs at all states of the migration cycle

Indicators for **Objective 3** expected that pilot interventions models would be developed and endorsed by relevant stakeholders in selected countries. This output indicator was achieved in Lebanon, Nepal, Malaysia, Indonesia, Argentina, and Paraguay. Pilot interventions were tracked, but with so many activities on-going, and a set time frame, it was very difficult to analyse and confirm progress towards achievement of a specific result. Moreover pilot initiatives also took place in South Africa, Lesotho, Zimbabwe and the Ukraine, if we count the preparation and distribution of the MDW brochure or information passport and the work with the MSW unions in South Africa and Lesotho.

Pilot interventions were expected to generate good practices and should be evaluated positively by project surveys evaluations. This did not take place, although it could be argued that the collation of materials for the MDW Global Report has collected good practices with some posted on the LO domestic work website. The ILO inter-regional knowledge sharing forum workshop⁶² held in Madagascar in May 2016 is an example of sharing good practices and lessons learned on promoting international cooperation and partnerships towards a fair migration agenda for MDWs. This was reviewed very positively by those interviewed. The ILO joint staff mission report from the workshop identifies lessons learned in terms of the policy orientation required to address the situation of MDWs. This should be carefully followed up upon.

For Objective 3, national capacity building approaches to protect, support and empower MDWs at all stages of the migration cycles were to be pilot tested. Official minutes from meetings; validated conclusions and recommendations as well as reports on law and policy, copies of changes were to be the means of measurement. Realistically the project could only show immediate evaluation feedback, but could not describe the level and extent of participation of MDWs in an initiative. For instance, the views of the MDWs following activities could not measure the extent to which they thought their issues are now placed on the agenda, compared to previously. It can be concluded that the voice and perceptions of MDWs themselves, and how they felt the impacts of this project was lacking in GAP-MDW pilot initiatives. For example in Zimbabwe a key point made by one questionnaire respondent was the importance of allowing MDWs to speak for themselves. Yet, given the objectives and indicators of the project, it could not have been expected that the voice of MDWs would be measured.

⁶² Organised jointly by ILO's Labour Migration Branch (MIGRANT) of the Conditions of Work and Equality Department (WORKQUALITY) and Fundamental Principles of Rights at Work Branch (FUNDAMENTALS) of the Governance and Tripartism Department, in collaboration with ILO's Regional Offices for Africa, Arab States, and Asia Pacific

Annex 10: GAP-MDW Case Study findings from the 5 migration corridors

A10.1 Ukraine - Poland corridor

Background context

GAP-MDWs activities in the Ukraine took place under political, economic and civil unrest. In 2013 the Ukrainian government suspended preparations for signing the Ukraine-EU Association Agreement and was moving towards closer economic relations with the Russian Federation, which resulted in protests, violence and a divided country (including conflict in the East). Internally displaced persons (IDPs) are estimated at well over a million (1.2 to 1.4 million). The rights of domestic workers were not high on the agenda when the GAP-MDW project was initiated with a focus on migration from Ukraine to Poland.

Salaries are very low in Ukraine, making migration attractive. Teachers, physicians and others migrate to clean houses, mind children or pick strawberries in Poland. Ukrainians tend to migrate to Italy, Spain, Portugal, Poland and the Russian Federation. Poland has transitioned from an emigration-focused country of origin to a destination country for migrant workers, with migrants coming from neighboring Ukraine. Wages in Poland can be up to four times higher than in the Ukraine. After 1989, citizens of Ukraine were able to travel freely to central Europe including Poland (as tourists for 90 days). In 2003 a visa requirement for citizens of Ukraine travelling to Poland was introduced, resulting in six month circular migration patterns from Ukraine to Poland. These circular migration patterns are maintained by other family members taking over.

Progress/Achievements

The evaluator visited the Ukraine during the evaluation. Twenty-two people were interviewed from this corridor for the evaluation, with a further two respondents to the questionnaire. The research commissioned under the GAP-MDW project was highly regarded by many interviewed (in both Ukraine and Poland), although there were some issues with the sample size being too small. According to most interviewed during this evaluation, the key achievement in Ukraine was getting the active engagement of the Ukrainian trade unions to consider the situation of domestic workers and lobby for their visibility in labour law. Domestic work is becoming more recognised as a form of work, worthy of the same 'decent work' standards as other forms of work, and recognised by the state and trade unions (as reported by three trade unions CFTUU, Vost Volya, and TUEWU). These trade unions may now target national domestic workers for future membership. The trade unions coordinated on the issue and came together to lobby. They initiated the ratification (of C189) with the government authorities, using president's office channels, when they initially failed to gain traction with the authorities at the Ministry of Social Policy.

The GAP-MDW project mainly commissioned research on migrant domestic workers in Poland, with some related consultations with trade unionist. The research in Poland highlighted that migrant domestic work in Poland is a new occurrence only starting in the mid-1990s with the economic decline of the former Soviet Union, and the relaxation of border regimes, all which facilitated international mobility.

Overall achievements in Ukraine include:

- A draft law (No. 3734) “On Amendments to Legal Acts to Regulate and Formalize Employment of Domestic Workers” is registered in Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (Parliament) on December 28, 2015
- ILO Convention 189 ratification is put in the Government Action Plan to Implement the European Social Charter (revised) as per the Cabinet of Minister Decree #450-r as of May 14, 2015. Ratification is scheduled for 2019
- Awareness of at least 1,200 people on migrant domestic workers’ rights is raised through the information campaigns, carried out by Trade Unions amongst their members
- 17 Trade Union leaders are trained at the master training based on the ILO/IDWN manual on MDWs decent working and living conditions
- 88 trade union activists from all regions of Ukraine trained at 3 Regional workshops
- Research “Migration Corridor: Ukraine –Poland for Migrant Domestic Workers” carried out in 2014
- 300 leaflets promotion ILO Domestic Work Convention 189 ratification
- 500 brochures of Migrant Domestic Worker passport for the migration corridor Ukraine to Poland disseminated to central and regional TU information centres

The evaluation found that a tremendous amount was achieved in a short time period and with very limited funds in Ukraine. The capacities of three Ukrainian trade unions (TUESWU, VOST, CFTUU) to protect MDWs was strengthened (as reported by each). These trade unions reported they will continue to advocate for protection of MDWs rights, provide information pre-departure support to MDWs; and organise regional trainings for their members. It can also be argued that awareness on MDWs needs in Ukraine and in Poland as destination country have been built from zero consideration to their recognition as workers. With just two years of focus, C189 has now been scheduled for ratification, which was unimaginable in 2013. This progress is rapid, relatively speaking when we make a comparison with ongoing slower progress with regard to the ILO Social Security Convention 102, of which Ukraine has accept parts; or the Maritime Labour Convention, which is still pending ratification. Two trade unions in Ukraine stated it would be extremely effective if Poland ratified C189 in parallel with the Ukraine.

The questionnaire respondents stated that the most positive outcomes of the GAP-MDW in this corridor was the focus on awareness raising (particularly in trade unions in both Ukraine and Poland) that domestic workers should have decent work; the passport for migrant domestic workers (both respondents); and the support through the GAP-MDW project towards moving the ratification of C189 further up the political agenda in Ukraine. Overall all interviewed and who respondent felt that the information brochure/passport was very practical and useful.

Challenges

The Ukrainian trade unions reported that although collegial, the Polish trade unions are not yet ready to put migrant workers high on their agenda. This was also reported by questionnaire respondents. More training for trade unionists is required with round table dialogues. Apart from the research undertaken with domestic workers, this corridor had no direct linkages with domestic workers themselves. Although not a pilot country in the original project document, the views of migrant domestic workers are not yet represented in the Ukraine. There is no domestic workers association or union.

Ukrainian law stipulates a strict registration of employers. In Ukraine, the current law does not consider a private individual as an employer of someone who works in their household. There is still a need to expand the concept of 'employer' to embrace individuals who hire domestic workers. There is still a cultural prejudice regarding the nature of domestic work. In the Ukraine and Poland, no one was aware of the progress and status of initiatives implemented in other corridors and there were few opportunities for face-to-face interactions with others participating in the GAP-MDW project. A trade union respondent to the questionnaire recommended ensuring the dissemination of the passport for domestic workers developed through GAP-MDWs, and updating it. An ILO respondent for this corridor stated that more realistic labour migration legislation and trade union organisation for this region with help desks is required.

Lessons learned

It was reported by TUESWU that how Ukrainian trade unions worked with trade unions in Lazio in Italy with regard to the rights of Ukrainian care workers may be worth exploring to see what lessons can be learned. Many interviewed and both questionnaire respondents stressed that it would be important for both Poland and Ukraine to ratify C189 so agreements between Polish and Ukrainian trade unions, which were initiated could be formalized.

In a country such as Ukraine, where is only an ILO national officer and few or no ILO projects, implementation can be challenging. Reaching out to specialists in the regional office or in headquarters depends very much on time available and personal initiative. In Ukraine the evaluation concluded that much of the success in moving the GAP-MDW activities further related to the fact that the national consultant who was hired to conduct specific activities had previously worked for the ILO, knew who to reach out to in regional offices, and her technical knowledge on ILO's decent work agenda was excellent.

A10.2 Zimbabwe, Lesotho and South Africa

Background context

The Southern African region experiences all types of movements, including mixed and irregular labour migration, migration and displacement due to conflict and natural disasters (IOM)⁶³. Politically, increasing attention is being paid to migration in the region, with South Africa the destination country for many migrant domestic workers. Migration is a sensitive topic in South Africa. Zimbabwe experiences high levels of migration (including irregular migration, season migration for agricultural work) for all skills levels. Lesotho has a long established migration path to South Africa.

Lesotho, Zimbabwe and South Africa are members of the Southern African Development Community (SADC). A *Regional Labour Migration Policy Framework* has been drafted to govern and better facilitate South-South labour mobility. The *Framework* relates to the SADC charters and protocols; the African Union migration policy; and the ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration. A draft *Protocol on the Facilitation of Movement of Persons* aims to encourage policies so that every SADC citizen may have entry (with some limitations) without a visa into another State, to seek permanent and temporary residence in other States, and to establish themselves with employment in another State. In the meantime state cooperation is required; a harmonization of immigration practices; resident permits; and the protection of migrants rights and issues around expulsion worked out. The Southern African Customs Union (SACU), of which the Republic of South Africa and the Kingdom of Lesotho are members, is an important stakeholder, as SACU collects tariffs at borders (in contrast to open borders).

South Africa has ratified C189. The *Basic Conditions of Employment Act (1997)* regulates all minimum conditions of employment. Sectoral determinations have been introduced to improve the position of vulnerable workers in sectors that are not significantly organized. These include determinations covering workers in the private security sector, domestic workers (Sectoral Determination 7), farm workers, and workers in the wholesale and retail sector. The Ministry of Home Affairs, rather than the Ministry of Labour in reality holds responsibility for migration in South Africa. For example, the Zimbabwean Special Dispensation permit (ZSP) for Zimbabweans who already have a permit is issued by the Home Affairs Department.⁶⁴ At the end of June 2016, Minister of Home Affairs launched the Green Paper on International Migration, which was open for comments until the end of September 2016. The Green Paper contains policy choices to manage international migration including: management of admissions and departures; management of residency and naturalization; management of international migrants with skills and capital; management of international migration within the African context (how best to manage significant immigration from SADC countries); admission of asylum seekers; and management of the integration process for international migrants. Clearly the South African government is exploring how best to manage international migration.

Progress / Achievements

The evaluator visited South Africa during the course of the evaluation. Seventeen stakeholders were interviewed, and in addition ten respondents to the evaluation questionnaire provided information on GAP-MDW activities in this corridor. On the whole, the development of actions by the three countries to mobilize for MDWS was mentioned as positive, indicating that the corridor approach was appropriate in this region, although there were issues raised with regard to how the GAP-MDW project operated without national staff.

⁶³ <http://www.iom.int/southern-africa>

⁶⁴ The permit is valid for three years, whereafter Zimbabweans must apply for standard study, work or business visas in order to remain and will have to return to Zimbabwe to do so.

Research conducted in Lesotho, South Africa and Zimbabwe mapped out the migratory flows and the presence of existing organizations and institutions providing services to migrant workers, including domestic workers. The South Africa study for instance, described the working and living conditions of MDWs compared to those of national domestic workers. The research produced in South Africa was considered positively by most interviewed during the course of this evaluation, bar a representative from the Ministry of Home Affairs in South Africa.

The **Lesotho** baseline study investigated the migration process of Basotho women to South Africa as domestic workers. Most of these women are under an irregular migration status. The study also assessed channels and patterns of migration and identified the causes and consequences of the migration process. A memorandum of understanding (MOU) between Lesotho and South Africa was signed in November 2015, leading to a regularization process.

In **Zimbabwe** the presentations and validations of the qualitative research results took place at a workshop and Convention 189 was discussed at length, in line with discussions on how it fits with national laws. A significant achievement through the GAP-MDW project in **Zimbabwe**, was that a module to collect labour migration data in the 2014 Labour Force and Child Labour Survey (LFCLS) was prepared and delivered. One questionnaire respondent specifically mentioned mainstreaming the labour migration into the labour force module as a very good achievement.

Research findings were presented during a workers tri-national workshop on the promotion of decent work for MDWs along the Lesotho/Zimbabwe to South Africa corridor (October 2014). For those who attended this workshop, a dialogue on migration and economic integration in the region took place, acknowledging the need for some aspects of migration reform. Research/evidence in the corridor was important to facilitate in depth knowledge about the sector and migration dynamics according to three respondents to the evaluation questionnaire. The research provided the context from which further project interventions were based.

SADSAWU, the domestic workers union was an important stakeholder in the GAP-MDWs project in South Africa. Research findings were shared at a workshop organised to strengthen SADSAWU's strategy for organizing and recruiting MDWs.⁶⁵ SADSAWU reported that they appreciated the workshops where ideas could be shared from other countries; overall were very happy with the excellent support from ILO via the GAP-MDW and via COSATU. As a result of the GAP-MDW project, SADSAWU encouraged more migrants to join the union reaching out via cultural evenings. In July 2016, an official from SADSAWU reported that they now have approximately 75 members who are from Zimbabwe; 13 from Malawi; 25 from the Congo and 13 from Lesotho. The president of SADSAWU reported that the total membership for SADSAWU is 2955 domestic workers, and SADSAWU are aiming to increase their membership to 5000 by the end of the year.⁶⁶

In South Africa overall, the involvement of trade unions members in activities and discussions on the fears of migrant workers to join trade unions was noted. The project provided space for activities to be implemented by domestic workers and their unions. Workshops that

⁶⁵ the workshop also supported SADSAWU to make linkages to other trade unions and migrant organizations. An official from SADSAWU reported that they particularly liked the *Study Circle* workshop approach to workers education facilitated by Saliem Patel (Labour Research Service) (through ILO).

⁶⁶ SADSAWU are also linked in South Africa to the Solidarity Center's for trade unions in their support to vulnerable—farm workers, domestic workers, migrant workers and women workers in South Africa.

brought local and migrant workers together (in a sisterly way) were considered effective for sharing experiences by two questionnaire respondents.

Awareness of conditions of migrant domestic workers among leaders of trade union national centres, trade unions national action plans, and the registration of one new union (Lesotho), along with tri-national (corridor) action plan were all considered positively in the region. The establishment of network between DW unions and other organisations working with and for migrant workers was reported as effective. Space for SADSAWU to develop strategies for recruiting and representing migrant domestic workers was reported by two questionnaire respondents as positive, with dialogue between trade unions and NGOs focusing on rights of migrants reported by another two respondents. This led to the establishment of an amicable working relationship between local and migrant domestic workers organizations.

Although not planned in the original project document, an information brochure for migrant domestic worker migrants travelling along the corridor was developed by ILO staff in Pretoria towards the end of the project. The pre-migration awareness package for domestic workers migrating to South Africa was considered a highlight of the GAP-MDW project by many in the region (except a representative of the Department of Labour in South Africa).

Other issues mentioned in this corridor included government sensitization (five questionnaire respondents) and capacity-building translating into migrant domestic workers issue being mainstreamed into national labour migration policy (in Zimbabwe and Lesotho). One Zimbabwe respondent highlighted integrating migrant domestic workers discussions within the broader framework of labour migration in Zimbabwe. Four out of 6 Zimbabwean respondents appreciated the awareness raising regarding the situation on the ground for domestic workers. At least three evaluation questionnaire respondents reported that a broad number of stakeholders are now more informed about the plight of domestic workers and C189.

The use of social media, twitter, facebook, Whatsapp, were mentioned as having been effective in the region. Some joint activities for Zimbabwe, Lesotho and South Africa facilitated knowledge sharing among the 3 countries on trends on the domestic work sector, decent work deficits, organising strategies, challenges as well lobbying and advocacy for ratification of C.189. One questionnaire respondent noted that the corridor approach was as important, as it overcomes boundaries and facilitates bi- or multilateral trade unions agreements. Learning from each other was considered effective.

Challenges

The Zimbabwe government initially felt the GAP-MDW project was adopting a top down approach. They wished to be involved in engaging researchers and developing terms of references for the parameters of the research. A representative of the Zimbabwean government reported that some of the language in the research report showed poor judgment in terms of tone. For this reason, the South African focal point designated by the Department of Labour for the project did not endorse the South African research report and felt concerned about possible political impact of research findings. For instance despite legal reform, the report stressed that the situation of (national and migrant) DWs had not significantly improved on the ground. A lesson learned was that both governments would like to have been consulted more when designing the terms of reference for the study. Nevertheless the study encouraged the South African government to critically examine what has been put in place since ratifying C189. Another issue reported is that research report findings were not widely shared with the affected domestic workers and their employers.

There is need for more efforts to dissemination research findings to groups beyond legislators and trade unions.

The South African Ministry of Labour also had hesitation in endorsing the information brochure for domestic workers, as they felt that it might be politically sensitive and look like South Africa is opening the door for migrants.⁶⁷ The fact that there was no high level government activity between the South African and Zimbabwean governments was perceived as a challenge (although bilateral talks may have taken place via SADC). A questionnaire respondent reiterated issues around the political buy-in of Department of Labour in South Africa as challenging, indicating that support should first be sought from higher levels of government. In South Africa reaching out to and sensitizing employers was reported as lacking and should be addressed. Another issue raised but not addressed in the GAP-MDW project is the need to understand the inherent fear of migrant workers with regard to becoming involved in unions. In South Africa although workers organizations are militant (compared to Zimbabwe and Lesotho), it was noted some union members do not see migrant workers rights as a priority, and many migrants themselves fear that they may be dismissed if they become active in a union.

It was noted by many interviewed that labour migration is a sensitive issue and requires a longer time frame, if it is going to be addressed holistically. This requires working closely with IOM and other partners. Migration dynamics in the sub-region are regarded as security issues, which was translated into challenges when trying to organise bilateral meetings. The GAP-MDWs project faced acceptance problems resulting in some key activities involving partners in South Africa and Zimbabwe not being undertaken.

Some of the suggestions for overcoming challenges

The following was reported by 10 evaluation questionnaire respondents from this migration corridor follow:

- Three respondents mentioned a better focus on public and social media on the issue of the right of migrant workers to organise (new technologies and social networks to reach MDW at their workplace) - one of these respondents also mentioned the need for capacity development.
- The employers' component was glaringly missing in South Africa according to an ILO employee who was closely involved in GAP-MDW in South Africa and another respondent from Zimbabwe. One suggestion to reach employers was to have stronger sanctions for non-registration of domestic workers; another to conduct an inspector 'blitz' in certain areas known to have domestic workers (similar to TV licenses that must be produced on demand to an authorized inspector; or a trade license required before trading). Could the focus be on shaming employers for their non-compliance on giving MDW rights?
- How can issues around male MDWs be addressed?
- Keeping everyone in the loop about what is happening at all times (one questionnaire respondent had not heard of any follow up since he/she had completed an activity, and were surprised when a colleague sent her/him the booklet on MDW rights).
- More resources (time and budget) required

In terms of project management, one questionnaire respondent reported that coordination with ILO headquarters level could have been improved. This respondent felt that activities could be changed at any time without consultations with stakeholders. Consultative process

⁶⁷ The Department reported to the evaluation that the pamphlet may promote particular private organizations over others

during the project inception and discussion of implementation plan with all stakeholders involved was suggested as a better approach. For instance, the ACTRAV specialist in the region must be informed at all times when discussions with trade unions take place. Having no ILO labour migration specialist in the region was noted by some others interviewed as lacking. Inadequate funding / resources in South Africa meant that efforts were mainly limited to Gauteng Province. In fact a lack of resources was blamed by a questionnaire respondent as the reason that many of the 'brilliant; ideas that came of out workshops remained abstract. One respondent recommended that when expectations are raised and then cut off at a very embryonic stage, this can pose problems for future endeavours.

Lessons learned

A project such as GAP-MDW could start with stronger consultations with key stakeholders, and strive to achieve strong coordination amongst them. Ensure early on that the right people are at the 'table' ensures that the political aspects and policy influence goes more smoothly. For example in South Africa, it may be necessary to involve both the Department of Labour who are responsible for domestic workers and the Department of Home Affairs who are responsible for migration. Evidently consistent and consultative communication is required to make headway at all steps of a project such as GAP-MDW. The Department of Labour in South Africa recommends more consultation and feedback at the design stage of a project such as GAP-MDWs. Ensure the issue of migrant domestic workers is raised with governments in a political astute way. Some governments in destination countries do not wish to be seen to be encouraging more migrants to come.

Migration domestic workers is a topical issue in the SADC region, and still requires support from ILO. For instance more capacity for trade union staff on how to organise domestic workers was noted by trade unions members. Mentioning MDWs in the DWCP is important, and ensuring that components are mainstreaming in ILO's programmes in the region. On the whole, SADC was reported by many to be the best entry point for issue related to migration.

GAP-MDW seized opportunities as they arose, and this is an example of the project going beyond what was scheduled, as the opportunity arose. Although not planned in the original project document, an information brochure for domestic worker migrants travelling along the Zimbabwe to South Africa corridor was developed. The idea of developing this MDW awareness 'brochure' came from sharing the 'MDW passport' from the Paraguay to Argentina corridor, demonstrating the value of sharing different approaches from different corridors. In Zimbabwe the ministry took ownership of the information booklet, whereas in South Africa the government did not engage in the process of developing the information booklet (until afterwards). It is worth noting that the effects of migrants having an 'information brochure' on their rights, cannot yet be evaluated as only recently launched. Thus we cannot draw lessons on its use yet.

To move policy ahead in South Africa, sensitization for high level officials in the ministries of labour, foreign affairs and home affairs is necessary, so MDWs are not considered a minor issue. Communication with those in power (government and employers) is particularly important, as they have the capability to either act as a catalyst or influence the direction and speed at which a project progresses. Direct sensitization of workers through campaigns, brochures, using local languages will help to increase the awareness of MDWs of their rights in South Africa according to questionnaire respondents (5), continuing to find ways to contact

these workers.⁶⁸ In Zimbabwe, a respondent from a trade union mentioned establishing unions for domestic workers, so they have a platform.

On the whole, four respondents mentioned capacity building for trade unions or MDWs. As one respondent who was involved in capacity building of trade unions in South Africa stated, much that took place through GAP-MDW was new, and it opened the eyes of trade union members to the challenges of representing domestic workers (migrant or national). Trade unions in South Africa need continuous support or this experience will be forgotten. This view was echoed strongly by a respondent from a government body. Expectations have been raised, *'more work must be done outside boardrooms.'* Linking this type of project with SADC frameworks will increase the visibility of migrants.

⁶⁸ In the Zimbabwe to South Africa corridor many interviewed and 8 evaluation questionnaires respondents provided details of approaches they felt were innovative, and suggestions for improvements in either the country of origin (Zimbabwe) and the country of destination (South Africa) or both, and other suggestions for a future programme on MDWs.

A10.3 Paraguay –Argentina Corridor

Background context

At least 1 million workers are employed in domestic work in Argentina, including 42 percent from other Latin American countries. Migration treaties under MERCOSUR allows freedom of mobility. Over 98 percent of the domestic workers are female, and over four fifths are undeclared. At least 60 percent of Paraguayan female workers in Argentina are employed in domestic work. Paraguay provides an example of the global care chain as domestic workers tend to leave their own family in the care of younger female family members. A key concern is health insurance and pension benefits for Paraguayan domestic workers who migrate back. Domestic workers in both Paraguay and Argentina are paid low wages (lower than minimum wage). Paraguayan domestic workers are often ill informed about their rights before arriving in Argentina. However in both Paraguay and Argentina there are strong organisations of domestic workers. In Paraguay SINTRADOP, SINTAHOP and AESD are active as domestic workers organisations. In Argentina, CONLACTRAHO provides a regional network with SINPECAF, SIPESEDO, UPACP all active.

Progress/Achievements

Under the GAP-MDW project, a baseline study in Paraguay analysed the push and pull factors of female migration to Argentina; the migration patterns (through special tabulations of census and labour force survey). Most domestic workers began as domestic workers in Paraguay before migrating to Argentina. Networks are extremely important for the migration process. Tabulations of census and labour force surveys showed there is an increasing demand for care related work due to an ageing society in Argentina. Another study examined the institutional framework, approach and impact of the Argentinean vocational training program for domestic workers, and the inclusion of MDWs as a target group.⁶⁹ Another study examined the viability of a portable social security program for workers returning from Argentina to Paraguay.⁷⁰ ILO organised tripartite technical workshops to validate study findings.⁷¹ Studies highlighted legal reforms and were used for the Paraguayan policy discussion for the bill adapted in 2015 and contributed to MERCOSUR adopting a recommendation (in 2015) to ensure that MDWs can benefited from portable pension rights.

In Argentina, migration law was covered by 2004 legislation. The baseline study in Argentina examined the legal frameworks for labour migration and domestic work. Research findings were disseminated during a technical meeting with members of the Argentinean Tripartite Commission on Equal Opportunities (28 April 2014); and also discussed at the trade union UPACP workers' workshop. In Paraguay, trade unions used the research on Paraguayan domestic workers in Argentina to campaign for better wages and working conditions. Research results also informed the information passport and a cell phone application linked to facebook, produced by the domestic workers union. All research findings were important for those engaging in debates on rights for domestic workers.

In Paraguay a bi-national workshop⁷² provided the first opportunity for trade unions and domestic workers' organizations from Argentina and Paraguay to meet to discuss issues related to MDWs and come up with strategies to move forward. A bi-national workers' agreement (*Acuerdo sindical bi-nacional*) was reached between DWs' organizations and Trade

⁶⁹ El impacto del Programa de Profesionalización del Servicio en Casas Particulares sobre trabajadores/as domésticos/as de origen nacional y migrante en Argentina

⁷⁰ Paraguayans were not granted entitlement of pension rights until the recent modification of DWs law in 2015. Even though there is no formal restriction on MDWs, no DW had been granted portability for his/her pension rights.

⁷¹ Also in this region, a comparative study of legal frameworks regulating domestic work covers 18 countries in Latin America and the Caribbean was conducted- Las leyes sobre trabajo doméstico remunerado en América Latina

⁷² Construir una estrategia sindical para el trabajo decente de las trabajadoras del hogar migrantes with the participation of trade unions and DWs' organization from the two countries (CGT, CTA, UPACP, AMUMRA from Argentina, CUT-A, SINTRADI, SINTRACAP from Paraguay)

Union Confederations from Paraguay and Argentina to promote decent work for Paraguayan MDWs in Argentina.

In March 2013, the government of Argentina passed the law to regulate employment relationships for private home workers. A domestic work bill in Argentina was passed into legislation in October 2015. Argentina has a new national migration policy, including a new law on domestic workers which demonstrates a commitment by the Government of Argentina to regularise and formalise the domestic work sector for nationals and migrants alike. Migrant domestic workers from Paraguay can now have a contract with rights. They can retire and have their pension paid in Paraguay. New regulations in Argentina thus provide equal rights for both national and migrant domestic workers. Government policy is now promoting the formalization of domestic workers, working conditions and social security coverage.

The Domestic Workers Union (UPACP) in Argentina provided vocational training course “Servicios en casas particulares” (“service in private homes”), to its’ members. GAP-MDW contributed to updating the vocational training modules for DWs, and incorporating provisions of C189. This new vocational training program for DWs will be run by the Minister of Labour.

Views of questionnaire respondents from the Paraguay – Argentina corridor

As the evaluator did not visit this corridor, the views from the evaluation questionnaire respondents are highlighted below.

- Six respondents to the questionnaire for the evaluation responded to the question regarding the most positive outcomes of the GAP-MDW in this corridor, and which approaches were considered the most effective.
- Four out of 6 mentioned the research as important as it generated knowledge and showed the extent of the problem. One respondent mentioned that the generation of research and information in different formats for different audiences was really important.
- Four respondents also mentioned issues around increased visibility of the sector or the visibility of domestic workers unions. Two mentioned strengthening the capacities of domestic workers, and one mentioned empowerment for organizations working on the issue.
- Other positive elements reported by respondents was the adoption of the new laws which the GAP-MDW project helped to put on the agenda, with tripartite dialogue between government, trade unions and independent actors.
- Three out of six respondents thought that the information passport or other forms of information shared during the project were effective approaches, as they were practical and could really help migrant workers.
- Alliances built for lobbying and bi national dialogue between trade unions was also considered effective.

Challenges

Challenges in this corridor related to the difficulties in contacting and organizing domestic workers (researchers and trade unionists mentioned this in the evaluation questionnaire); and the fact that traditional trade unions still see domestic workers as ‘external’ to their working

class. Many actors still need to continue to be reached (government officials, academia, citizens, trade unions) and hear the testimonies of MDWs and domestic workers.

The low consideration of the 'care economy' in Argentina is still a challenge (even with the new curricula being developed to professionalise the care economy). Implementing laws on domestic work was mentioned also as difficult. At the political level in Argentina, it was felt by one respondent that there is still a need for a discussion on the establishment of a national system of care, and a rethink of the gender division of labour.

Lessons learned

In the Paraguay to Argentina corridor six evaluation questionnaires respondents provided details of approaches they felt were innovative, suggestions for improvements in both the country of origin (Paraguay) and the country of destination (Argentina), and other suggestions imminent attention to MDWs. Three respondents reported that the manuals and information materials developed were innovative (including the android application and video, and communication exhibits that looked like laundry to attract attention). The corridor approach was mentioned as important by two respondents one specifying the 'corridor' focus; the other simply stating that the project was well designed. An interesting point was made about training for spokespersons to lobby for domestic workers. Another responded reiterated the need for a strong awareness campaign particularly within trade unions and on promoting a gender equality focus in trade unions.

In terms of suggestions for this corridor, four respondents gave ideas. The anomaly of having a separate system for domestic work in Argentina was raised. Should we be addressing simplified tax regimes for both domestic workers, migrant domestic workers and paying attention to the rights of all migrant workers was queried. Another way is to approach the issue according to this respondent is from a perspective on 'unpaid work'. In Argentina the research results underlined the importance of regulatory advances in the care sector. It was felt that research results in Argentina can also inform other regions.

A10.4 Nepal - Lebanon Corridor

Background context

The United Arab Emirates was initially envisaged to be part of the GAP-MDWs project, but later declined to work on MDWs and trafficking issues. Following consultations, Lebanon became the substitute target country of destination for Nepali MDWs. The issues facing migrant domestic workers in Lebanon have been well documented.⁷³ A range of initiatives was underway funded by various donors in the Arab States that linked with migrant workers, domestic workers or MDWs. The EU funded ILO implemented *Action Programme for Protecting the Rights of Women Domestic Workers* in Lebanon (PROWD⁷⁴), launched in 2011, was instrumental in supporting the set up of the Migrant Domestic Workers Union, which was later aligned with the trade union FENASOL. Through social dialogue, PROWD was working towards national labour migration governance to improve working conditions for women domestic workers. ILO also collaborated with OHCHR to assist the *Syndicate of the Owners of Recruitment Agencies* in Lebanon in the development of a code of conduct for private employment agencies operating in the country. This was to enhance the transparency of the recruitment process, in the absence of a protective regulatory framework for domestic workers.

The SDC funded *Migration and Governance Network* (MAGNET) was implemented through ILO's Regional Office for the Arab States. MAGNET embarked on broad advocacy initiatives in late 2012, including pushing for the ratification of Convention No. 189 in the Arab region. Entitled '*Decent Work for Domestic Workers: Advocating for Institutional Reform in the Middle East*', this regional initiative aimed at providing options for Arab governments to reform national laws and migration policies related to domestic workers and bring them in line with international labour standards.⁷⁵ PROWD and the *Decent Work for Domestic Workers* project produced a useful ten page brief outlining good practices and lessons learned from the Arab Region with regard to protecting the rights of migrant domestic workers. This and many tools and reports are available on migrant domestic workers in Lebanon.

It is important to note that political instability affected Lebanon during the project period. During GAP-MDWs implementation period, Lebanon hosted at least 1.3 million Syrian refugees. With one in 5 people in the country a refugee, this was evidently higher on the political agenda than MDWs. Lebanon is hosting many nationalities working as domestic workers and many displaced communities (Palestinian, Iraqi, Syrians).

Nepal, was the country of origin of focus for the project in this migration corridor. In Nepal, the GAP-MDW project collaborated closely with the UK funded ILO *Work in Freedom* project. *Work in Freedom* was attempting to make migration safer for women from South Asia adopting an integrated and targeted approach to prevent trafficking of women and girls in South Asian countries of origin (Bangladesh, India and Nepal) and in destination countries (India, Jordan, Lebanon and the United Arab Emirates). *Work in Freedom* had a strong focus on supporting women's empowerment at the community level, which was expected by ILO to help support a reduction in their vulnerability to trafficking and forced labour. Such an approach was also expected to promote safe labour migration. On April 2015, an earthquake

⁷³ See for example the 2014 report published by Anti-Slavery International in collaboration with GEFONT (General Federation of Nepalese Trade Unions) and KAFA (a Lebanese civil society organization) which summarises the exploitation of Nepalese Migrant Domestic workers in Lebanon. *Into the Unknown: Exploitation of Nepalese migrant domestic workers in Lebanon*. Anti-Slavery International May 2014

⁷⁴ EU and Swiss Development Cooperation's (SDC)-funded

⁷⁵ In the SDC funded MAGNET project (Dec'12-Nov'14), governance was to be improved and protection afforded to migrant domestic workers through a focus on research and policy reform. Various products were produced including an annotated bibliography on women migrant domestic workers in the Arab States which was used to inform ILO's regional technical cooperation strategy on domestic work in terms of what is needed for labour migration policies in countries (Briggs, 2014).

struck Nepal, followed tragically by another earthquake two weeks later. At least 8,000 people were killed with many more injured (over 21,000). Obviously the destruction from the earthquakes resulted in operational delays for GAP-MDWs and delays in establishing joint initiatives with *Work in Freedom*.

Progress / Achievements

Baseline research was conducted in both Lebanon and Nepal. Based on the labour force survey methodology and module developed in Zimbabwe through GAP-MDW, a quantitative study using this labour force survey module was planned for Nepal but could not be implemented due to the earthquake.⁷⁶ As funding has been secured, the labour force survey module has been postponed, but should be incorporated between September 2016 and June 2017. Studies were used extensively to shape national legislation and policy in Nepal. The Government of Nepal had announced an age ban on women under the age of 30 years from migrating to the Arab States for domestic work. Through GAP-MDW a study on the *Impact of Age Ban*⁷⁷ focused on employment management. Although well intended, a ban to protect young women from abuses by forbidding them to migrate was found to link to higher risks and abuses because of resultant irregular migration. Research findings were shared with the national stakeholders by organizing dialogue sessions. It can be argued that this GAP-MDWs study made a significant contribution in Nepal towards reducing the age ban (at which MDWs can migrate).

Thematic studies of employers' attitudes and practices were undertaken in Lebanon. In fact, Lebanon hosted one of the few employers' initiatives through GAP-MDW as part of four banks' Corporate Social Responsibility activities. Sensitization activities were offered to Lebanese female employers of the four Lebanese banks such as information sessions on ILO Convention 189 and evidence of the maltreatment of MDWs. Interviews for this evaluation found that this pilot initiative is now being followed upon in recently ILO formulated projects.

According to an ILO 2015 publication, in Lebanese labour law, migrant domestic workers may join existing national unions, if the objective of the union is in line with domestic employment, and on the condition that the foreign worker is authorized to work in Lebanon, is 18 years with a clear criminal record. Domestic workers can establish a committee within an existing Lebanese union, as in the case of the domestic worker committee established within FENASOL.⁷⁸ Although still on shaky ground, the first domestic workers union in the Arab world had been established in Lebanon linked with PROWD. The union faces difficult challenges posed by the direction different stakeholders wish it to go, its diverse membership along with differences in language (at least five Asian nationalities) and educational backgrounds of members. The GAP-MDWs project supported the founding congress for this fledgling domestic workers union. ILO influence helped in re-activating the Lebanese Domestic Workers Steering Committee (inactive since 2011). Information on employers and recruitment agencies was another achievement in Lebanon.

A workshop that held in Kathmandu (in February 2015) allowed trade unions such as *All Nepal Trade Union Federation*; the *General Federation of Nepalese Trade Union* (GEFONT); and the *Nepal Trade Union Congress* (NTUC) come together with domestic workers organizations

⁷⁶ In Nepal, discussions with the Central Bureau of Statistics and the Ministry of Labour, UNDP and research institutions resulted in the Central Bureau of Statistics agreeing to incorporate a statistical module to capture abroad labour migration into the 2014-2015 Labour Force Survey (LFS). GAP-MDW committed funding to contribute to fund the new module. The ILO Labour Statistics Department provided technical support.

⁷⁷ No Easy Exit, Migration Ban Affecting Women from Nepal. ILO MIGRANT/FUNDAMENTALS 2015
http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---declaration/documents/publication/wcms_428686.pdf

⁷⁸ Cooperating out of isolation: the case of migrant domestic workers in Kuwait, Lebanon, and Jordan: Working Paper / International Labour Organization, ILO Regional Office for Arab States. Beirut: ILO, 2015

/NGOS to discuss implications of the baseline study research findings. An ILO staff member who was involved in a joint workshop of three domestic workers' union in Nepal, reported that it was started a process of action plans to move the agenda further. However, it was also reported that due to the lack of a coordinator on the ground, there has been little communication with the domestic workers union reported to ILO Nepal since then. In Nepal, the GAP-MDW project organized a series of tri-partite consultation and knowledge sharing workshop including to share research results and discuss: the implementation of *Visa Free Ticket* policy; the ratification of the ILO C189 for domestic workers; and to review Labour Law and the Foreign Employment Act of Nepal.

In collaboration with *Work in Freedom*, GAP-MDWs project funds contributed to ToT for community workers from five Nepalese districts.⁷⁹ By the end of July 2016, approximately 3,425 community people including 3,170 women benefited from 2-4 hours orientation on women empowerment and safe labour migration. About 1,678 aspirant migrant workers who were in the process of receiving a passport received fair recruitment and safe migration information at the Migrant Resource Centre established at the District Administration Office. Enabling women to make an informed choice regarding their migration was reported as effective by one questionnaire respondent during the evaluation. Also in collaboration with another ILO project a pre-departure skills training curriculum was developed and a ToT workshop in July 2014. In Nepal, the GAP-MDWs project also provided support to GEFONT so they could better organise domestic workers. This was also to support their affiliation to the Nepalese Independent Domestic Workers Union (NIDWU). Focus was put on GEFONT Support Groups (GSG) in countries of destination.

Positive outcomes of GAP-MDW in Nepal-Lebanon corridor, and effective approaches

As the evaluator did not visit this corridor, the views from the evaluation questionnaire respondents are highlighted below. Seven respondents from this corridor gave views on the most positive outcomes of the GAP-MDW in this corridor, and which approaches were considered the most effective.

- Most responses related to knowledge sharing of domestic workers issues (domestic workers rights, or MDWs sharing their experiences in both Nepal and Lebanon) and awareness raising (including the launch of *My Fair Home* campaign). One respondent mentioned implementing the unified contract to protect MDW rights in Lebanon.
- Two respondents from Nepal mentioned capacity building (one of community workers, the other or domestic workers organizations). Effective approaches mentioned included targeting government for policy change in Lebanon, although it was highlighted that there is still weakness in government regulations in Lebanon (which perpetuates abuse). Approaches that included unions were considered effective, as this helped unions to revisit their structures and bylaws to consider defending MDWs.
- In Nepal, trainings and skill enhancement activities to target groups as well as policy advocacy to the government and others (associations, unions etc.) agencies were mentioned as effective by two respondents. One respondent in Nepal mentioned technical support for drafting bilateral labour agreements with governments as very important, and this was implemented jointly with *Work in Freedom*.

⁷⁹ For example the GAP-MDW project contributed about USD 40,000 to the community empowerment project in Morang and Dolakha districts out of the total Implementation Agreement amount of USD 142,000.

- Another respondent mentioned the importance of hearing the voices of MDW victims to share their experiences. Finally having a migration corridor approach was considered experimental and an effective way to work on MDWs by a respondent based in Lebanon.

Challenges

The Kafala system is used to monitor migrant labourer in the domestic work sectors and construction in Lebanon (Bahrain, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and the UAE). Many view the Kafala system as at the root of migrant workers disadvantage. Changing the Kafala system will take a long time.

FENASOL in Lebanon supported preparatory activities to create a Domestic Workers Union. The union was established according to trade union principles and it is currently in the process of elaborating final bylaws and structures. The union is still not recognized by the Minister of Labour, and ILO may need to examine again how to ensure this union can gain recognition. Challenges with regard to the nascent domestic workers union were mentioned during the evaluation, with the need for a clear agreement with ACTRAV on how to about work with this domestic work union. The union still has some capacity issues, and ILO continue to provide technical support upon request. Despite the many issues faced by the union, it should be noted that the formation of the first ever domestic workers union in the region, has raised the profile of MDWs, has created some pressure and *noise* around the issue.

Challenges: views of questionnaire respondents from the Nepal– Lebanon corridor

Seven evaluation questionnaire respondents for this corridor outlined challenges in Nepal (4) and Lebanon (3).

- In Lebanon it was felt that employer focus group attendees did not appear receptive to the idea of ‘formalising’ payment to domestic workers (i.e. opening bank accounts from domestic workers) as they did not believe their domestic worker would want or benefit from this initiative. This respondent reported that many involved in project activities questioned the focus on domestic workers (in banks) when there are other marginalized and vulnerable minority segments scattered across the Lebanese population who are in equal need. In fact focusing on MDWs as a specific group was also mentioned by another respondent as challenging (why are they special?).
- Dealing with the trade union movement (cooperation and coordination between the trade union movement and the human rights and civil society organizations) was mentioned as difficult in this corridor. Another respondent mentioned the need to increase capacity in the country of origin for collective bargaining.
- A respondent in Nepal highlighted that approaches are required in the country of destination, regardless of whether migrants receive training or not. Yet, spreading issues with regard to rights to the wider community in Nepal is challenging.
- Respondents from Nepal mentioned the need to use social media to raise awareness, to share success stories, and exchange across countries as important to overcome challenges.
- Working more closely with government agencies in Nepal was suggested, with the need to link the activities with other women organizations networks like the government women’s network at the field level.

A lot remains to be done with regard to MDWs in Lebanon. As one report on the exploitation of Nepalese migrant domestic workers concludes, Nepal and Lebanon should: ratify ILO C189; abolish the kafala system; include domestic workers in labour laws; provide accessible and

relevant pre-departure information to all potential migrants; regulate recruitment agencies and monitor recruitment practices; harmonise policy and practice in relation to migration for domestic work in Nepal; establish a Nepalese consular or diplomatic representation in Lebanon; and support the self-organising of MDW with the view of organizing them in unions.⁸⁰

With regard to project management, the lack of national staff fully dedicated to the GAP-MDW project was mentioned as challenging. Country level briefings about the project activities, budget allocation and collaboration with other projects was not very clear at the beginning of the project, and national priorities are often different to ILO global priorities (with national priorities receiving less attention). A respondent from Lebanon stated that ACTRAV should have a bigger role in the designing, and implementation of any future similar interventions. The bidding process to conduct the survey work in Lebanon (of employers) caused delays. The American University of Beirut and Kafa were awarded the contract, but the cost had to be shared with three other ILO projects as it was so high. Transaction costs of organizing collaboration were also significant.

Lessons learned

The GAP-MDW project gave the opportunity to pilot different approaches to addressing the issue of MDWs, with few resources to bring the approaches to the next level. As one interviewed stated, the approach to work with the private sector, was a pilot and requires follow up. Fortunately this seems to be the case. Some new projects currently being formulated in Lebanon include a domestic workers component; a focus on fair recruitment, including scaling up the pilot approaches that were implemented through GAP-MDW. Thus a lesson learned is that pilot approaches can demonstrate and test initiatives with regard to MDWs. Overall in Lebanon, a key lesson is that more work with employers is required. Apart from changing perceptions towards MDWs, employers may require incentives. A mandatory insurance scheme was mentioned as an important focus for the future. This would encourage employers to move beyond the current sponsor system (kafala).

Support to the domestic workers union in Lebanon was considered helpful by an ILO respondent directly involved in this work, but as outlined above, the domestic workers union is still on shaky ground. Many lessons can be harvested with regard to helping a nascent domestic workers union set up.

Clearly the collaboration with *Work in Freedom* in Nepal was important. Suggestions and lessons learned from three respondents in Nepal centred on the need to have a good plan for the country context that addresses many issues (information, campaigns, lobbying community focus, local government focus, linking support to social security schemes). Nepal also requires a strong monitoring system for implementing policies. In Nepal the intensive training for community workers (20 days) was mentioned as innovative as these community workers were able to provide services to the aspirant MDWs. One respondent in Nepal reiterated, there is still a need for collective approaches amongst countries of origin, to protect the rights of domestic workers.⁸¹

⁸⁰ Exploitation of Nepalese migrant domestic workers in Lebanon. Anti-Slavery International in collaboration with GEFONT, May 2014

⁸¹ In the Nepal to Lebanon corridor 4 evaluation questionnaires respondents provide details of approaches they felt were innovative, 5 made suggestions for improvements in both the country of origin (Paraguay) and the country of destination (Argentina), and other suggestions for a future programme on MDWs.

A10.5 Indonesia – Malaysia corridor

Background context

About 4.3 million documented Indonesians work overseas (with perhaps 2-4 million more who are undocumented). About 75 percent of all Indonesian migrant workers are female. Malaysia is an important destination country for Indonesian migrant domestic workers. The Malaysian government is trying to encourage female labour participation, but domestic workers are required to substitute women in the home. As domestic work is an occupation not many Malaysian nationals themselves are willing to do, there is a large demand for migrants. In June 2013, the Ministry of Human Resources reported that there were 180,000 documented MDWs in Malaysia.

Migrant domestic workers coming from Indonesia face exploitation through both recruitment agencies in Indonesia, and employment agencies in Malaysia. Domestic workers are usually sponsored through a 'middle man'. The recruitment agency also provides training and candidates must pass a competency test. In 2009, following media reports of abuse, a ban on the recruitment of Indonesian domestic workers to Malaysia was put in place, which lasted until the end of December 2011 with the renegotiation of the MoU between the two countries.

The *Tripartite Action to Protect Migrants from Labour Exploitation* (ASEAN TRIANGLE) ran for roughly the same period and included Indonesia. ASEAN TRIANGLE helped to put the migration debate on the map in the ASEAN region, and has also opened up new avenues for engagement with ASEAN for the social partners. Amongst other objectives it aimed to strengthen regional legal and policy framework to more effectively govern labour migration and protection of the rights of migrant workers, in a gender responsive manner. The GMS Triangle Project focused on recruitment and labour protection policies and practices, to ensure safe migration (including for domestic workers) and included Malaysia as a target country. Services to migrant workers were to be through Migrant Worker Resource Centres. Again, work plans were designed to complement each other. The PROMOTE project was a national project in Indonesia to protect national domestic workers. While joint activities did not take place, activities were planned in coordination with one another to avoid overlap.

Progress / Achievements

The research undertaken in Malaysia assessed the needs and preferences of employers of domestic workers, their concerns about the recruitment process, and their knowledge of the rights of domestic workers under Malaysian law. The sample covered 120 employers of live-in and live-out domestic worker. The government has now issued draft regulations on domestic workers, and the MOHR plans to launch a draft code of conduct for employers in 2016, based on the consultations with the 100 employers. The study on employer practices in Malaysia was considered significant by those interviewed and two questionnaire respondents out of nine in particular because the results were shared with key government agencies (Ministry of Human Resources, and Ministry of Home Affairs/Immigration Department). According to an ILO staff member supporting GAP-MDW in Malaysia, legalizing this code of conduct will be a huge jump forward (for example it stipulates that domestic workers the right to one day off per week).

Using the research on employers in Malaysia, a consultative process was launched with employers to identify ways to improve the situation of their work environments. Training with staff of the Malaysian Ministry of Human Resources on the labour dimensions of trafficking

and forced labour in domestic work was also conducted. This training included ILO GMS TRIANGLE, GAP-MDW and GAP 11 projects. Ten case studies of abuses illustrated alarming situations. The survey with employers provided evidence of practices that can lend themselves to forced labour and trafficking. Conclusions included discussions on how enforce compliance to Malaysian law' the need for referral mechanisms to reach isolated domestic workers; and the need for inspectors to frequently visit households. A meeting of 70-80 employers of domestic workers was organised to discuss the many challenges. The result was a guide with tips for employers of domestic workers, which was planned for launch towards the end of the project by the Malaysian Ministry of Human Resources. The Guidelines shall be made available in both the Bahasa Malaysia and English on the Ministry's web page. All respective employment agencies who are certified and authorized to bring in foreign domestic workers will also be encouraged to use the guidelines. Three respondents to the evaluation questionnaire mentioned the draft guidelines (i.e. the code of conduct) and tips for employers of domestic workers in Malaysia.

Domestic workers themselves in Malaysia are being encouraged to understand the responsibilities of employers and their role and rights as domestic workers. Representative embassies will be encouraged to translate the guidelines. Also in Malaysia, GAP-MDW supported efforts by Malaysian Trade Union Confederation (MTUC) and the NGO Tenaganitia. Tenaganitia provide services to abused MDWs. MTUC and Tenaganitia lead a group of concerned bodies called the *Domestic Worker Coalition* and ILO support helped them to comment on draft regulations for the sector. Having consulted migrant domestic workers themselves, the *Coalition* developed a joint action plan to develop a draft *Bill of Rights* for Domestic Workers, (basing their work and on other countries experiences) and submitted it to the Ministry of Human Resources. The *Coalition* has now finalized the draft Bill with an advocacy plan for it.

Qualitative research was undertaken on returned MDWs in Indonesia in four targeted survey areas/provinces.⁸² This research highlighted several types of abuse and exploitation. Linkages with insufficient livelihoods or earnings from agricultural land were found as a push factor for migrants to travel. Following the national trade union workshop, where trade unions developed workplans, the GAP-MDW project in Indonesia supported the four main trade unions (KSBSI, KSPSI Kongres Jakarta, KSPSI Rekonsiliasi, and KSPI) to have better outreach in different target areas. The trade union confederations were expected to monitor the implementation of the action plans by the local government.⁸³ Once trade unions began to recognize domestic workers as part of their core work, the project began to plant seeds that trade unions could monitor the rights of domestic workers.

Indonesia has a massive population, and is highly decentralized. Research results in Indonesia were shared at a national multi stakeholder seminar, and also shared with the local authorities and stakeholders in targeted regions. GAP-MDWs through *Migrant Aid* provided a training of trainers (ToT) for 22 trade union members (covering safe migration; advocacy; organizing MDWs;) during which and trainees developing an outreach action plan. It can be concluded that the pilot activities in Indonesia facilitated local level interventions to improve the

⁸² Lumajang - East Java; Timor Tengah Selatan – NTT; Sambas-West Kalimantan and Tanjung Pinang – Riau Island

⁸³ For instance capacity building to strengthen Indonesian trade unions on organizing and providing services to Migrant Domestic Workers and Their Families in Six Origin Areas in Indonesia (East Java, Nusa Tenggara Timur, West Kalimantan, West Java, North Sumateran and Nusa Tenggara Barat). The four trade union confederation in Indonesia delivered the capacity development namely: KSBSI, KSPSI Kongres Jakarta, KSPSI Rekonsiliasi and KSPI. Members or organizers of trade union at provincial or district level were targeted. Capacity building through training to provincial trade unions took place in six provinces, so that they would be knowledgeable about how to protect, support and empower migrant domestic workers at all stages of the migration process: East Java; Nusa Tenggara Timur; West Kalimantan; West Java; North Sumatera; and Nusa Tenggara Barat Province

situation of MDWs and their families in certain key communities of origin.⁸⁴ Based on survey data, GAP-MDW selected West Java, East Java, NTB, NTT and West Kalimantan as communities of origin to target MDWs and conduct awareness raising on safe migration. A further entry point in Indonesia was at training/recruitment centres for domestic workers themselves. This required agreement between trade unions operating in the area, local government and the recruitment agencies for domestic workers. A pilot MOU between trade unions and recruitment agencies on providing pre-departure and orientation training to migrant domestic workers was tested. The MoU allows rights and joint monitoring of the migrant domestic workers who pass through the IEMSA pre-departure facilities. It also helps to give visibility to MDWs, and enhanced trade union organizing. The project facilitated the signing of the first tripartite agreement between the trade union KSBSI, the provincial Ministry of Manpower office in East Java, and the association of private recruitment agencies, IEMSA.

Another set of initiatives related to binational tripartite meetings between Indonesia and Malaysia stakeholders. During the meeting, the results of research conducted in Malaysia and Indonesia was presented, demonstrating among others the working conditions of domestic workers from the perspective of employers and domestic workers. This was accomplished because the research questions in the Malaysia and Indonesia research were aligned to allow for comparison. The tripartite approach was reported as important as it allowed discussions on the recruitment and protection of MDWs along the corridor. Previously, it was government to government dialogue. Overall establishing a network and cooperation mechanism between Four Trade Union Confederation in Indonesia, with SBMI (Migrant Workers Trade Union in Indonesia), Migrant Aid (NGO) and Malaysia Trade Union Congress (MTUC) was also reported as significant.

KSBSI, one of the Indonesian trade unions, was listed as a partner for GAP-MDWs. KSBSI subsequently were given a contract to carry out several activities, including the preparation of a pocket information booklet (or 'information brochure) to distribute to prospective migrant domestic workers going to Malaysia to inform them on how to migrate safely; and links to website information.

Positive outcomes of GAP-MDW in Indonesia – Malaysia corridor, and effective approaches

Nine survey respondents provided their views on the most positive outcomes of the GAP-MDW in this corridor, and which approaches were considered the most effective.

- Bi-national Meetings between Indonesia and Malaysia were considered positive by two three as they identified good practices in other corridors and provided an opportunity for dialogue with both Governments. Opportunity was also seized in strengthening Trade Union Partnership.
- Establishing information platforms using WhatsApp application was also important. A respondent from Malaysia reported that there was good coordination and cooperation, and an effective methodology, and communications products was also mentioned. Communications through WhatsApp was also mentioned as positive by one respondent in Indonesia.
- In Indonesia, the improved understanding and acknowledging by Government of Indonesia about the role of Trade Union in organizing and advocating MDWs protection was mentioned by questionnaire respondents for the evaluation. This has resulted in Trade Union now being involved in the government's overall design of protection measures for MDWs in Indonesia. The action plan for four provinces,

⁸⁴ Timor Tengah Selatan; Nusa Tenggara Timur; Lumajang; East Java; and Sambas – West Kalimantan

designed based on the finding and recommendation from the ILO research (on returned MDWs) is important for the trade unions, along with the cooperation mechanism between these Trade Union Confederations and their linkages with SBMI (the migrant workers trade union), Migrant Aid (an NGO) and the Malaysia Trade Union Congress (MTUC).

- The tripartite approach on social dialogue to improve recruitment and protection of MDWs corridor along the Indonesia to Malaysia corridor was mentioned by another respondent. Previously there was only government to government dialogue.

Challenges

As mentioned, in Indonesia ILO worked with PROMOTE; ASEAN TRIANGLE and the GMS Triangle Projects.⁸⁵ However these projects have their own agendas and expected outcomes. The GAP-MDW project was trying to manage seven partners and numbers activities in 6 provinces. Staffing issues for the project in Indonesia was raised by many interviews (twice out of 9 respondents to the evaluation questionnaire for this corridor), with relief when eventually a budget was put aside for a national officer for a number of months. This point was reiterated many times in interviews - global projects still need national staff for effective implementation. One respondent in Indonesia felt the project lasted only 9 months of work after all administrative issues were settled. Eventually GAP-MDW was able to hire someone in Indonesia to work on GAP-MDW, which significantly catalyzed activities. Having no project staff based in Kuala Lumpur was reported to have made implementation difficult also and unsustainable. Overall it was strongly stated that global projects that rely on other project staff require goodwill to operate.

The formation of a domestic workers association would also be a major step forward in Malaysia, but was not undertaken. The MTUC has attempted to register an association but the government refuses to accept it. The MTUC has experienced many political complexities. Nevertheless, such an organization would represent all domestic workers and provide legal assistance and a forum for their voices to be heard. However overall in Malaysia, reaching out to domestic workers is difficult - one strategy used was to reach out to the families of migrant worker in the country of origin. ILO requires a strong country presence if they are to further build contacts with domestic workers and other organizations.

Another challenge mentioned by two questionnaire respondents in this corridor, is the overall need for a broader recognition of domestic work. Getting domestic work recognised requires more than data but an ability link how relevant and significant domestic work is for economic and social development policy.

In Indonesia, the availability of official data /information was challenging (for the research) and researchers had to supplement information from local civil society organizations in the research locations. A significant challenge is the short term nature of a project such as GAP-MDW project. For example it was reported that the government in Indonesia still require technical assistance from ILO.

Lessons learned

The GAP-MDW project in Malaysia had a significant focus on employers of domestic workers, but also supporting existing alliances of NGOs that were advocating for domestic workers

⁸⁵ The final evaluation of ASEAN TRIANGLE recommended that the ILO office should maintain the current level of attention for gender issues, and where possible expand to activities targeted to women migrant workers (e.g. domestic workers).

rights. Also in Malaysia, the GAP-MDW project staff realized they had to speak to ministry officials as actual employers of domestic workers to gain their buy-in.

Indonesia is a very large country with nearly 250 million citizens. To improve the quality of work at the country level according to one questionnaire respondent, a proper assessment at the beginning of the project is required, that examines the national context, the capacity of trade unions, government needs, and then determines what resources are required for implementation. It was stressed during interviews that a proper quality assessment at the national level is required before starting such a project. The country context, and the capacity of trade unions and governments must be scrutinized to determine the levels of resources required to implement such a project. Yet in Indonesia, an important achievement was an increased understanding and acknowledging by Government of Indonesia about the role of Trade Union in organizing and advocating MDWs protection. As a result, there was more involvement of the trade unions in the governments' efforts to protect domestic workers. The work at the provincial level was also important, as Indonesia is highly decentralized, with qualitative research useful for informing provincial level work⁸⁶.

Innovative approaches included binational meetings to open dialogue between government and trade unions in both countries, and allow for a strengthening of a MoU between trade unions. The *Open Space* workshop methodology for discussions among employers in Malaysia were well received and mentioned by two respondents. Clearly this methodology works well. For the *Open Space* workshops with employers' organizations, one respondent wanted more time as there are many opposing views. Another respondent mentioned that a government officers' role and rank affects how they can act. Discussions on trade pacts (TPPA) did however focus the government machinery in Malaysia to work towards meeting ILO standards on labour. Thus, getting the right people to policy dialogue is important, but more importantly, the MDW issue has to affect Malaysia's economic planning system as a policy, before priority and resources are given. In Malaysia the focus on employers was well received.

In Indonesia the WhatsApp application and information platforms were well received and considered useful for information sharing. However the time period was too short and many efforts require follow up. However more coverage and information dissemination to regions and potential domestic workers is required. Involving returned MDWs is important, and involving various stakeholders in the cycle of migration to monitor and evaluate what is happening. Another respondent mentioned the corridor approach, but this respondent who was a researcher, stated that researchers in both Malaysia and Indonesia could have communicated with one another during the research for better linkages.

Suggestions based on what worked in Malaysia included campaigns to ratify C189, trainings for MDWs, strengthening partnership between trade unions, networking, workers education. A Malaysian respondent working in the government stated that Indonesia should get their own house in order first with regard to how they treat domestic workers. In Indonesia the focus on local intervention action plans seems to be strongly recommended as working by an ILO respondent. A tripartite coalition is necessary for this according to another ILO questionnaire respondent. Binational meetings seem to work, so that different actors can listen and share with each other and both countries can be involved and assume ownership of challenges in the sector.

⁸⁶ In the Indonesia to Malaysia corridor seven evaluation questionnaires respondents provide details of approaches they felt were innovative, suggestions for improvements in both the country of origin (Indonesia) and the country of destination (Malaysia), and other suggestions for a future programme on MDWs.

Although in reality they were invited, one suggestion was to ensure officials from the Ministry of Home Affairs are members of a similar project advisory team. Likewise a suggestion from Indonesia was to involve other government ministries besides the Ministry of Manpower.