



## Evaluation Unit (EVAL)

- **Project Title:** Going back – moving on: Economic and Social Empowerment of Migrants including Victims of Trafficking returned from the EU and Neighbouring Countries
- **TC/SYMBOL:** RAS/08/03/EEC
- **Type of Evaluation :** Independent External Final Evaluation
- **Country(ies) :** Thailand - Philippines
- **Date of the evaluation:** February-March 2012
- **Evaluation Manager:** Pamornrat Pringsulaka
- **Administrative Office:** Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
- **Technical Backstopping Office:** MIGRANT
- **Evaluator(s):** Pierre Mahy
- **Date project ends:** 31 May 2012
- **Donor: country (budget):** EU (Total budget of Euro 2,199,813 with EU contribution of Euro 1,758,813)
- **Key Words:** return and reintegration, labour migration, migrant workers
- **Evaluation Budget:** USD 34,442 (including final evaluation stakeholders cum closing workshop)

# Table of Contents

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>                           | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>2 PROJECT BACKGROUND .....</b>                          | <b>6</b>  |
| 2.1 PROJECT ENVIRONMENT                                    | 6         |
| 2.2 OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE OF THE PROJECT                    | 6         |
| 2.3 PLANNED RESULTS  | 7         |
| 2.4 PLANNED ACTIVITIES                                     | 7         |
| 2.5 PLANNED ORGANISATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR IMPLEMENTATION | 8         |
| <b>3 EVALUATION BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY .....</b>       | <b>11</b> |
| <b>4 MAIN FINDINGS .....</b>                               | <b>13</b> |
| 4.1 ACTIVITIES IMPLEMENTED                                 | 13        |
| 4.2 PROGRAMME DESIGN – RELEVANCE AND STRATEGIC FIT         | 21        |
| 4.3 VALIDITY OF DESIGN (LOGIC AND COHERENCE)               | 23        |
| 4.4 RESULTS OBTAINED TO DATE – PROJECT EFFECTIVENESS       | 25        |
| 4.5 EFFICIENCY OF RESOURCE USE                             | 32        |
| 4.6 EFFECTIVENESS OF MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS               | 33        |
| 4.7 IMPACT AND SUSTAINABILITY                              | 34        |
| <b>5 CONCLUSIONS .....</b>                                 | <b>37</b> |
| 5.1 CONCLUSIONS  | 37        |
| 5.2 LESSONS LEARNED  | 44        |
| 5.3 GOOD PRACTICES   | 45        |
| 5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS  | 46        |
| <b>APPENDICES .....</b>                                    | <b>49</b> |
| APPENDIX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION          | 50        |
| APPENDIX 2: LIST OF PERSONS AND ORGANISATIONS INTERVIEWED  | 65        |
| APPENDIX 3: LIST OF DOCUMENTS AND PUBLICATIONS CONSULTED   | 68        |

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| <b>ARCM</b>  | Asian Research Centre for Migration                      |
| <b>BLE</b>   | Bureau of Local Employment                               |
| <b>CFO</b>   | Commission on Filipinos Overseas                         |
| <b>CTA</b>   | Chief Technical Advisor                                  |
| <b>DFA</b>   | Department of Foreign Affairs                            |
| <b>DILG</b>  | Department of the Interior and Local Government          |
| <b>DOE</b>   | Department of Employment (Ministry of Labour, Thailand)  |
| <b>DOJ</b>   | Department of Justice                                    |
| <b>DOLE</b>  | Department of Labor and Employment (Philippines)         |
| <b>DSWD</b>  | Department of Social Welfare and Development             |
| <b>EC</b>    | European Commission                                      |
| <b>EU</b>    | European Union   |
| <b>IACAT</b> | Inter-agency Council Against Trafficking                 |
| <b>ILO</b>   | International Labour Organisation                        |
| <b>LFM</b>   | Logical Framework Matrix                                 |
| <b>LoU</b>   | Letter of Understanding                                  |
| <b>MDT</b>   | Multi-Disciplinary Team                                  |
| <b>MTE</b>   | Mid-Term Evaluation                                      |
| <b>MSWG</b>  | Multi-Stakeholder Working Group                          |
| <b>NPC</b>   | National Project Coordinator                             |
| <b>NRCO</b>  | National Reintegration Center for OFWs                   |
| <b>NRLC</b>  | National Labor Relations Commission                      |
| <b>OFW</b>   | Overseas Filipino Worker                                 |
| <b>OUMWA</b> | Office of the Undersecretary for Migrant Workers Affairs |
| <b>OVI</b>   | Objectively Verifiable Indicator                         |
| <b>OWWA</b>  | Overseas Workers Welfare Administration                  |
| <b>PESO</b>  | Public Employment Services Office                        |
| <b>PO</b>    | Programme Officer  |
| <b>POEA</b>  | Philippine Overseas Employment Administration            |
| <b>PSWDO</b> | Provincial Social Welfare & Development Office           |
| <b>ROAP</b>  | ILO Regional Office for Asia and Pacific                 |
| <b>TESDA</b> | Technical Education and Skills Development Authority     |
| <b>TLC</b>   | Thai Labour Campaign                                     |
| <b>TWG</b>   | Technical Working Group                                  |
| <b>TWNE</b>  | Thai Women Network in Europe                             |

# 1 Executive Summary

---

## Background & Context

The project “Going back – moving on: Economic and Social Empowerment of Migrants including Victims of Trafficking returned from the EU and Neighbouring Countries Project” has been initiated in the framework of the EU’s “Global Approach to Migration and Mobility”.

Implemented by ILO with a budget of €2.199.813 (of which 79.95% EU funding) over a period of 36 months (2009-2012) subsequently extended to 40 months, the project’s overall objective is: “*to contribute to the reduction of labour and sexual exploitation of migrants including victims of trafficking in Thailand and in the Philippines through support to a humane return and reintegration process emphasizing economic and social empowerment.*”

The primary partners selected by ILO for the implementation of the project were:

- the National Operation Centre for the Prevention and Suppression of Human Trafficking under the administration of the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security in Thailand, and
- the Overseas Workers and Welfare Administration (OWWA) attached to the Department of Labour and Employment in the Philippines.

The project is now in its final stages (closing date of 31 May 2012) and the expected results should now have been achieved.

The scope of the final evaluation is to examine the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project, with a particular focus on good points and achievements, areas for improvement and recommendations for sustainability. It also aims at assessing the extent to which the project has taken into consideration the recommendations of the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) undertaken in 2010 and at identifying possible lessons learnt and good practices for learning and knowledge sharing purposes.

The evaluation has been conducted over a six-week period from February to March 2012 under supervision of the Regional Evaluation Officer of ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP).

The tools employed were documentary analysis, identification of relevant evaluation questions, structured interviews to elicit the facts relevant to the evaluation questions and synthesis of findings, conclusions and recommendations presented in this report.

Preliminary findings and proposed recommendations have been presented and discussed during a stakeholder’s workshop after the project’s final Conference in Manila on 28 March 2012.

## Main Findings & Conclusions

### *Relevance*

The project is consistent with the ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration, with the priorities of Regional Strategy documents and relevant ILO and International Conventions on Migration. This has already been documented in both the Annex I to the Contribution Agreement and in the project’s Mid-Term Self Evaluation Report submitted in January 2011.

The project is coherent with other EU funded and/or ILO managed projects in the area of migration and builds on the experience and knowledge developed by ILO through the ILO-HSF reintegration project. It is also coherent with the ASEAN Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers.

The proposed strategy addresses the need for coordination among service providers, the need for decent livelihood upon return and return with dignity through two main intervention areas: Institutional Development and Direct Assistance. The intervention logic has a focus on "longer term socio-economic reintegration" which does not receive sufficient attention in the two countries. It addresses it from a point of view of access to rights and to decent work opportunities.

While being overall well designed, a few weaknesses have been identified, among which the absence of a "policy/advocacy" plan, insufficient "cross fertilization" activities between Thailand and the Philippines and the absence of clearly defined priorities.

### *Effectiveness*

The different reports produced by the project are activity based and lack a comprehensive results and potential impact analysis. Activities have been adequately implemented, but have the expected results indicated in the project document actually been achieved?

A number of positive factors have contributed to the successful delivery of activities, in particular the commitment of all project partners, as well as the close cooperation between authorities (national, provincial, local) and NGOs especially in the Philippines.

Field visits have established that the benefits of the activities have been largely perceived, both at the institutional level as at the level of the returnees. Making a structured assessment of the benefits received is a complex task for capacity building activities like training courses, mapping exercises, providing guidelines, etc. Overall, the evaluator's visits to national and local authorities and interviews with several participants in the various seminars, workshops and study tours organized by the project allowed to perceive a real interest in what has been done. Capacity building at the local level however remains an important issue and further assistance would be more than welcome.

Benefits have also been taken on board by implementing partners through exposure to new tools and approaches of dealing with reintegration issues.

The "target" of 1.000 beneficiaries has been exceeded, but more importantly will generate a wider impact for example by integrating new returnees into self-help groups arising from the initial interventions.

Two major unplanned achievements need to be highlighted:

- a. In Thailand the signature of a Letter of Understanding (LoU) with the Department of Employment (DOE) in May 2011 which came as a major advance in project implementation.
- b. In the Philippines, institutional development activities were pushed beyond the original plans in supporting the preparation of local strategic action plans to integrate migration in provincial development plans, aiming to enhance local mechanisms and responses to address migration issues such as illegal recruitment, trafficking, access to information by migrants and return and reintegration assistance.

Through the "Institutional Development" component, the project has provided a platform to involve many stakeholders in individual training activities as well as in collective initiatives by setting up working groups/teams which are referred to as Multi-Disciplinary Teams (MDT), Multi-Stakeholders Working Groups (MSWG), Technical Working Groups (TWG), etc.

As far as direct beneficiaries assisted by the provision of legal services, training courses and/or seed capital, the perception of benefits is easier to assess as it often relates to a visible change in their daily life.

### *Efficiency*

The project incurred start-up delays partly as a consequence of the late arrival of the first PO six months after inception. Project resources have been correctly managed and utilized despite some difficulties arising from strong variations in the exchange rates and from slight delays in the transfer of funds.

Project inputs (sub-contracted external expertise) have been adequately selected and the project team has shown a high degree of efficiency despite the turnover in project management. Implementing partners have been very committed to their responsibilities and provided the most suitable contribution to the project.

Recommendations made by the Mid-Term Evaluation have partly been taken into consideration when they were considered to be relevant.

### *Impact and sustainability*

At **Institutional** level, the project has produced tools and delivered outputs, such as increased capabilities of national/local authorities to deal with return issues. Research work undertaken has brought new ideas for policy considerations and also enhanced the attention and priority given to migration. The project furthermore initiated and encouraged new approaches in having Letters and/or Memoranda of Understanding/Agreement signed, Multi Stakeholders Groups set up and joint initiatives undertaken in bringing together government authorities and civil society. This has allowed demonstrating new mechanisms which are likely to inspire officials and civil society to closely cooperate in the future.

Three main pillars for longer term impact and sustainability have emerged from the project:

- a. The LoU with the DOE in Thailand which could be the vehicle for further joint activities to be developed with ILO, in particular through the TRIANGLE project.
- b. The integration of migration plans into provincial development plans in the Philippines.
- c. The cooperation intentions declared by European Trade Unions in supporting migrant workers facing problems while being employed in Europe.

In the field of **Direct Assistance**, the short-term impact resulting from training courses, legal support and grants distributed to returnees appears rather obvious. The number of assisted returnees may not be very high (though in line with available funds), but more importantly, the project partners have set the basis for a much larger impact and longer term sustainability.

A number of positive factors are likely to create this wider impact and lead to longer term sustainability, among which the willingness of returnees to organize themselves in self-help/peer support groups to extend assistance to others, the existence of funds out of which further assistance can be provided, the integrated approach towards direct assistance, the commitment of NGOs to further support returnees and the creation of “examples” under the Thai law leading to a possible better enforcement.

Less encouraging factors have also been noted, as for example the lack of motivation of the MDT in Petchabun to carry on with the group, the reluctance of returnees to engage into legal action, the limited referral to other financial sources (like it was for example done in the Philippines, where Batis Centre referred returnees from Ilocos Sur to the regional office of the Department of Labor and Employment to access livelihood funds), etc.

### **Recommendations & Lessons Learned**

The main global **lessons learned** from the project are the following:

1. Consolidating achievements of earlier initiatives/projects and making best use of existing structures is a prerequisite to push things further.
2. Working with local government units and providing them with mechanisms to cooperate with service providers and national authorities is a major challenge.
3. Involving implementing partners at the project design stage leads to more realistic approaches and ownership of a project.
4. Joint initiatives lead to better results; the engagement of all partners is vital to achieve meaningful results.
5. Government buy-in is a must to achieve impact and ensure longer-term sustainability.
6. Policies largely depend on personalities rather than on established systems.
7. Networking is important to ensure continuous improvements.
8. Traffickers and exploiters will continue to operate. Gaps in law enforcement remain and lacking knowledge of laws among migrants still needs to be dealt with.
9. Short term actions are useful, but creating a more favorable environment provides longer term impact.
10. ILO's support has been vital for putting together strategic development plans.

The project has generated several **good practices** which would be worth mentioning, but the two key ones quite obviously are:

1. The formalisation of a cooperation proposal at the highest level through signature of a Letter of Understanding as done in Thailand with the Department of Employment. More than just a declaration of good intentions, the LoU confirms the commitment of the Thai government to engage in a number of activities with ILO in order to jointly work on combating illegal recruitment practices and protection of migrant workers.
2. The definition of integrated migration and development strategic plans which formalize the recognition of the importance of overseas migration in the overall development of a region. In the Philippines, the La Union Migration & Development Strategic Plan takes into consideration the perspective of migrants and their families as well as their own associations, local government units at the provincial, city, town and barangay levels, and public/state, non-government and other service providers.

Based on the above analysis and conclusions, the evaluator would like to make the following **recommendations**:

**To ILO and project partners** for the remainder of the project (April-May)

1. Follow-up on all pending issues and consolidate ownership of acquired results. While a continuation of activities appears to be secured at the level of the Technical Working Group of the DOE in Thailand as part of the LoU, the ownership and continuation of the MDT in Petchabun remains questionable. A follow-up visit to bring together the team one more time before project closure could help to establish a tentative work plan on activities to be implemented. In the Philippines, the project team should assist the provincial government of Ilocos Sur and Nueva Ecija in the further processing of their respective migration and development plans. The plans have now been formulated and a meeting with the local governments concerned are scheduled to present the plan and advocate for its adoption and eventual reintegration in local development plans. In La Union, a provincial workshop with Municipal Mayors and local planners will be convened early May by Kanlungan Center Foundation and the provincial Government to assist municipal government in integrating the La Union Migration and Development Plan in municipal development plans. The process supports the provincial implementation

of the plan. Per discussion with the Provincial Planning and Development Officer, some aspects of the migration plan have been integrated in the updated provincial development plan. Same process will proceed in the case of Ilocos Sur and Nueva Ecija.

2. Prepare a comprehensive **Exit Strategy**, clearly pointing out what needs to be done, where, when and by who in the months following the project closure to maintain the benefits of the interventions, further advance the impact of all activities undertaken and suggest options for longer-term sustainability.
3. Report results, impact and conditions for sustainability to higher levels (“Policy/advocacy”) of authority.

#### **To ILO (after project end)**

4. Consolidate project results through other ongoing and/or future interventions. In Thailand, the TRIANGLE project provides a perfect opportunity to consolidate the achievements of the project in working with the TWG of the DOE.

#### **To Authorities**

##### ***National level:***

5. Further develop activities in the framework of the LOU signed with ILO (Thailand, DOE) and further develop the integrated services model in possibly tapping into the EU Migration project (Philippines, OWWA)

##### ***Local/provincial level:***

6. Consolidate & expand MDT and/or MSWG while seeking further assistance for capacity building.

#### **To Returnees**

7. Organize self-help groups and/or cooperatives/associations to extend assistance to new returnees as well as guidance to new migrants with the support of the NGOs
8. Seek assistance from other donor initiatives to expand the start-ups generated by the project (with NGO support or group leader initiative)
9. Continue filing legal action against traffickers and/or illegal recruiters collectively

#### **To the European Union**

10. Allow the new Migration project (hosted by NEDA) to engage in further support in the provinces where this project has been operating (PHI)
11. Allow the project on Public Finance Management for LGUs to support provincial governments in the development of integrated plans (PHI)
12. Include the returnees as a target group in the “Justice for all” project (PHI)
13. Include Migration as a key issue under the Governance component of the Policy Dialogue Support Facility (THA)



## 2 Project Background

---

The following sections will briefly summarize the project by providing an outline of the environment in which the project has been initiated, its objectives, an overview of the management & implementation structure and a succinct description of activities per area of intervention as defined in the Contribution Agreement signed in December 2008 (Annex I) and the Logical Framework Matrix (LFM).

These sections are therefore presented as a *reminder of the main features* of the Project.

### 2.1 Project environment

Since 2005, approximately 300 migration-related projects in non-EU countries have been funded by the European Commission, amounting to a value of €800 million. In the framework of the EU's "Global Approach to Migration and Mobility", the main areas covered include legal migration, irregular migration and trafficking in human beings, migration and development, international protection and asylum.

The project "Going back – moving on: Economic and Social Empowerment of Migrants including Victims of Trafficking returned from the EU and Neighbouring Countries Project" is one of them and was launched with the objective to provide assistance in Thailand and the Philippines, which both are major source countries of migrants seeking foreign employment. The number of Thai and Filipino migrants working legally and/or illegally in Europe is estimated to be of one million (plus or minus depending on information sources), of which women are the largest migrant group, with a concentration in the services sector (restaurants, bars, private homes) in which exploitation seems to be a common practice.

The project was intended to build on other experiences of ILO related to the reintegration of migrants returning from distressed work conditions (ILO-HSF reintegration project) as well as on strategies, experiences and tools developed under the ILO-IPEC "Mekong sub-regional project to combat trafficking in children and women", the ILO projects "Mobilizing Action for the Protection of Domestic Workers from Forced Labour and Trafficking in South East Asia" and "Combatting Trafficking in Children South Asia" operating under the framework of ILO's strategies on Labour Migration.

### 2.2 Objectives and scope of the project

The overall objective of the project is:

*"to contribute to the reduction of labour and sexual exploitation of migrants including victims of trafficking through support to a humane return and reintegration process emphasizing economic and social empowerment."*

The (specific) objectives of the project are described as being:

***Institutional Development:*** *"improving the capacities of service providers to return and reintegrate migrants who have experienced labour and sexual exploitation through enhanced coordination and referral among focal agencies and key stakeholders" (Specific Objective 1),*  
*and*

**Direct Assistance:** “*assisting and economically/ socially empowering return migrants in Thailand and in the Philippines who have experienced labour and sexual exploitation to protect them from further exploitation including re-trafficking*” (Specific Objective 2).

## **2.3 Planned results**

The results expected were set out in the Logical Framework Matrix as being:

### **1. Institutional Development**

*R1.1: The knowledge base on return and reintegration between Asia and Europe and neighbouring countries has been improved;*

*R1.2: The coordination and referral mechanisms between destination and origin countries have been improved;*

### **2. Direct Assistance**

*R2.1: Return migrants in Thailand and in the Philippines who have experienced labour and sexual exploitation including trafficking from the EU and neighbouring countries are provided with or referred to appropriate services prior to return and upon their immediate return to countries of origin;*

*R2.2: Long-term and sustainable socio-economic reintegration support is provided to return migrants from Thailand and the Philippines.*

Although indicators were identified to measure the achievement of these results, they were not quantified. The narrative section of the project document only refers to 1.000 final beneficiaries.

## **2.4 Planned activities**

To achieve Results 1.1 and 1.2 above, the activities planned were:

- 1.1.1 the production of a baseline / rapid assessment including estimates on the number of official returnees and self-returnees and existing practices in the area of return and reintegration between EU, neighbouring countries and Thailand/Philippines;
- 1.1.2 mapping of relevant service providers and the distribution of a digital directory (CD-ROM);
- 1.1.3 research focussing on key trends of migration and return migration between Thailand/Philippines and the EU and neighbouring countries emphasizing the quality of existing services, good practices and gaps from the perspective of returnees and service providers;
- 1.1.4 the development and distribution of information/campaign materials for migrants in their own language, providing contact points and an overview of support networks and assistance available in countries of destination and origin;
- 1.1.5 systematic information sharing through the establishment of a website for migrants and service providers;
- 1.1.6 the development and dissemination of project information materials;
  
- 1.2.1 the organisation of an experts meeting on return and reintegration to take stock of current practices and explore innovative strategies;
- 1.2.2 a three day consultation and coordination workshop for key service providers to enhance collaboration and establish linkages between regions;
- 1.2.3 the establishment of systematic inter-regional referral mechanisms/guidelines emphasizing case management and alternative livelihood opportunities;

- 1.2.4 the development of a training manual and the implementation of a three day pilot training course for service providers to improve pre-return and post-return mechanisms and services;
- 1.2.5 the implementation of local training courses for service providers in Thailand and in the Philippines to enhance local economic reintegration services and processes;
- 1.2.6 the mobilization of selected workers and employer's organizations to address labour exploitation and trafficking of migrant workers;
- 1.2.7 the identification and mobilization of private sector companies in Thailand and in the Philippines to offer employment opportunities to returning migrants;
- 1.2.8 study tours for social/out-reach workers from selected service providers to learn more about pre-return and reintegration programmes and services;
- 1.2.9 the facilitation of online connections between service providers in Europe and neighbouring countries and the Philippines and Thailand.

The activities foreseen for Results 2.1 and 2.2 were:

- 2.1.1 the coordination of initial counselling and other services prior to return of migrants;
  - 2.1.2 facilitating and supporting the repatriation of migrants who have experienced labour and sexual exploitation;
  - 2.1.3 providing community out-reach and awareness raising about available support in countries of origin;
  - 2.1.4 providing immediate individualized assistance to returned migrants, including referral services focusing on temporary shelter, medical services and psycho-social counselling;
  - 2.1.5 conducting intake and family/community assessments and developing individual reintegration plans;
  - 2.1.6 providing reintegration "start-up and return with dignity grants" for recent returnees in need of financial assistance;
  - 2.1.7 providing opportunities to returned migrants to meet with others who have shared the same experiences;
  - 2.1.8 providing legal assistance for filing complaints against exploitation and abuse for possible prosecution and compensation.
- 
- 2.2.1 providing systematic career counselling and occupational guidance in accordance with labour market demand and individual aspirations;
  - 2.2.2 providing or referring returnees to technical/vocational and sustainable livelihood training courses;
  - 2.2.3 providing seed money (grants) for returnees who desire to set up their own business after training and development of a business plan;
  - 2.2.4 providing pro-active job placement support to returnees;
  - 2.2.5 providing information and training on safe legal re-migration for employment;
  - 2.2.6 providing practical life skills trainings;
  - 2.2.7 conducting family reorientation programmes.

## **2.5 Planned organisational arrangements for implementation**

### **2.5.1 Management and Implementation Team**

The proposed (and budgeted) set-up for implementation was:

- A Senior Programme Officer (PO) responsible for the overall management and implementation of the project based in the Regional Office for Asia and Pacific (ROAP);
- Two National Project Coordinators (NPCs) and two Administrative Assistants based respectively in Thailand and in the Philippines;
- Technical support and backstopping provided by the ROAP (Migration Specialist, Child Labour Specialist, Gender Specialist, Workers Specialist, and Employers Specialist) and by International and Local consultants.

The main project office was to be hosted in the ILO Regional Office in Bangkok and a second office was to be established in Manila.

## 2.5.2 Project Funding arrangements

The project budget is €2.199.813, of which 79.95% EU funding, i.e. €1.758.813.

Payment arrangements are defined in Article 4 of the Contribution Agreement and include a first pre-financing payment, two interim instalments and a final payment.

## 2.5.3 Project partners

The **primary** partners selected by ILO were:

- the National Operation Centre for the Prevention and Suppression of Human Trafficking under the administration of the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security in Thailand, and
- the Overseas Workers and Welfare Administration (OWWA) attached to the Department of Labour and Employment in the Philippines.

The role and involvement of the main partners were defined as follows:

- In Thailand:
  - To be a focal point for providing direct assistance to trafficked returnees,
  - To improve/support the operation and coordination at all levels in order to provide better services to target groups, and
  - To ensure capacity building of key staff of the Operations Centre and service providers throughout the country.
- In the Philippines:
  - To provide immediate welfare assistance to migrants in distress in the country of destination and immediately after return, and
  - To facilitate the social and economic reintegration of exploited returned migrants through provision of, or referral for, appropriate services in coordination with its partner organizations, networks and local offices.

Due to shift in focus in Thailand towards half of the project period, the project partnered with the Department of Employment (this was made due to pressing concern about recruitment of seasonal workers to Sweden and Poland).

## 2.5.4 Monitoring system

Section 1.8.4 of the Annex I to the Contribution Agreement provides an overview of the “Procedures for follow-up and internal/external evaluation” which ILO intended to adopt for the project.

Section 1.8.6 specifies that monitoring backstopping will also be provided by the technical backstopping unit in ILO Geneva.

Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs) are listed in the LFM, but not quantified.

### **3 Evaluation Background and Methodology**

---

As per ILO's policy governing technical cooperation project cycle management, the present final independent evaluation is a mandatory exercise.

The scope and modalities of the evaluation have been defined in accordance with ILO's evaluation procedures in coordination with the Governments of Thailand and the Philippines and the European Union's Delegations in both countries.

The scope of the evaluation is to examine the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the project, with a particular focus on good points and achievements, areas for improvement and recommendations for sustainability. It also aims at assessing the extent to which the project has taken into consideration the recommendations of the Mid-Term Evaluation undertaken in 2010 and at identifying possible lessons learnt and good practices for learning and knowledge sharing purposes.

The full Terms of Reference of the Evaluation are set out in Appendix 1.

The Final Evaluation is managed by ILO Regional Evaluation Officer, Ms Pamornrat Pringsulaka of ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP).

The evaluation has been conducted by Mr. Pierre Mahy, External Evaluator, over a six-week period from February to March 2012 and comprised field visits to Thailand and to the Philippines as well as inputs from the consultant's base to undertake desk research and prepare this Final report.

Preliminary findings and proposed recommendations were presented and discussed during a stakeholders workshop right after the project final Conference in Manila on 28 March 2012.

The work of the Final Evaluation takes place over four phases, in accordance with the terms of reference:

| <b><u>Phase</u></b>               | <b><u>Planned Result</u></b>  | <b><u>Planned Schedule</u></b>        |
|-----------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Inception phase                | Initial information gathered on the project – desk review of documents completed and the Inception Report prepared.   | 26-28 February                        |
| 2. Field Phase in Thailand        | Discussions with project team, beneficiaries and partners completed and assessment of Thai component of the project made.   | 5-13 March                            |
| 3. Field Phase in the Philippines | Discussions with project team, beneficiaries and partners completed and assessment of the Filipino component of the project made; Preliminary assessment completed and findings presented in Manila | 14-28 March                           |
| 4. Reporting phase                | Preparation of the draft final report completed and draft report submitted.<br>Incorporating the comments of stakeholders into the final report.<br>Final report and Evaluation Summary submitted.  | 1-10 April<br>26-27 April<br>30 April |

The work plan for the evaluation comprised:

- Review of relevant documentation
- Interviews with ILO programme management, coordinators and technical experts
- Interviews with the project partners, beneficiary organizations, individual project beneficiaries (migrants), relevant authorities and other key informants
- Preparation of the draft final report
- Incorporation of comments into the draft report and preparation of the Final Report

Field visits to meet with project beneficiaries in both countries were undertaken to the major locations where the project has been working, i.e. Petchabun province in Thailand, La Union and Ilocos Sur in the Philippines. Nueva Ecija in the Philippines was not visited due to time constraints, but findings would have been similar to those made in the visited provinces.

For respondents that were available and based in Thailand and in the Philippines, consultations took place in the form of physical meetings; where this was not feasible, telephone and e-mail communication was used. Formal questionnaires were not sent out to potential informants due to the typical reluctance of respondents to express detailed or sensitive views in writing.

The tools employed were documentary analysis, identification of relevant evaluation questions, semi-structured interviews to elicit the facts relevant to the evaluation questions and synthesis of findings, conclusions and recommendations in this report.

The ILO evaluation norms, standards and ethics have been followed throughout implementation of the assignment.

The list of meetings / consultations held by the Evaluator is set out in Appendix 2.

The evaluation report provides answers to the questions suggested in the Evaluation Terms of Reference, which the consultant slightly edited/amended in the Inception Report accepted by the Evaluation Manager on 1 March 2012.

The Evaluator received good cooperation and assistance during the entire assignment and expresses his thanks to all who contributed to its findings.

## 4 Main Findings

---

### 4.1 Activities implemented

#### 4.1.1 Operational issues

##### *Human Resources*

The project secretary for the main office in Bangkok started on 1 February 2009.

The two National Project Coordinators (NPCs) in Thailand and in the Philippines officially started on 1 June 2009, whereas the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) / Programme Officer (PO) only joined the project on 30 September 2009.

The Administrative Assistants and the project secretary for the Philippines joined the project in June 2009.

The CTA/PO left the project in December 2009, leaving a “gap” until 1 March 2010 when a second PO took up duties. A further replacement was made in November 2011 after departure of the second PO in June 2011, thus creating another “gap” of 4 months. In the periods where there has been no CTA/PO, project management duties were assumed by the Regional Migration Specialist of the ROAP, who throughout the project has had a technical back-stopping function. The NPC of the Philippines became the third PO for a period of 3 months until January 2012. Since then, the project does not have an official CTA/PO anymore, but is again supervised in its no-cost extension phase by the Senior Migration Specialist.

A total of 262 International consultant man-days have been contracted (against a budget of 175 man-days) of which:

- 60 man-days for the provision of different technical inputs and assistance during the 4 months extension period (February-May 2012) by the ex-(3<sup>rd</sup>) CTA/PO of the project;
- Several more specific shorter inputs during implementation, such as for the preparation of concept notes, the preparation of training programmes and curricula, the coordination of meetings, etc.

##### *Premises*

The main project office was established in the ILO Regional Office for Asia and Pacific in February 2009.

The Philippines project office was established in June 2009 in the premises of the ILO office in Manila.

#### 4.1.2 Getting started

Between the official start of the project on 1 February 2009 and the official recruitment of the CTA at the end of September 2009, initial activities were developed by the NPC for Thailand (initially working on a different budget arrangement until June 2009).

Preliminary activities included for example:

- Finalizing the project set up (hiring of staff and administrative arrangements in both Thailand and the Philippines);
- Drafting of an initial work plan (revised in August 2009) and organizing several consultations with stakeholders;



- Drafting Terms of Reference and selecting consultants for the initial research studies, for the background papers on Thai and Filipino migrants in Europe;
- Initiating the compilation of a draft directory of service providers;
- Providing assistance to workers returning from Sweden in their compensation claim process;
- Etc.

Despite of this preliminary work, overall the project ran into some delays due to the absence of a CTA upon inception.

#### **4.1.3 Activities implemented in the field of Institutional Development**

The following sections are not meant to be a complete overview of all outputs but will present the **main outputs** generated for each **planned** activity relating to the four expected results as reported by the project.

*R1.1: The knowledge base on return and reintegration between Asia and Europe and neighbouring countries has been improved.*

- 1.1.1 Production of a baseline study / rapid assessment including estimates on the number of official returnees and self-returnees and existing practices in the area of return and reintegration between EU, neighbouring countries and Thailand/Philippines.
  - Activity merged with 1.1.3 due to complementarities of the issues to be covered and advantage of having one authorship for the compilation of information (further details under 1.1.3)
- 1.1.2 Mapping of relevant service providers and distribution of a digital directory (CD-ROM).
  - A list of contacts of service providers in Thailand and EU countries (Sweden, Germany, Switzerland, Poland and Czech Republic) was printed and launched on 30 November 2010 (“Handbook for Labour Migration to Europe”).
  - In the Philippines a directory of all service providers has been prepared and was released in March 2012.
- 1.1.3 Research focussing on key trends of migration and return migration between Thailand/Philippines and the EU and neighbouring countries emphasizing the quality of existing services, good practices and gaps from the perspective of returnees and service providers.
  - Activity merged with 1.1.1 (see above)
  - Draft reports covering Thailand and the Philippines were prepared in the second half of 2009 and circulated for discussion at the Expert Group Meeting in December 2009.
  - A draft background paper in European countries was also prepared.
  - Final documents available are:
    - “From Asia to Europe and back” (A rapid assessment of Thai workers travelling to and from the European Union, and available assistance)
    - “The Philippines and return migration: Rapid appraisal of the return and reintegration policies and service delivery”
- 1.1.4 Development and distribution of information/campaign materials for migrants in their own language, providing contact points and an overview of support networks and assistance available in countries of destination and origin.

- 5.000 pens with information of key service providers in countries of origin and destination were distributed to Thai migrant workers and service providers in the EU and Thailand;
  - 10.000 short flyers and posters regarding safe migration including information on pre-departure requirements, legal channels for working overseas and costs involved in migration were distributed;
  - 3.000 copies of safe migration manual in Thai version were produced and distributed in selected provinces;
  - An Information Kit for Thai migrant workers was completed on 30 November 2010 (“Handbook for Labour Migration to Europe”);
  - Checklist and migration booklet based on facts from Petchabun province
- 1.1.5 In the Philippines, information materials for migrants are largely available with the government agencies. In addition the project developed and produced a directory of service providers for Filipino migrant workers (HELP Line), with an initial printing of 1,000 copies and a reprint of 3,500 copies. A Guide for Filipinos in France is being developed by the Filipino community with support from the project.. Systematic information sharing through the establishment of a website for migrants and service providers.
- An on-line facility for accessing services and reporting complaints linked to the existing online system of the Ministry of Labour is being developed in support of the implementation of the ILO-DOE LoU in Thailand. At the time of the Evaluation the facility was still under development and said to be nearing completion. Training for complaint taking officials is scheduled to take place in April and the system will then be available on line.
  - In the Philippines on-line facilities were already available and operational.
- 1.1.6 Development and dissemination of project information materials.
- A project brief with basic information has been prepared (1.000 copies distributed)
  - A project webpage has been created on the ILO website. The access link is [http://www.ilo.org/asia/whatwedo/projects/WCMS\\_124750/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/asia/whatwedo/projects/WCMS_124750/lang--en/index.htm)
  - The AP-Magnet (ILO sponsored Asia-Pacific Multi-Stakeholder online forum for professionals and practitioners to share knowledge on migration and anti-human trafficking issues) has been developed and launched in November 2010: <http://apmagnet.ilobkk.or.th>
  - “Stories” of Thai returnees (cases from Poland, Sweden and Spain) have been published in 2011. In the Philippines, migrant stories are being compiled by journalists and will be released in a publication to be uploaded on the ILO website and distributed to service providers, migrants associations, etc.
  - Video presentations of case studies in Thailand and in the Philippines have been produced.
  - Verbal communication from project partners provided further dissemination of project information among migrants and returnees.

*R1.2: The coordination and referral mechanisms between destination and origin countries have been improved.*

- 1.2.1 Organisation of an experts meeting on return and reintegration to take stock of current practices and explore innovative strategies.
- Renamed as “project Advisory Group Meeting” to better reflect the project need for practitioners viewpoints and suggestions, the meeting took place in Bangkok on 2-3 December 2009 with 22 participants from Thai and Philippine government agencies, trade unions, academic institutions, non-government organizations in Europe, international organizations, the EU Delegation in Bangkok and the project team.
  - The meeting resulted in the following key findings and comments<sup>1</sup>:
    1. Cooperation at destination needs to be strengthened. There are networks between EU and Thailand and the Philippines (e.g. Baan Ying and Batis) which could be tapped into and further developed;
    2. In Thailand a pilot inter-ministerial (+civil society, TU, EO etc.) group on return and reintegration could be set up;
    3. Trade unions in EU and Asia are cooperating and the project could tap into this cooperation and further the networks. The strength of the unions in many of the EU countries can strengthen bargaining power for migrant workers;
    4. Action orientated research could be conducted to improve the knowledgebase on return and reintegration;
    5. One of the issues that can come out of the project is more conceptual clarity on the issues of return and reintegration;
    6. Geographical differences in EU need to be taken into consideration;
    7. There is a EU framework that can be used as a platform;
    8. A database should be set up and the project should further the work on the referral system that was developed under the HSF project. There is a need to further establish referral systems nation wide as well as at destination;
    9. Documentation of best practices would be beneficial to find models to replicate.
- 1.2.2 Three day consultation and coordination workshop for key service providers to enhance collaboration and establish linkages between regions.
- A meeting for key service providers was held separately in Thailand and the Philippines:
    - On 16-18 February 2010 in Bangkok, Thailand with 20 Thai and European service providers
    - On 21-23 April 2010 in Tagaytay City, Philippines with about 30 participants.
  - Both meetings resulted in a number of key suggestions and recommendations and generated follow-up meetings among European-based service providers (e.g. in Sweden, in Germany), a senior level mission by the Thai Government to Sweden and Poland in September-October 2010, a Thai service providers meeting attended by service providers and migrants (28 February 2011), several Philippine service providers meetings organised by the Batis Center for Women, etc.
- 1.2.3 Establishment of systematic inter-regional referral mechanisms/guidelines emphasizing case management and alternative livelihood opportunities.

---

<sup>1</sup> Meeting Report of the Advisory Group Meeting on Economic and Social Empowerment of Thai and Filipino Migrants including victims of Trafficking returned from EU and neighbouring countries (Bangkok, 2-3 December 2009)

- A meeting between EU and Philippine service providers was held on 18 June 2010 at the ILO International Training Centre in Turin, Italy to further discuss ways towards establishing systematic inter-regional referral/guidelines between the EU and the Philippines. The commitment of two Italian trade unions (CGIL, INA-CISL) to assist Filipino migrant was obtained.
  - Draft Guidelines on inter-regional mechanisms between the Philippines and selected pilot areas in Europe (Italy and France) were developed. The preliminary paper on improving referral mechanisms was presented to stakeholders in Manila in September 2011. It was then felt premature to produce Guidelines as such and the project focussed on looking at possible opportunities for collaboration rather than defining a full set of guidelines. In France, 3 unions eventually agreed to support Filipino migrants to inform them on laws and provide legal assistance. This is now being followed up by the Embassy of the Philippines in Paris.
  - On the Thai side, a team of service providers from Petchabun province went to Sweden to gather information and strengthen collaboration. The intentions were declared without however formal commitments. The focus in Thailand was oriented towards internal collaboration and referral mechanisms and a Multi-Disciplinary Team (MDT) has been established in the province of Petchabun.
- 1.2.4 Development of a training manual and implementation of a three day pilot training course for service providers to improve pre-return and post-return mechanisms and services.
- A training manual was developed in collaboration with the ILO Training Centre in Turin, pilot tested in a training conducted on 14-17 June 2010 in Turin for 27 participants from Thailand, the Philippines and Italy, Sweden, Poland, Spain and Cyprus.
- 1.2.5 Implementation of local training courses for service providers in Thailand and in the Philippines to enhance local economic reintegration services and processes.
- the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) in the Philippines organized training courses on 22-26 November 2010 for anti-trafficking focal persons, on 20-24 February 2011 for local service providers on facilitating recovery and social and economic reintegration, etc.
  - Training for Migrants Desk Officers of Ilocos Sur and Nueva Ecija was organized in Baguio City (March 7-9, 2012) and for La Union, also in Baguio City (March 12-14, 2012) incl. Municipal Social Welfare & Development Officers (MSWDO) on “Enhancing the capacity of Service Providers to facilitate the Economic Empowerment of Returned Migrant Workers;; Local Public Employment Service Officers were associated to the training in order to provide them with the necessary skills in assisting returning migrants.
  - In Thailand, the Asian Research Center for Migration (ARCM) developed the training curricula for a) returned and prospective migrants and b) for executive officials of the Ministry of Labour. The curriculum for migrants was tested in Petchabun on 8-10 October 2011 and the MDT Team of Petchabun was trained on 9 December 2011; the curriculum for officials was put on hold at the ministry’s request on the basis that it was not needed.
  - A workshop on Enhancement of Recruitment Standard on Overseas Employment was organized in Bangkok on 5-6 January 2012
- 1.2.6 Mobilization of selected workers and employer’s organizations to address labour exploitation and trafficking of migrant workers.

- CGIL and CISL (see above point 1.2.3) from Italy have confirmed their commitment to support migrants from the Philippines. This mainly refers to the provision of legal assistance and is based on a declaration of good intentions, without formal agreement (yet). In the February 2012 meeting in Rome, the ILO Office has offered to convene a meeting among Philippine authorities, migrant associations, Italian trade unions and service providers
  - ILO has committed to follow-up on this matter.
  - A meeting on Developing linkages, cooperation and coordination between Philippines and French Service providers held in Paris on 9-11 February 2012 generated the interest and willingness of 3 French Labour Unions (CGT, CFDT and FO) to provide migrant workers with legal assistance. A regular exchange between trade unions and migrants association will be facilitated by the Philippine Embassy with a view to developing a more formal and sustained collaboration between them. Thai Unions have been contacted but did not show any real interest due to other priorities (Focus on own people). European Unions have not been contacted by the Thai component of the project.
- 1.2.7 Identification and mobilization of private sector companies in Thailand and in the Philippines to offer employment opportunities to returning migrants.
- Nothing particular in this regard has been done neither in Thailand nor in the Philippines.
  - In the Philippines however OWWA approached the Employers Federation to possibly offer employment opportunities to a number of Romanian returnees (without intervention of the project).
- 1.2.8 Study tours for social/out-reach workers from selected service providers to learn more about pre-return and reintegration programmes and services.
- Study tours were organized in Thailand (19 February 2010) for Filipino, Thai and European service providers, in Italy (21-22 July 2011) for Thai and Filipino government officials and NGOs
- 1.2.9 Facilitation of online connections between service providers in Europe and neighbouring countries and the Philippines and Thailand.
- No particular activity, except for the on-line facility described under 1.1.5 for Thailand. Considering the fact that most service providers have means and facilities to communicate with counterparts, the setting-up of on-line connections was not deemed to be necessary.

#### **4.1.4 Activities implemented in the field of Direct Assistance**

*R2.1: Return migrants in Thailand and in the Philippines who have experienced labour and sexual exploitation including trafficking from the EU and neighbouring countries are provided with or referred to appropriate services prior to return and upon their immediate return to countries of origin.*

As for 4.1.3, the following sections will only provide examples of activities implemented and are not meant to be exhaustive.

- 2.1.1 Coordination of initial counselling and other services prior to return of migrants.

- Counselling and other services to Thai returning migrants were provided by the Thai Labour Campaign, the Thai Women Network in Europe and Thai Embassies in Sweden and Poland.
  - Filipino returning migrants were assisted by the OWWA Welfare Office in Cyprus and in Lebanon. Pre-return services and/or counselling are provided by OWWA Welfare Officers in destination countries. These officers, of which OWWA has 37, are usually housed at the embassies and consulates of the Philippines abroad.
- 2.1.2 Facilitation and support for the repatriation of migrants who have experienced labour and sexual exploitation.
- OWWA assisted 113 project beneficiaries from Lebanon, Romania, Jordan, Cyprus and Albania through the Philippine Overseas Labour Office (POLO)
  - TLC supported victims of labour exploitation upon their arrival from Poland and Spain in facilitating group discussions, organizing a community forum and accompanying them to meet the DOE officials.
- 2.1.3 Provision of community out-reach and awareness raising about available support in countries of origin.
- In Thailand, outreach activities have been undertaken by the Thai Labour Campaign (TLC) in Udon Thani province (Community Consultation “Solution to Unfair Recruitment Practices” 27-29 July 2010) and in five north eastern provinces..
  - In the Philippines, the Kanlungan Centre Foundation has conducted a mapping exercise in La Union province and the Batis Centre for Women has undertaken outreach and identification activities in Metro Manila and other northern provinces of Bulacan, Nueva Ecija and Ilocos Sur
- 2.1.4 Provision of immediate individualized assistance to returned migrants, including referral services focusing on temporary shelter, medical services and psycho-social counselling.
- Referral to cover medical and health needs was provided to returnees in the Philippines, as well as airport assistance, stress debriefing counselling, etc.
  - No activity in Thailand
- 2.1.5 Intake and family/community assessments and development of individual reintegration plans.
- 2.1.6 Provision of reintegration “start-up and return with dignity grants” for recent returnees in need of financial assistance.
- Intake and family/community assessments and development of individual reintegration plan are part of the case management procedures observed by implementing partners in the Philippines. In Thailand, TLC and Petchabun province did carry out individual assessments through meetings and home visits. Thereafter, livelihood development planning was made jointly with the returnees.
- 2.1.7 Provision of opportunities to returned migrants to meet with others who have shared the same experiences.
- In Thailand, TLC established peer group support in Khon Kaen, Udon Thani and Ubonratchathani provinces.
  - In the Philippines, Kanlungan facilitated support group sessions in Burgos and Naguilian
  - The project organized a workshop on 21-24 November 2011 among beneficiaries from Metro Manila, La Union, Ilocos Sur and Nueva Ecija (24 participants)

- 2.1.8 Provision of legal assistance for filing complaints against exploitation and abuse for possible prosecution and compensation.
- Assistance (legal advice, counselling and orientation/training) has been provided to 151 Thai returnees from Sweden of which 118 sued the recruiting companies, 2 returnees from Spain to file their case with the Central Labour Court.
  - OWWA has assisted Filipino returnees from Romania with their legal cases, both in Romania (against the employer) and in the Philippines (against the recruiter). The project also facilitated a case conference with the Inter-agency Council Against Trafficking (IACAT) on possibilities of filing criminal charges for trafficking against their recruiters in the Philippines.

*R2.2: Long-term and sustainable socio-economic reintegration support is provided to return migrants from Thailand and the Philippines.*

- 2.2.1 Provision of systematic career counselling and occupational guidance in accordance with labour market demand and individual aspirations.
- OWWA organized training workshop for a total of 143 women returnees having expressed interest in setting up a small business.
  -
- 2.2.2 Provision of or referral for returnees for technical/vocational and sustainable livelihood training courses.
- A sustainable livelihood training course has been provided by TLC to returnees (with families) in North East Thailand.
  - Livelihood courses have been provided in the Philippines by OWWA (starting a business, basic accounting, technical training) and Kanlungan (financial literacy courses), but of particular interest is the seminar-workshop on Building Peer Support for Return Migrants organized on 22-25 November 2011.
- 2.2.3 Provision of seed money (grants) for returnees who desire to set up their own business after training and development of a business plan.
- Training on organic farming was provided to 8 returnees in Yasotorn Province and financial support was granted to start up their activities in Khon Kaen, Udontani and Ubonratchatani (TLC)
  - In Petchabun province, 24 returnees from Sweden and Laos were provided with financial assistance to set up their business after training.
  - In Ilocos Sur province, financial assistance has been provided to returnees from Jordan and Lebanon through Batis Center for Women
  - Kalungan provided similar training schemes and grants to returnees from Lebanon, Syria and Cyprus
  - OWWA provided the same kind of support to returnees from Romania
- 2.2.4 Provision of pro-active job placement support to returnees.
- No activity has taken place neither in Thailand nor in the Philippines.
- 2.2.5 Provision of information and training on safe legal re-migration for employment.
- A Community-based awareness raising campaign on safe migration was carried by TLC out in the provinces of Udon Thani and Khon Kaen with the result that candidates for migration called upon TLC to seek advice prior to employment.

- Pre-departure Training Workshops for job-seekers were organized in Chaiyapoom (26-30 June 2011) and Udon Thani (5-8 July 2011) by The Oversea Employment Administration (TOEA)
  - Brochures on safe migration and posters have been disseminated to villagers in different locations (Nong Kham, Udontani, Ban Tak, Tak, etc.) reaching out to an estimated 3-3,500 beneficiaries.
  - In the Philippines, the provision of information and training on safe legal re-migration for employment was part of the community outreach done by Kanlungan and Batis
- 2.2.6 Provision of practical life skills trainings.
- Provided both in Thailand and in the Philippines by all partners
- 2.2.7 Family reorientation programmes.
- Limited activity in the Philippines, mainly implemented by Kanlungan
  - No activity in Thailand. Victims of labour exploitation typically return to their families.

#### **4.1.5 Reporting during implementation**

At the time of the present evaluation, the following reports have been produced by the project:

- Flash Report 01 February 2009 – 31 May 2009
- Flash Report 21 November 2009 – 30 June 2010
- Flash Report 16 November 2010 – 15 May 2011
- Interim Narrative Report 01/02/2009 to 20/11/2010
- Interim Narrative Report 20/11/2009 to 15/11/2010
- Interim Narrative Report 16/11/2010 to 15/11/2011
- Mid-Term Self Evaluation Report (January 2011)
- Update on activities in Thailand November 2011 – February 2012

#### **4.1.6 Follow-up and monitoring during implementation**

According to project reports, a 12-months work and monitoring plan to monitor progress on project implementation was agreed during an internal review and planning meeting in Bangkok on 21-23 October 2009.

Minutes of the meeting are not available.

In Thailand and in the Philippines project activities are “monitored” by the NPCs against the defined work plan (time line); the NPCs attended meetings and events but no qualitative formal monitoring has taken place. There is no methodical results measurement system in place and direct impact is not systematically monitored.

### **4.2 Programme design – relevance and strategic fit**

#### ***Consistency with the policy framework of ILO, the EU and government policies***

The overall objective of the project - “*contribute to the reduction of labour and sexual exploitation of migrants including victims of trafficking through support to a humane return and reintegration process emphasizing economic and social empowerment*” - is consistent with the objectives of the EU’s Thematic programme of



cooperation with third countries in the areas of migration and asylum aiming to help third countries to better manage all aspects of migration flows.

The project is also consistent with the ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration and relevant ILO and International Conventions on Migration. It also promotes “Improved dialogue and management of labour migration to benefit both sending and receiving countries and better protect the rights and equal treatment of migrant workers” in accordance with the priorities of Regional Strategy document (IP 2010-2011, RAS 150).

The relevance of the project to the above programmes and frameworks has been well documented in both the Annex I to the Contribution Agreement and in the project’s Mid-Term Self Evaluation Report submitted in January 2011. This evidence will therefore not be replicated here.

In the Philippines, which accounts for more than 3 million overseas workers, the government has at policy level actively encouraged migration for many years and is committed to the welfare of its OFWs, ensuring that their rights and privileges are promoted in accordance with the Overseas Filipinos Act of 1995. OWWA has the mandate to protect and promote the well-fare of OFW’s and their dependents, but policies and measures affecting migrants are decided by a number of different government agencies without appropriate coordination and a lack of collaboration with local government units. The Institutional Development part of the project (Specific Objective 1) aiming at enhancing the coordination and referral among strategic agencies both within the country as with the destination countries is thus very relevant in the Philippines.

With an average of 150.000 migrants per year (143.795 in 2010)<sup>2</sup>, Thailand’s outbound migration is much smaller than in the Philippines. The legal framework is provided by the Recruiters and Job-Seekers Protection Act of 1985, revised in 1994 and in 2001 which the Thailand Overseas Employment Administration (TOEA) is mandated to enforce. Enforcement however remains a major issue and exploitation of migrants, especially seasonal workers, has increased in recent years. The project’s objectives therefore are in line with the need to better protect migrants from abusive recruitment processes and exploitation or trafficking.

### ***Coherence with previous, on-going and future initiatives***

The project is coherent with other EU funded and/or ILO managed projects in the area of migration and builds on the experience and knowledge developed by ILO through the reintegration of migrants returning from distressed work conditions (ILO-HSF reintegration project) as well as on strategies, experiences and tools developed under the ILO-IPEC ”Mekong sub-regional project to combat trafficking in children and women”, the ILO projects “Mobilizing Action for the Protection of Domestic Workers from Forced Labour and Trafficking in South East Asia” and “Combatting Trafficking in Children South Asia” operating under the framework of ILO’s strategies on Labour Migration.

The project is also coherent with the ASEAN Declaration on the Protection and Promotion of the Rights of Migrant Workers signed by the ASEAN Heads of States/Governments at the 12<sup>th</sup> ASEAN Summit on 13 January 2007.

As far as Thailand is concerned, the 3 August (2010) “Declaration for Work with Dignity” of the Ministry of Labour stepping up efforts to better protect migrant workers reinforced the relevance of the Going back – Moving on project.

In the Philippines, the project will furthermore feed into the new upcoming EUR 3 million Migration project being launched by the EU “Improving the International Migration Management System of the Philippines” for which the Action Fiche explicitly refers to the “Going back – Moving On” project as a reference project from which lessons might be drawn.

### ***Strategic options and justification of the implementation strategy***

---

<sup>2</sup> Source: Ministry of Labour, Department of Employment

In absence of a formal formulation study the “Action” document has been prepared on basis of earlier acquired knowledge and understanding of ILO which has led to the identification of three major problems to be addressed:

1. The need for decent livelihoods upon return,
2. The need to return with dignity, and
3. The need for close coordination and knowledge among service providers in the EU, neighbouring countries and Asia.

The proposed strategy addresses the above issues through two main intervention areas: Direct Assistance and Institutional Development. Both are adequate, though partly incomplete in relation to the task involved in addressing the overall objective of the project.

This in particular refers to the absence of a clear “policy/advocacy” plan at the level of national governments and for which ILO has the necessary capacities and standing to encourage necessary improvements to be made where deficiencies exist and policy decisions to be taken to allow progress to be made.

While this has not been foreseen in the original concept of the project, the Memorandum of Understanding signed between ILO and the Ministry of Labour, Department of Employment in Thailand during implementation compensates for this initial strategic weakness in the design, at least for Thailand.

In the case of the Philippines, advocacy under the project was directed at the local governments (in target areas) through integration of migration issues in local governance and development planning. At national level, policies exist but as pointed out in the evaluation, the project contributed to developing a model of “total integrated approach’ to service delivery for migrants as exemplified by OWWA.

### **4.3 Validity of design (logic and coherence)**

This refers to the relevance of activities in order to achieve the planned results.

#### ***Intervention logic and consistency of objectives***

In its design, the intervention logic tends to focus on "longer term socio-economic reintegration" which indeed does not receive sufficient attention in the two countries. It addresses it from a point of view of access to rights and to decent work opportunities.

Most programs on return are limited to the process of return and not to the longer term consequences and implication of it, which are key to ensuring sustainability of return and avoiding risks of further exploitation.

Notwithstanding the above mentioned absence of a “policy/advocacy” plan, the activities designed to achieve the objectives are largely consistent and adequate.

The following weaknesses however have been identified:

- no account appears to have been taken of the well-known fact that capacity building activities only generate a meaningful impact if they can be disseminated and sustained in the long term (organising a seminar and/or producing a report is just an output which needs to be converted into a result and possibly generate a meaningful impact);
- activities are presented in a sequence or list without clearly defined priorities or degree of importance;

- “cross fertilization” activities between Thailand and the Philippines are missing (ILO’s knowledge of both countries should have allowed to identify areas in which Thailand could learn from the Philippines and the Philippines could learn from Thailand);
- No differentiation on implementation modalities in Thailand and in the Philippines have been integrated into the design of activities (the context of outbound migration is different in both countries and activities could have been better “tailored” to the specific needs in each country);
- While the focus has been placed on return and reintegration, the importance of re-migration has not been given enough attention (a high proportion of returnees is interested in re-deployment rather than starting a new life in their home country).

### ***Stakeholder participation in design***

The project has been designed by ILO on basis of the lessons learned from previous projects and ILO activities in the two countries. It is based on ILO’s knowledge of the subject and was developed in consultation and agreement with national stakeholders.

OWWA in the Philippines has been involved in the preparation of the project. This is not the case for the Department of Employment in Thailand as the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security was the original main partner identified for the project.

### ***Realism of the choice and quantity of inputs (financial, human and administrative)***

In order to achieve the scope of work and implement the activities intended to attain the objectives of the programme, ILO proposed a set up in Bangkok and Manila staffed with a Programme Officer, two National Project Officers, administrative/support staff and a range of technical experts (migration, child labour, Gender, etc.) providing the necessary back-up to the implementation team.

While the overall set up appears to be adequate, the suggested input of technical experts (51 man-months over a period of 3 years) has been excessively overstated. The actual input of the technical experts has not been tracked by the project team, but these inputs have been much more limited in time and of sporadic nature.

The budget allocation for the “Direct Assistance” component (EUR 308.000) only represents 14% of the overall budget.

### ***Analysis of assumptions and risks***

The assumptions defined in the LFM of Annex I to the Contribution Agreement relate to:

For Specific Objective 1 (Institutional Development):

- The acknowledgement by recipient countries of the migrant workers’ contribution and the need to protect them from exploitation;
- The political commitment of Thai, Philippine and EU governments to combat labour and sexual exploitation and trafficking;
- The willingness of government and non-government entities to cooperate with each other; and
- The commitment and involvement of all stakeholders.

For Specific Objective 2 (Direct Assistance):

- The fact that victims of exploitation and trafficking seek support and assistance; and
- The availability of services and other forms of assistance.

All assumptions made were of a general nature and proved to be representative of the environment in which the project has been implemented, though the willingness of government and non-government entities to cooperate with each other has been and still is more limited in Thailand than in the Philippines.

The Risk analysis was presented in very positive way on basis of the fact that the project built on an existing project implementation structure developed by ILO with national programme partners in Thailand and in the Philippines.

Further potential risks could have been mentioned in the project proposal, in particular:

- procedural issues which may hinder the implementation of capacity building efforts
- the emergence of conflicting interests between stakeholders
- the potential difficulty to mobilize European and Thai/Philippine employers' organizations, preventing the programme to leverage its interventions and demonstrate the benefits of the activities
- the lack of capacity and financial means of local government structures to sustain efforts and implement required actions.

***Extent to which the nature of the problems originally identified has changed and to which the planned activities have been updated***

The nature of the problems originally known has not changed, but the context in which they are being addressed has (better understanding). Activities 1.1.1 and 1.1.3 having resulted in rapid assessments/appraisals of the situation in each country, one could have expected subsequent activities to be slightly adapted. The different work plans prepared by the project do not deviate from the original design of proposed activities, but some of them have been refined and new ones were added to address current project context (e.g.: the rapid assessment report for the Philippines recommended 'harnessing local government units' as partner; hence, local government engagement was made as a strategy in implementing the action in the Philippines). The project extension was requested to support the initial implementation of the ILO-DOE Agreement in Thailand and the multi-level mechanisms and local plans in the Philippines.

#### **4.4 Results obtained to date – project effectiveness**

***Filed visits provide a better picture of achievements than progress reports***

The different reports produced by the project are essentially activity based and lack a comprehensive results and potential impact analysis. Interim reports only mention facts and the heading "Achievements" in the flash reports is misleading as it only reflects project outputs deriving from the activities implemented.

Planned activities have been adequately implemented and field visits have established that the benefits of the activities have been largely perceived, both at the institutional level as at the level of the returnees.

A number of positive factors have contributed to the successful delivery of activities, in particular the commitment of all project partners, as well as the close cooperation between authorities (national, provincial, local) and NGOs especially in the Philippines.

***Quantifying target groups directly benefiting from the project***

While sections 4.1.3 and 4.1.4 have provided examples of activities undertaken, the following tables present a more detailed overview of the actual number of beneficiaries having directly benefited from the project (Target groups as of 15 March 2012)<sup>3</sup>. These numbers have to be considered in the light of the initial “target” of 1.000 beneficiaries suggested in the project document.

### THAILAND

| Target groups                                 |  | Training | Legal ass. | Econ. support |
|---|--|----------|------------|---------------|
| <b>Service providers</b>                      |  |          |            |               |
| Provincial Committee                          | MDT (Petchabun)  | 25       |            |               |
| District Committee                            | Wichientburi, Petchabun  | 35       |            |               |
| Sub-district Committee                        | Bung-gajab sub-district, Wichientburi, Petchaboon  | 18       |            |               |
| Officials of DOE                              | Officers organized by DOE  | 50       |            |               |
| Community leaders and its network             | Petchabun  | 680      |            |               |
| Community volunteers                          | Volunteers   | 14       |            |               |
| Head of Ministry                              | MOL, MOFA and NCHR – visit to Sweden   | 3        |            |               |
| Staff of key agencies                         | Committee members of DOE- ILO collaboration (20)<br>31 Experts (ARCM expert group)                   | 51       |            |               |
| Recruiting agencies                           | DOE (TOEA) - Code of Conduct   | 36       |            |               |
|   |  |          |            |               |
|   |  |          |            |               |
| <b>Returned migrant workers + job seekers</b> |  |          |            |               |
| Language Skill training (plus safe migration) | Jobseekers (to Korea and Sweden)   | 69       |            |               |
| Legal assistance                              | Returnees (TLC) – court cases<br>542 returnees sue employers with police (150 cases included)        |          | 150        |               |
| Economic self sufficiency                     | Returnees from Sweden (24)<br>Returnees from Laos (8)  | 32       |            | 32            |
| Safe migration orientation                    | Chaiyapoom   | 320      |            |               |
| Pre Departure training                        | Job seekers/migrant workers (640Chaiyapoom (580 male+60 female) 306 Udon Thani (193 male+113 female) | 946      |            |               |
|   |  |          |            |               |
| <b>Community and public</b>                   |  |          |            |               |
|   |  |          |            |               |
| Safe Migration Awareness Campaign             | Petchabun<br>2,063 community members (through meetings, radio broadcast)                             |          |            |               |

### PHILIPPINES

**Target Group for capacity building and improving coordination: Service providers and key**

<sup>3</sup> Data provided by Project Offices in Bangkok and Manila

| <b>migration stakeholders</b>   |  |                               |
|---|--|-------------------------------|
| <b>Type of training</b>   | <b>Participants</b>  | <b>Number of participants</b> |
| Training on the )<br>Mainstreaming and<br>Institutionalization<br>National Referral System<br>(NRS) and the National<br>Reintegration and<br>Reintegration Database<br>(NRRD)<br>Date: November 2010                                    | Social Workers – City/Municipal Social<br>Welfare and Development Office from<br>Region I, Region III, Region IV-A,<br>Region IV-B, and Region IX  | 31                            |
| Training on Facilitating<br>Recovery and Social and<br>Economic Reintegration<br>Date: February 2011  | Social Workers – City/Municipal Social<br>Welfare and Development Office from<br>Region I, III, VII, VIII, IX and X  | 30                            |
| Seminar-Workshop on<br>Building Peer Support for<br>Return Migrants<br>Date: November 22-25,<br>2011  | Project Beneficiaries from Batis Center<br>for Women, Kanlungan Center<br>Foundation and Overseas Workers<br>Welfare Administration  | 29                            |
| Meeting/Roundtable<br>Discussion on “Sharing of<br>Good Practices on Local<br>and Community-Level<br>Mechanisms to Protect and<br>Promote the Rights of<br>Migrant Workers in<br>Thailand and the Philippines<br>Date: January 11, 2012 | DOE- Ministry of Labour , Thailand,<br>POEA, OWWA, NRCO, PESO-<br>Palayan, NGOs and EU Delegation to<br>the Philippines  | 21                            |
| Meeting on Developing a<br>System on Linkages,<br>Cooperation and<br>Coordination between<br>Philippines and French<br>Service Providers Towards<br>Improved Service Delivery<br>for Migrant Workers<br>Date: February 9/11, 2012       | Embassy and consular officials; Labour<br>Attaché; Assistance-to-Nationals<br>(ATN) Officers; Welfare Officers;<br>Filipino migrant associations; trade<br>unions [Confederation Generale du<br>travail (CGT), Confederation Française<br>Democratique du Travail (CFDT),<br>Confederation Generale du travail –<br>Force Ouvriere (FO)]; non-government<br>organization/service providers [FASTI<br>CIMADE, GISTI, Veneto Lavoro];<br>other service providers; Department of<br>Foreign Affairs, Office of<br>the Undersecretary for Migration,<br>Manila and ILO | 45                            |
| Training-Workshop on<br>Enhancing the Capacity of<br>Service Providers in Ilocos<br>Sur Province to Facilitate<br>the Economic<br>Empowerment and   | Migrant Desk Officers, Public<br>Employment Services Officers, Social<br>Welfare and Development Officers and<br>migrant associations from the<br>Provinces of La Union and Ilocos Sur   | 36                            |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Reintegration of Returned Migrant Workers<br>Date: March 7-9, 2012<br>March 12-14, 2012 |  |  |
|   |  |  |

**PHILIPPINES**

| <b>Target Group for Direct Assistance component</b>   |  |                 |   |                            |
|---|--|-----------------|---|----------------------------|
| <b>Type of service</b>  | <b>Details</b>   | <b>Training</b> | <b>Legal/Medical and other services</b> | <b>Economic Assistance</b> |
| Provided with immediate assistance upon return<br>- Airport Assistance<br>- Stress Debriefing<br>- Counseling<br>- Need Assessment          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 112 return migrants were provided by OWWA with counselling and needs assessment immediately after return (47-Romania; 1 Albania; 2 Cyprus; others from Lebanon, Jordan and Romania)</li> <li>- Of the 112 assisted by OWWA, 50 return migrants from Romania, Albania and Cyprus were provided with airport assistance</li> <li>- 13 return migrants from Syria, Jordan, Cyprus and Lebanon were provided by Kanlungan with counselling and stress debriefing</li> <li>- 5 return migrants from Lebanon were provided by Batis with psycho-social care after return</li> </ul> |                 | 130                                     |                            |
| Provided with/referred for medical and other health needs   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- OWWA referred one (1) return migrant for medical</li> <li>- 1 was provided by Batis with medical care to her youngest child</li> <li>- 10 were referred/provided by Kanlungan for medical attention for glaucoma, fracture, hospital assistance</li> </ul>  |                 | 12                                      |                            |
| Provided with or referred for legal assistance (specify type of legal assistance, i.e. filing criminal cases, money claims and civil cases) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 48 were referred to the National Labor Relations Commission (NLRC) for monetary claims against their recruiter; legal assistance through private counsel and referral to the Department of Justice</li> <li>- 30 were provided by Kanlungan with legal advice and assistance including assistance in filing of cases</li> </ul>   |                 | 78                                      |                            |

|   |  |     |     |     |
|---|--|-----|-----|-----|
| Provided and/or referred to technical/vocational and sustainable livelihood training courses  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 111 were provided by OWWA with training on starting a business including financial literacy and basic accounting and recording</li> <li>- Of the 111, 28 were provided by OWWA with technology training on soap making; 28 on meta processing and 11 referred to TESDA for other technology training</li> <li>- 22 were provided by Kanlungan with financial literacy courses as part of economic assistance preparation</li> </ul> |     | 133 |     |
| Provided with capital assistance after completion of necessary training and development of a sound business plan.                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 112 were provided by OWWA with capital assistance after training and assessment, plus additional assistance to 22 of the 112</li> <li>- 43 were provided by Kanlungan with capital assistance after training and assessment</li> <li>- 14 were provided by Batis with capital assistance after training</li> </ul>  |     |     | 191 |
| Provided with opportunities to meet other who share same experiences  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 38 by Batis and 6 by Kanlungan</li> <li>- 29 benefitted from the Peer group training organized by the project</li> </ul>  |     | 73  |     |
| Provided training on Illegal Recruitment and Human Trafficking  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provided by Kanlungan</li> </ul>  |     | 21  |     |
| Provided Practical Life skills training, including decision making, financial management, investment opportunities and saving schemes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 111 by OWWA including formation of a self-help group and a cooperative</li> <li>- 25 by Kanlungan</li> <li>- 14 by Batis</li> </ul>   | 150 |     |     |
| Families of beneficiaries provided with family re orientation and values program  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 by OWWA</li> <li>- 20 by Kanlungan</li> </ul>   |     | 22  |     |

NB.: above data does not include OWWA-3<sup>rd</sup> and last Phase and Batis-2<sup>nd</sup> and last phase with total remaining target of 120

The “target” of 1.000 beneficiaries has been exceeded, but more importantly will generate a wider impact for example by integrating new returnees into self-help groups arising from the initial interventions.

***Activities & results beyond original design***



Almost all planned activities have been adequately implemented, but two major unplanned achievements need to be highlighted:

- c. In Thailand the signature of a Letter of Understanding (LoU) with the Department of Employment (DOE) in May 2011 which came as a major advance in project implementation. Signing such a LoU was a very new approach for the DOE and confirmed the Ministry's commitment to cooperate with key partners on combating illegal recruitment practices and protection of migrant workers.
- d. In the Philippines, institutional development activities were pushed beyond the original plans in supporting the preparation of local strategic action plans to integrate migration in provincial development plans. This has been done in the three provinces of Ilocos Sur, La Union and Nueva Ecija with La Union having reached the most advance stage at the time of the present evaluation. The "La Union Migration and Development Strategic Plan 2012-2016" has already been finalized

### *Different methods in different countries*

The list of activities to be implemented was proposed without real differentiation between Thailand and the Philippines.

The context and economic importance of outbound migration is different in both countries as well as the existing structures at pre-departure and return level; the reintegration of exploited and/or abused migrants however is equally important in both countries. Problems to be addressed typically cover emergency needs, financial difficulties (most often linked to the debts incurred at the stage of recruitment), missing structures to file legal action and the lack of skills to start a new life in the home country.

Through its Direct Assistance component, the project has addressed these issues in providing the adequate support, without however following the same pattern on certain activities, like for e.g.:

- different conditions of disbursing seed capital to returnees to start a small business (while the funds were intended to be disbursed as grants, Batis Centre in the Philippines imposed a personal reimbursement scheme, while funds were more loosely disbursed in Thailand);
- different channels in providing legal assistance in suing employers/recruiters (Government support in the Philippines through OWWA, private support in Thailand from a private law firm);
- different ways of dealing with recruitment debts (Thailand successfully managed to shift debts from loan sharks charging prohibitive interest rates to more accessible official bank loans in order to reduce the pressure on reimbursement; a similar approach has not been developed in the Philippines).

These are only some examples intended to point out that different conditions may indeed lead to different implementation mechanisms. There is nothing wrong with different approaches and the project has made best use of the existing environment and structures to provide the most suitable services.

It would however have been profitable to both countries to have more frequent exchanges on the way problems are dealt with (during implementation) as both countries could have learned from each other.

This also applies to the institutional component of the project for which the Philippines certainly, because of the much higher importance of outbound migration, has more developed structures which could have inspired the Thai partners. Copying what others are doing would not have been the objective, but learning from each other always contributes to improve even the best choices made. The questions raised by participants at the closing conference of the project on 27 March 2012 confirmed the eagerness of all parties to learn from each other.

A number of activities allowed exchanges between Thailand and the Philippines (e.g. the sharing on local mechanisms along the areas of pre-employment and pre-departure services including pre-departure, pre-employment and safe migration information, etc. and local-level coordination structures such as the multi-disciplinary team in Thailand and the Migration and Development Committee in La Union. This activity held on 15 January 2012 generated policy recommendations and practical measures to enhance local level assistance). The visits of DOE officials to POEA and OWWA also facilitated exchange of practise which hopefully will result in some policy reforms or development in Thailand (report yet to be submitted by DOE on follow-through action). While these activities were held rather late in, or towards the end of the project, these could still have some positive results later on.

### ***Do beneficiaries participate in the interventions?***

In the field of “Direct Assistance”, beneficiaries have actively participated in all activities proposed by the project, in particular in adhering to the entire cycle of intervention leading to the provision of a small grant, i.e. following training courses, developing a business plan, obtaining funds and setting up the business.

Some “fall outs” have been observed in the provision of legal assistance, for which a number of returnees who had been offered assistance withdrew, either because they had been offered compensation to stop legal action or because family considerations prevailed).

On the “Institutional Development” component, the project has provided a platform to involve many stakeholders through individual training activities as well as through collective initiatives by setting up working groups/teams which are referred to as Multi-Disciplinary Teams (MDT), Multi-Stakeholders Working Groups (MSWG), Technical Working Groups (TWG), etc.

During the lifetime of the project, all groups have been active and taken up the challenge of developing work plans and implementing activities in order to achieve the aims for which they have been set up by the project. The implementing partners and the project management team have actively contributed in leading and organizing all the groups throughout the project with the objective to prepare the basis for their existence after the project ends.

### ***Have planned benefits been perceived to have been received by stakeholders?***

Making a structured assessment of the benefits received is a complex task for capacity building activities like training courses, mapping exercises, providing guidelines, etc. Overall, the evaluator’s visits to national and local authorities and interviews with several participants in the various seminars, workshops and study tours organized by the project allowed to perceive a real interest in what was done. Capacity building at the local level remains an important issue and further assistance would be more than welcome.

The eagerness of civil servants working at the local level to build on what has been learned with the project is very noticeable. Further developments by means of self initiatives are likely to appear, in particular in the two provinces visited by the evaluator in the Philippines. As already stated, the development of an integrated approach of migration and development in La Union has reached an advance stage, while the MSWG in Ilocos Sur has publicly declared its intention to build on the benefits of the project in signing a Memorandum of Agreement between all partners on 15 March 2012.

Benefits have also been taken on board by implementing partners through exposure to new tools and approaches of dealing with reintegration issues. OWWA for example has been dealing with returning migrants for many years, but the concept of integrated services based on a needs approach has created a new model for future interventions. In Thailand, the approach leading to a code of conduct for recruiting agencies (suggested by ILO with reference to a similar existing scheme in Vietnam) has brought a new impulse to the Department of Employment in their endeavour to fight illegal recruiting.

As far as direct beneficiaries assisted by the provision of legal services, training courses and/or seed capital, the perception of benefits is easier to assess as it often relates to a visible change in their daily life. Operating a business, growing vegetables for own consumption, being able to repay debts in more favourable conditions, obtaining financial compensation for having been exploited and/or trafficked, generally coming back to a normal life are all visible outcomes which have all been well perceived by the beneficiaries. Even the few returnees which regrettably failed in their initial attempt to make best use of seed money received (the evaluator met such cases in Thailand) acknowledged the fact that the project had given them a new opportunity which would not have existed elsewhere.

***Were there any shortcomings as a result of not considering cross-cutting issues: gender environment and poverty?***

The Evaluator did not encounter any such shortcomings. It is worth mentioning that the Direct Assistance component of the project in the Philippines has been directed to women only.

#### **4.5 Efficiency of resource use**

***Operational work planning and management of the budget***

The operational planning of the project has been made by means of successive work plans updated in the different Interim reports listed in the above section 4.1.5 and commented in the last section of the Flash Reports submitted by the project. Initial delays incurred partly as a consequence of the late arrival of the first PO as well as other operational delays have led to a four months extension. The presentation of work plans has been based on the sequence of results and activities presented in the initial project document.

The funding arrangements and successive payments of the EU to ILO have resulted in phased implementation of activities by the project partners. ILO did not advance any funds for the implementation of projects.

Budgeted resources have been correctly managed according to ILO procedures, and financial reporting has been made in line with EU requirements.

***Relations / coordination with local authorities, institutions and beneficiaries***

As suggested by the approach of ILO, the project should have the ultimate objective of being a catalyst in bringing about change in the environment of the migration process. Close co-ordination on the ground would therefore be the most efficient way of ensuring the 3Cs (consistency, coherence and complementarities) between interventions of all concerned parties.

In order to implement the project, ILO worked with and through the following key partners:

In Thailand:

- The Ministry of Social Development and Human Security
- The Department of Employment (Ministry of Labour)
- The Petchabun Provincial Employment Office
- Thai Labour Campaign (TLC)
- The Foundation for Women (FFW)
- The Asia Regional Center for Migration (ARCM), Chulalongkorn University
- SR Law (private law firm)

In the Philippines:

- The Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD)
- The Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (OWWA)
- Batis Centre for Women
- Kanlungan Foundation
- National Reintegration Center for OFWs
- Provincial Governments of La Union, Ilocos Sur and Nueva Ecija
- Bureau of Local Employment-Department of Labor and Employment
- Office of the Undersecretary for Migrant Workers Affairs
- Inter-agency Council Against Trafficking

The project has been able to develop a close cooperation between all stakeholders involved in order to mainstream efforts to achieve better results. The following examples demonstrate the types of cooperation which have been developed:

- In Thailand, TLC and SR Law worked together in order to provide legal and moral support to returnees
- The MDT set up in Petachbun, Thailand brought together Provincial officials, District Officials, a government bank, lawyers, the police and more under impulse of the local project coordinator in order to provide integrated support to a group of returnees,
- The Department of Employment in Thailand set up a Technical Working Group including officers from different departments to work with the ILO project team on specific activities;
- In the Philippines, the cooperation between NGOs and authorities at all levels has been one of the driving forces of project implementation.

The excellent level of cooperation between stakeholders has not only been possible thanks to the established relationship of ILO with state authorities and NGOs in previous joint undertakings, but also thanks to the commitment of all parties to achieve meaningful results through the project.

## **4.6 Effectiveness of management arrangements**

### *Performance control*

The project offices in Bangkok and Manila have tracked implementation by means of a regular follow-up of activities implemented by partners and/or consultants recruited to undertake specific assignments; ILO's monitoring framework for results requiring projects to monitor performance against indicators related to objectives could have resulted in better measurement of results.

Service contracts have been adequately managed and the outputs produced by these contracts match expectations and planned outputs indicated in the Terms of Reference.

The financial management and follow-up of projects has been adequately dealt with, both in terms of procedures as well as in terms of day-to-day control.

### *Management of personnel & information (Knowledge management)*

It has already been pointed out that the changes in project management (CTA) and the different "vacancies" in the position have led to some implementation delays, but they also have created some gaps in the strategic orientation of the project.

The National Project Officers have played an important role throughout the duration of the project in making sure that all activities are being implemented, but how these would address the key issues of migration has not always been clear.

Technical backstopping has been provided by MIGRANT and by the experts based in the Regional Office in Bangkok. Comments have been provided on training materials, progress reports have been revised, documents such as guidelines or ToRs have been looked into, and participation in meetings has been provided.

The overall input provided by technical experts has been more limited than the budgeted input of 51 man/months, but actual data is not available as the input has not been documented.

### ***Adequacy of the management of risk – i.e. whether flexibility has been demonstrated in response to changes in circumstances (Risk Management)***

As stated in section 4.3, the Risk analysis was presented in very positive way in the original project document, without however referring to the potential difficulty to mobilize European and Thai/Philippine employers' organizations, preventing the programme to leverage its interventions and demonstrate the benefits of the activities.

While activities were being implemented, it became clear that it would indeed be difficult to mobilize unions and even to engage with the private sector enterprises to support project initiatives.

The project eventually managed to secure the "support" of two Italian and three French Unions to support migrants (from the Philippines) but what this will imply still has to be defined. Attempts to mobilize Swedish Unions to assist Thai seasonal workers did not generate any meaningful progress.

The status of dealings with the unions has been communicated at the project's final conference with the recommendation to all parties involved to "follow through their commitments", while ILO could play a role as a catalyst. The evaluator thinks that ILO should be, rather than could be, a catalyst to allow further progress to be made. This could eventually happen in the case of Italy where the ILO Office in Rome has offered to follow-through links between Philippine authorities and migrants organizations in Italy and the Italian trade unions and other service providers.

### ***The quality of information management and reporting and the extent to which key stakeholders have been kept adequately informed of programme activities (including beneficiaries /target groups);***

The communication and information approach of the project has been adequately developed since the inception of the programme.

Major milestones and project outputs have been reported and disseminated on ILO's website. A link to the project was available on the EU Delegations' websites and project dissemination materials have largely been produced.

## **4.7 Impact and sustainability**

When the project ends, does everything stop?

Assessing Impact means looking at the effects of the project on its wider environment and its contribution to the objectives; the likelihood of a continuation in the stream of benefits produced by the project after the period of external support has ended will be the key to longer term Sustainability. Both Impact and Sustainability are very closely interlinked and have been jointly considered.

At **Institutional** level, the project has produced tools and delivered outputs, such as increased capabilities of national/local authorities to deal with return issues. Research work undertaken has brought new ideas for policy considerations and also enhanced the attention and priority given to migration. The project furthermore initiated and encouraged new approaches in having Letters and/or Memoranda of Understanding/Agreement signed, Multi Stakeholders Groups set up (MDT in Petchabun, MSWG in Filipino provinces, TWG between ministries in Thailand, etc.) and joint initiatives undertaken in bringing together government authorities and civil society. This has allowed demonstrating new mechanisms which are likely to inspire officials and civil society to closely cooperate in the future.

The 3 main pillars for longer term impact and sustainability upon closing the project appear to be:

- a. The LoU with the DOE in Thailand which could be the vehicle for further joint activities to be developed with ILO, in particular through the TRIANGLE project which is due to develop a working plan with the Technical Working Group; policy issues and capacity building activities could be further discussed and developed in continuation of the present project, even though the focus will be on Inbound migration.
- b. The integration of migration plans into provincial development plans in the Philippines; the project has developed the approach in three provinces, but others are likely to follow when a similar approach will develop at the national level, which is likely to be initiated when the upcoming EU project on Migration will be operational. One of the two project components will indeed be to better integrate international migration into social and economic development policy, planning and programming at all levels (national, regional and local).
- c. The cooperation intentions declared by European Trade Unions in supporting migrant workers facing problems while being employed in Europe; the project has initiated promising contacts in Italy (which has the largest migrant community in Europe) and France (which has the largest un-documented migrant community in Europe), but trade unions in other countries might be inclined to offer similar support services. This however will require a close follow-up by ILO.

In the field of **Direct Assistance**, the short-term impact resulting from training courses, legal support and grants distributed to returnees appears rather obvious. The number of assisted returnees may not be very high (though in line with available funds), but more importantly, the project partners have set the basis for a much larger impact and longer term sustainability.

Among the positive factors which are likely to create this wider impact and lead to longer term sustainability, the following are very important:

- The willingness of returnees to organize themselves in self-help/peer support groups to extend assistance to others; several groups of returnees have already taken the decision to establish more formal structures in order to put together resources and possibly help other returnees in their reintegration process; this is for example the case for the returnees from Romania (assisted by OWWA) who set up a credit cooperative and the returnees from the Middle East (assisted by Kanlungan) who set up an association.
- The existence of funds out of which further assistance can be provided; both Thailand and the Philippines have different funds out of which assistance can be provided to returnees, e.g. the 2 billion Pesos OFW RP Reintegration Fund in the Philippines, the Aid Fund for Overseas Workers in Thailand available for migrants facing difficulties while still overseas as well as funds from several NGOs.
- The integrated approach towards direct assistance; several services to returnees have been in existence since migration developed, but the “total needs approach” leading to a more integrated offer of services proposed by the project has created a model, which in the

Philippines OWWA intends to follow in the future and which could be taken up in the framework of future MDTs in Thailand.

- The commitment of NGOs to further support returnees; in both countries the civil society is committed to further support migrant workers irrespective of the availability of external funding.
- The creation of “examples” under the Thai law leading to a possible better enforcement; the legal framework in Thailand is in principle adequate enough to protect migrant workers from exploitation and trafficking, but law enforcement remains the key issue. In obtaining favorable judgments from the courts on cases brought forward in the framework of the project (e.g. Thai berry pickers returning from Sweden, returnees from Spain with shortened contract, etc.) law enforcement will appear more accessible for victims, possibly forcing recruiters to discontinue their unfair business.

While all the above ingredients are likely to lead to favourable developments, a number of more pessimistic observations were made during the present evaluation:

- The lack of motivation of the MDT in Petchabun to carry on with the group; most members consider the group as being an ad-hoc group only set up for the duration of the project. Without the presence of the local project coordinator who has been of crucial importance, the MDT is likely to disappear.
- The reluctance of returnees to engage into legal action (in particular when family members have been involved in the recruitment process).
- The lack of referral to other financial sources; communication and information on possible financial interventions remains insufficient as most returnees do not seem to be aware of the existence of the funds mentioned above.
- The missing potential support of private sector enterprises; OWWA managed to secure a limited number of employments in private sector companies for returnees from Romania, but the project itself has not tapped into the potential of enterprises to take on board returnees in need of employment. Incentives do exist for enterprises employing OFWs in the Philippines (e.g. tax deductions) but this has not been given further consideration by other project partners.

## 5 Conclusions

---

### 5.1 Conclusions

Before drawing conclusions from the assessment made during this evaluation and answering the evaluation questions, the following section will comment on the follow-up made (or not) by the project on the recommendations of the Mid-Term Evaluation.

#### Follow-up on MTE recommendations

##### *1. Defining clear focus for upstream efforts*

After signature of the LoU with the Department of Employment, the project activities in Thailand focused on building capacity of DOE officials, improving training curriculum and develop the on-line facility.

In the Philippines, the project continued working in different directions (providing direct support to returnees in three provinces, building capacity of local government units and service providers, etc.) with a particular focus on ensuring sustainability beyond the project in promoting the formulation of local migration and development plans.

##### *2. Definition of target group*

The definition of target groups has not been revised after the MTE. The project continued working with service providers in following the sequence of activities of the original design, with more attention given to the DOE in Thailand as a result of the LoU.

##### *3. Potential general focus fields*

The proposal to have the project team hold an internal workshop in order to reach agreement on clear focus fields led to the organization of a staff meeting in June 2011 during which the work plan was revised. The suggestion to define in which way the activities planned for the remainder of the project would help attain overall objective goals and how they address problems has not resulted in a more strategic paper which would have documented the process.

##### *4. Potential general focus fields for multi-country work*

Nothing has been done in Thailand in terms of looking at other models of managing return or establishing networks for return or repatriation.

In the Philippines, return and/or repatriation assistance of migrants and trafficked persons is covered by existing national policies. In the previous ILO project, the Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (OWWA) developed a Case Management Manual for Exploited Migrants and/or Trafficked Persons which defines the scope of assistance and the manner by which services should be delivered. A National Referral System has been put in place and is currently mainstreamed across the country, with the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) leading the process. The Department of Foreign Affairs (DFA) and OWWA have existing mechanisms to receive complaints and on return/repatriation assistance. The project also brought together trade unions, migrants associations and Philippine authorities in Paris and Rome to discuss and agree on ways to promote cooperation between them. The on-line discussion facility – AP MAGNET – housed in the existing ILO website seeks to promote sharing of policies and experiences along several migration issues including on return and reintegration. This facility will also enable sharing of resources (publications, researches, etc.) among service providers.

##### *5. Monitoring & Evaluation*



The harmonization of rolling work plans has allowed a common template to be developed as an implementation plan for both countries. Monitoring however has not gone any further than tracking activities against a work plan and compliance with expected outputs. Impact (or potential impact) analysis has not been undertaken but should be included in the project's final report.

The MTE also recommended tracking the budgeted input of various ILO specialists. While it is clear that assistance has been obtained from Migration Specialists in Bangkok and Geneva, Regional Information Officer, Regional Programming Unit, Regional Evaluation Unit, etc, the actual inputs have not been documented. The project management team however suggested that this would be done in the final report.

#### ***6. Thinking strategically about documentation and websites***

The documents produced by the project have been produced for clear reasons and not just for the sake of having them.

In Thailand, the three main documents produced during the second half of the project – i) a case study on Thai workers in Sweden; ii) a case study of Thai workers in Poland; and iii) Stories as told by migrants - aim to surface issues and challenges along recruitment, on-site protection and return and reintegration assistance, and identify recommendations to address them, and hopefully feed into policy discussions and reviews.

In the Philippines, studies were undertaken to support project actions/interventions, as for example the study “Situation Analysis of Outbound and Return Migration and Local Institutional Mechanisms to Support Migrants in La Union” used in developing local strategies and development plans in the three provinces in the Philippines and in establishing relevance for local governments to integrate migration issues in local governance and development planning. Excerpts from the study were included in the La Union Migration and Development Plan (2012-2016) and in developing similar plans in Ilocos Sur and Nueva Ecija.

Similarly, migrants' stories were developed to inspire service providers and return migrants themselves on how exploited and/or trafficked women were able to rise from a situation of despair resulting from exploitative migration experience.

#### ***7. Revisit the budget and activities***

A budget revision was requested to support activities in support of the LoU in Thailand and the initial implementation and follow through to local development plans in the Philippines. The proposed budget revision consisted of reallocating contingency funds. The proposed budget reallocation was not approved by the EU Delegation.

#### ***8. Focus capacity building efforts on a limited number of partners***

As already stated in the above answer to question 1, the focus was given to the DOE on capacity building for officials and migrant workers (safe migration, pre-departure training, etc.).

In the Philippines, the first training programme was undertaken through the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD). Later on, selected local service providers in the three target provinces were trained on migration policies including illegal recruitment and trafficking and facilitating support for return migrants through employment services based on standard training modules of the Department of Labour and Employment - Bureau of Local Employment.

#### ***9. Build on new openings***

The project and project partners in the Philippines worked with key national government agencies such as the National Reintegration Center for OFWs (NRCO) and the Technical Education and Skills Development Authority (TESDA) for additional services. Other government agencies were also tapped as needed such as the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the Department of Foreign Affairs - Office of the Undersecretary for Migrant Workers Affairs (OUMWA).

In Thailand, working with the DOE allowed a Code of Conduct to be developed and agreed by the participants to a seminar which is due to be replicated in order to involve a larger number of recruiting agencies..

### ***10. Analysis of key institutions***

Institutions as such were not specifically analyzed, but external experts in the field of migration, development and local development planning were invited to support the work with local governments in the target provinces in the Philippines. A Professor at the University of the Philippines - School of Economics prepared a study on the outbound and return migration from the three target provinces. The study focused on how relevant migration issues are to local governments more particularly in protecting migrants and helping them in their return and reintegration. Of particular interest was the part of the study that analysed the flow of remittances into the province and how this could potentially benefit migrant families and local economic development. The study included existing mechanisms for support for migrants at the national and local levels. The project in the Philippines collaborated with the Bureau of Local Employment (BLE) of the Department of Labour and Employment in the project-sponsored trainings for local service providers in 3 target provinces with modules on public employment services which are part of the newly revised training modules of BLE.

Nothing specific has been done in Thailand in this regard.

### ***11. Encourage extension of reach and improved services, not universal coordinated systems***

Encouraging extension of reach and improved services has been done by the project through community outreach activities in both countries. Universal coordinated systems may indeed not be the only solution and the project has certainly not encouraged governments to work towards state-centred universal solutions, to the contrary. The “total needs” approach suggested by the project in working with OWWA provides a flexible model rather than a universal solution. The suggestion made by the MTE is therefore beside the point.

### ***12. Enabling different directions for different countries***

The project implementation in Thailand and the Philippines was based on common objectives. Each country differs in emphasis or focus but remains within the original project framework and overall objective.

In Thailand, due to the growing concerns over recruitment and return assistance issues of Thai workers recruited for berry picking in Europe, much of the interventions were directed towards addressing such with the Department of Employment (DOE). Through the Letter of Understanding between the ILO and DOE, activities were undertaken to improve adherence by recruitment agencies to a code of conduct which they themselves have developed with technical support of the project; to increase understanding of migrants on overseas employment procedures through development of community training modules, conduct of safe migration campaigns and development and distribution of information materials to migrants.

In the Philippines, the project focused on providing economic and social services to migrants. In the process, the project worked with local government units by strengthening its policies and mechanisms for the protection of migrants through the development of migration and development strategy or plan. Capacity building activities were also directed towards improving the knowledge, skills and attitudes of local service providers. These include trainings to improve their understanding of the country’s overall migration policies and laws, overseas migration governance structures and the government’s programs and services for migrants. The local service providers were also trained on tools and system on employment services that are used commonly by public employment services offices.

### ***13. Link increasingly with other projects***

The project linked-up with the ILO Project on Tripartite Action against Labour Exploitation (TRIANGLE Project) that is funded by AusAID. The TRIANGLE Project will build on the ILO-EU Project's work with the Department of Employment in Thailand in strengthening recruitment policies and protection of migrants.

In the Philippines, the project exchanged experiences with the Youth Employment and Migration (YEM) Project. The training modules of YEM project on employment services were considered in the project's training programme for local service providers.

In the provision of direct services, the project worked with the Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (OWWA) and the National Reintegration Center for OFWs (NRCO). OWWA and NRCO supplemented project funds by covering repatriation expenses and counselling services while the project supported OWWA and NRCO by funding the training and provision of capital assistance to project beneficiaries.

#### **14. Management**

The Evaluator did not perceive any "preferential" attention given to the Thailand programme due to the project's management location in Bangkok. Assuming that the MTE assessment of the situation was different in 2010, the necessary corrective action has been taken. The CTA of the project went to the Philippines in December 2010 and joined an activity in La Union including a meeting with the Provincial Governor. Project team meetings were held to update and review implementation. This provided an opportunity for the project management to provide the Philippine component with technical assistance and directions.

Recommendations addressed by the MTE to the European Commission were not found to be relevant by the evaluator, as they were i) inadequately formulated and ii) in conflict with normal procedures applying to EU funded projects.

#### ***Answers to the main evaluation questions outlined in the Terms of Reference of the Evaluation.***

Most of the answers have already been presented in a different format. The following will therefore only summarize conclusions in a more formal layout.

#### **Relevance and strategic fit**

|  |
|--|
| The extent to which the project approach is strategic and it is based on the ILO comparative advantages  |
| The project approach is consistent with the ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration and relevant ILO Conventions on Migration. It promotes community participation, local capacity building, improved accessibility to services and targets the three main sectors: public, private and local communities.  |
| Did (and how) the project interventions align with and support relevant national development plans and, national action plan on relevant issues e.g. on migration, anti-trafficking etc. as well as programmes and priorities of the social partners?  |
| In Thailand, the legal framework on migration is provided by the Recruiters and Job-Seekers Protection Act of 1985, revised in 1994 and in 2001 which the Thailand Overseas Employment Administration (TOEA) is mandated to enforce. In the Philippines, OWWA has the mandate to protect and promote the well-fare of OFW's and their dependents in line with the Overseas Filipinos Act of 1995. In both countries protection for migrant workers is the main focus, but without explicit attention given to reintegration of migrants, on which the project intended to dedicate specific interest. The project interventions are also aligned with the 22-point policy pronouncement and platform of the Aquino Administration on labor and employment, specifically on the following: 1) assisting OFWs in achieving financial stability through training, |

|  |
|--|
| investment and savings program; 2) facilitating the re-integration of returning OFWs; 3) fully implementing the anti-trafficking law; and 4) creating and strengthening community-based support groups for families of OFWs, among others.<br>National development plans and/or local development plans do not really take the benefits of migration (remittances) into consideration  |
| <b>To what extent was the project design related to relevant and identified needs?</b>   |
| Earlier acquired knowledge and understanding of ILO led to the identification of three major problems to be addressed by the project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The need for decent livelihoods upon return,</li> <li>➤ The need to return with dignity, and</li> <li>➤ The need for close coordination and knowledge among service providers in the EU, neighbouring countries and Asia.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Did (and how) the project align with and promote the ILO's Asian Regional Strategy on Labour Migration, Asian Regional Plan of Action, and the ILO Multilateral Framework on labour migration?</b>  |
| The Multilateral Framework was designed to provide technical guidance to governments and to employers' and workers' organizations on the development, strengthening and implementation of national and international labour migration policies. The project provides a well-founded contribution to these guidelines both in enriching the knowledge base on migration issues in Thailand and the Philippines and in suggesting new approaches/models to deal with migration. In terms of the regional dimension of the project, ILO's strategic option to identify common needs, share good practices and jointly develop strategies and programmes has not been integrated in the design of the project. |
| <b>Did the project support and to what extent contribute to the country outcomes identified and the targets to be achieved (in IRIS) for Thailand and the Philippines and complement and fit with relevant ILO projects and programmes in the region?</b>  |
| Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCP) for Thailand and Philippines are not available at the time of the evaluation and are still in "drafting stage" for both countries. In the Philippines redrafting of the DWCP will take into account the Philippine Development Plan (2011-16), the UNDAF (2012-18) and the Philippines Jobs Pact, which are currently being formulated.  |

### **Validity of design (to what extent the design is logical and coherent)**

|   |
|---|
| <b>To what extent the issues related to the design (defining the project's focus and target group) that were pointed out in the midterm evaluation, has been taken into consideration by the project?</b>   |
| The definition of target groups has not been revised after the MTE. The project continued working with service providers in following the sequence of activities of the original design, with more attention given to the DOE in Thailand as a result of the LoU. |
| <b>What have been the lessons learnt in the design of the project?</b>  |
| The close involvement of all parties involved in designing a project has been mentioned as a key condition for a successful implementation. In the Philippines, OWWA declared having been associated to the design of the project which has been highly praised.  |

### **Project progress and effectiveness (and gender equality and promotion)**

|   |
|---|
| <b>To what extent the project's immediate objectives have been achieved vis-a-vis the project logical framework and taking into account the midterm evaluation recommendations?</b> |
| Overall the specific objectives of the project have been achieved; in the Philippines the project has   |

|  |
|--|
| gone one step further in redefining migration as a potential contributor to local development. Whether the MTE recommendations have largely contributed to the successful implementation of the project however remains questionable.  |
| Have the contractual Terms of Reference been delivered by ILO?   |
| All activities have been implemented (with minor exceptions however not leading to a negative impact). The only quantified indicator of 1.000 beneficiaries has been matched (and exceeded).   |
| Have the activities implemented actually contributed to the achievement of expected results?   |
| Field visits have established that the benefits of the activities have been largely perceived, both at the institutional level as at the level of the returnees. There is still much more to be done to reach an ideal situation, but the project has brought the agenda a step further on all expected results.   |
| Has the project's monitoring plan ensured that the project has been on track with regard to the expected results?  |
| There has never been a real “monitoring” plan other than a tracking process of activities against rolling work plans. Impact assessments have not been made and will be part of the final project report.  |
| How is gender being mainstreamed? Has there been any effort to mainstream gender throughout the project?   |
| The Direct Assistance component has given a particular attention to assist women, especially in the Philippines where the two implementing NGO partners (Batis Center for Women and Kanlungan) were – and still are – women support organizations. OWWA’s support was also provided to a group of women only, so that the ratio men/women in the Philippines came out to 0/100. Direct assistance in Thailand has been provided to both male and female returnees.                         |
| In which areas of project implementation have social partners been meaningfully integrated?  |
| Workers and employer’s organization in the Philippines and Thailand have been approached by the project team but no real interest could be found as their role and mandate does not cover outbound migration.<br>European workers’ organizations in France, Italy and to a lesser extent in Sweden have been contacted with the result that good intentions to provide support to migrant workers have been declared. This will need a close follow-up to convert intentions into actions. |
| What are the lessons learnt and good practices?  |
| Please refer to sections 5.2 and 5.3   |

### Efficiency of resource use

|   |
|---|
| What progress has been made to date in the commitment of funds and what constraints have influenced the usage of allocated budget?  |
| All budgeted funds have been allocated (94% commitment on 31/03/2012). During implementation some difficulties arose from strong variations in the exchange rates and from slight delays in the transfer of funds without however affecting the timely implementation of activities.  |
| Have project results been generated with the best possible allocation of resources (funds, expertise, time, etc.)?  |
| Budgeted resources have been correctly managed according to ILO procedures and the necessary expertise has been adequately secured. The only restraint applies to the input of ILO technical expertise for which the final report will provide the necessary justification.   |
| Has there been any arrangement in the implementation of the project at various level (inter-agencies, national, provincial, district, and community) to leverage resources?   |
| In the Philippines, OWWA and NRCO supplemented project funds by covering repatriation expenses and counselling services while the project supported OWWA and NRCO by funding the training and provision of capital assistance to project beneficiaries. In Thailand, the cooperation of the banking sector has allowed the conversion of high interest debts of migrants into lower |

|  |
|--|
| interest bank loans.   |
| What are the lessons learnt and/or possible good practices noteworthy of documentation for knowledge sharing purposes? |
| Please refer to sections 5.2 and 5.3   |

### Effectiveness of management arrangements (including monitoring and evaluation)

|   |
|---|
| <p>Are management capacities and programme implementation systems adequate and do they facilitate good results and efficient delivery?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Is there a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities by all parties involved?</li> <li>➤ Does the project receive adequate political, technical and administrative support from its national partners, especially local governments at the district level?</li> <li>➤ Do implementing partners provide for effective Project implementation?</li> <li>➤ Has cooperation with Project partners been efficient?</li> </ul>  |
| <p>The answer to all above questions definitely is a big YES. The project has been well received at all political levels and cooperation with the project team has been very efficient. The implementing partners have all been well selected and were all aware of their respective roles, while regularly trying to establish joint initiatives.</p>  |
| <p>How effectively did the project management and ILO monitor Project performance and results?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Is a monitoring and evaluation system in place and how effective is it?</li> <li>➤ Have appropriate means of verification for tracking progress, performance and achievement of indicator values been defined?</li> <li>➤ Is relevant information and data systematically being collected and collated? Is reporting satisfactory?</li> <li>➤ Is data disaggregated by sex (and by other relevant characteristics, if relevant)?</li> <li>➤ Is information being regularly analysed to feed into management decisions?</li> </ul> |
| <p>Monitoring in its correct definition of being an instrument to systematically collect, analyze and use information for the purpose of management and decision-making has not been implemented by the project. The purpose of monitoring is to achieve efficient and effective performance of a project. Monitoring must highlight the strengths and weaknesses in project implementation, enabling managers to deal with problems, finding solutions and adapt to changing circumstances in order to improve project performance.</p> <p>As earlier stated, monitoring has been limited to keeping track of activities.</p>  |
| <p>Has relevant gender expertise been sought? Have available gender mainstreaming tools been adapted and utilized?</p>  |
| <p>The budget of the project made a provision of 6 man/month Senior Gender Specialist expertise. The evaluator could not find any specific evidence which could justify such an input. Gender expertise has been mainly provided by the implementing NGOs supporting women in general, i.e. the Foundation For Women in Thailand, Batis Center for Women and Kanlungan in the Philippines.</p>  |
| <p>Has the Project made strategic use of coordination and collaboration with other ILO projects and with other donor's projects in Thailand and the Philippines?</p>  |
| <p>In Thailand, the project linked-up with the ILO Project on Tripartite Action against Labour Exploitation (TRIANGLE Project) funded by AusAID.</p> <p>In the Philippines, the project exchanged experiences with the Youth Employment and Migration (YEM) Project.</p>  |

### Impact orientation, and sustainability of the intervention

What are the impacts of the project?

- What are the emerging impacts of the project and the changes that can be causally linked to the project's interventions?
- What are the arrangements to measure the project's impact during and at the end of the project?
- Are these arrangements adequate and will they deliver reliable findings?
- In how far has the project made a significant contribution to broader, longer-term development impact?
- What are realistic long-term effects of the project on better migration management, reduction of labour migration exploitation, poverty levels and the decent work conditions?

The project has produced tools and delivered outputs, such as increased capabilities of national/local authorities to deal with return issues. The project furthermore initiated and encouraged new approaches and joint initiatives in bringing together government authorities and civil society.

How this will impact on the policy framework remains to be assessed; 6 "pillars" for longer term impact and sustainability have emerged:

- The LoU with the DOE in Thailand which could be the vehicle for further joint activities to be developed with ILO, in particular through the TRIANGLE project
- The integration of migration plans into provincial development plans in the Philippines;
- The cooperation intentions declared by European Trade Unions in supporting migrant workers facing problems while being employed in Europe.
- The willingness of returnees to organize themselves in self-help/peer support groups to extend assistance to others;
- The integrated approach towards direct assistance;
- The commitment of NGOs to further support returnees.

Has the project management defined an effective and realistic exit strategy? Is the Project gradually being handed over to the provincial/local government partners? Once external funding ends will local government and other implementing partners be likely able to continue the project or carry forward its results?

- Are local governments and implementing partners able, willing and committed to continue with the Project? How effectively has the project built national ownership and capacity?
- Has the Project successfully built or strengthened an enabling environment (laws, policies, technical capacities, people's attitudes, etc.)?

The exit strategy is not defined, but needs to be prepared as an important part of the end of project report. The above mentioned "pillars" for longer-term sustainability need to be further supported by ILO and other donor initiatives. Local ownership has been established, but further capacity building is required at the level of local governments.

## 5.2 Lessons Learned

The main global lessons learned from project implementation identified by the evaluator and confirmed by the implementing partners during the final workshop are the following:

1. Consolidating achievements of earlier initiatives/projects and making best use of existing structures is a prerequisite to push things further. The project has built on previous actions



- undertaken by ILO and developed the knowledge base available in both countries in a more focused while supporting established structures dealing with migrant's protection and welfare.
2. Working with local government units and providing them with mechanisms to cooperate with service providers and national authorities is a major challenge. While such cooperation has been straightforward from the inception of the project in the Philippines, developing cooperation mechanisms at local level in Thailand has required a strong input from the local project coordinator.
  3. Involving implementing partners at the project design stage leads to more realistic approaches and ownership of a project. This has been the case for OWWA in the Philippines which is planning to make best use of the new "model" of total needs and integrated services approach suggested by the project.
  4. Joint initiatives lead to better results; the engagement of all partners is vital to achieve meaningful results. The different working groups set up in both countries have clearly demonstrated that joint efforts encourage beneficiaries in their efforts of reintegration as they provide better solutions to overcome related problems.
  5. Government buy-in is a must to achieve impact and ensure longer-term sustainability. Without commitment of the government (at all levels) the civil society can only provide marginal support.
  6. Policies largely depend on personalities rather than on established systems. While NGOs will remain committed to their cause irrespective of their management, government officials will often stick to their "normal routine". The project has been able to initiate new approaches thanks to the strong input of the project team and the personal interest of officials involved, but in absence of formally established structures (like e.g. the official recognition of a MDT through a legal status in Thailand) the chances to further build on the achievements of the project are rather slim. In the Philippines, the importance of systems has been acknowledged as they have been for example integrated in the provincial development plan of La Union.
  7. Networking is important to ensure continuous improvements. Formal and informal networking is of prime importance to create a favorable environment.
  8. Traffickers and exploiters will continue to operate. Gaps in law enforcement remain and lacking knowledge of laws among migrants still needs to be dealt with.
  9. Short term actions are useful, but creating a more favorable environment provides longer term impact. The LoU in Thailand and the development of strategic plans in the Philippines set the basis for such an environment and will therefore be retained as good practices of this project (see point 4.3)
  10. ILO's support has been vital for putting together strategic development plans, but capacity building at the local level still needs to be reinforced.

### **5.3 Good Practices**

There are several good practices which would be worth mentioning, but the two key ones quite obviously are:

1. The formalisation of a cooperation proposal at the highest level through signature of a Letter of Understanding as done in Thailand with the Department of Employment. More than just a declaration of good intentions, the LoU confirms the commitment of the Thai government to engage in a number of activities with ILO in order to jointly work on combating illegal recruitment practices and protection of migrant workers.
2. The definition of integrated migration and development strategic plans which formalize the recognition of the importance of overseas migration in the overall development of a region. In the Philippines, the La Union Migration & Development Strategic Plan takes into consideration the perspective of migrants and their families as well as their own associations, local



government units at the provincial, city, town and barangay levels, and public/state, non-government and other service providers.

## 5.4 Recommendations

Based on the above analysis and conclusions, the evaluator would like to make the following recommendations:

**To ILO and project partners** for the remainder of the project (April-May)

1. Follow-up on all pending issues and consolidate ownership of acquired results. While a continuation of activities appears to be secured at the level of the Technical Working Group of the DOE in Thailand as part of the LoU, the ownership and continuation of the MDT in Petchabun remains questionable. A follow-up visit to bring together the team one more time before project closure could help to establish a tentative work plan on activities to be implemented. In the Philippines, the project team should assist the provincial government of Ilocos Sur and Nueva Ecija in the further processing of their respective migration and development plans. The plans have now been formulated and a meeting with the local governments concerned are scheduled to present the plan and advocate for its adoption and eventual reintegration in local development plans. In La Union, a provincial workshop with Municipal Mayors and local planners will be convened early May by Kanlungan Center Foundation and the provincial Government to assist municipal government in integrating the La Union Migration and Development Plan in municipal development plans. The process supports the provincial implementation of the plan. Per discussion with the Provincial Planning and Development Officer, some aspects of the migration plan have been integrated in the updated provincial development plan. Same process will proceed in the case of Ilocos Sur and Nueva Ecija.
2. Prepare a comprehensive **Exit Strategy**, clearly pointing out what needs to be done, where, when and by who in the months following the project closure to maintain the benefits of the interventions, further advance the impact of all activities undertaken and suggest options for longer-term sustainability.
3. Report results, impact and conditions for sustainability to higher levels (“Policy/advocacy”) of authority.

**To ILO** (after project end)

4. Consolidate project results through other ongoing and/or future interventions. In Thailand, the TRIANGLE project provides a perfect opportunity to consolidate the achievements of the project in working with the TWG of the DOE.

**To Authorities**

*National level:*

5. Further develop activities in the framework of the LOU signed with ILO (Thailand, DOE) and further develop the integrated services model in possibly tapping into the EU Migration project (Philippines, OWWA)

*Local/provincial level:*

6. Consolidate & expand MDT and/or MSWG while seeking further assistance for capacity building.

#### **To Returnees**

7. Organize self-help groups and/or cooperatives/associations to extend assistance to new returnees as well as guidance to new migrants with the support of the NGOs
8. Seek assistance from other donor initiatives to expand the start-ups generated by the project (with NGO support or group leader initiative)
9. Continue filing legal action against traffickers and/or illegal recruiters collectively

#### **To the European Union**

10. Allow the new Migration project (hosted by NEDA) to engage in further support in the provinces where this project has been operating (PHI)
11. Allow the project on Public Finance Management for LGUs to support provincial governments in the development of integrated plans (PHI)
12. Include the returnees as a target group in the “Justice for all” project (PHI)
13. Include Migration as a key issue under the Governance component of the Policy Dialogue Support Facility (THA)



## **Appendices**

## **Appendix 1: Terms of Reference for the Evaluation**

**Terms of Reference  
Final Independent Evaluation  
RAS/08/03M/EEC**

**Going back – moving on : Economic and Social Empowerment of Migrants including Victims of Trafficking returned from the EU and Neighbouring Countries Project**

**Project Budget:** Euro 2,199,813 million (EU contribution Euro 1,758,813 million)

**Project duration:** 01 February 2009 – 31 January 2012 (36 months) – (*the extension to end 31 May 2012 is proposed*)

**Geographical coverage:** Thailand and the Philippines and partner agencies in selected EU countries

**Final evaluation:** TOR drafted Nov. 2011; actual evaluation planned for February 2012

- 1 Introduction and Rational
  - 2 Background on the project
  - 3 Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation
  - 4 Suggested Methodology and framework
  - 5 Main outputs
  - 6 Management arrangements and time frame
  - 7 Resources required
- Annex 1: Results Framework  
Annex 2: ILO Evaluation quality checklist and templates

### **1. Introduction and Rational**

An independent project evaluation is a mandatory exercise for the ILO, as per ILO's policy governing technical cooperation project cycle management. The evaluation will be managed by the ILO but the ILO, Government of Thailand and the Philippines, and the donor will be collaborated in defining the scope and modalities of the evaluation as presented in these Terms of Reference. The preliminary findings of the evaluation will be discussed in conjunction with the Project Closing Workshop to be conducted in Manila, Philippines.

The project's midterm self-evaluation was undertaken in Aug 2010. The final evaluation intends to examine the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project. It will focus on whether the project has delivered the expected outcomes in light of time and budget and to what extent the project has act upon the recommendations of the midterm evaluation. It is expected that the final evaluation will provide useful recommendations and lessons learnt.

The evaluation will be carried out in February-March 2012, with a final report being available by mid April 2012. It will be managed by ILO Regional Evaluation Officer, Ms Pamornrat Pringsulaka of ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP). The project will bear the cost of the evaluation, including the cost of the Evaluation consultant. The evaluation report will be in English.

The evaluation will comply with evaluation norms and standards and follow ethical safeguards, all as specified in ILO's evaluation procedures.

## **2. Background on the project**

### **2.1 Origin and content of the project**

Migrants who have been exploited abroad, including victims of trafficking, often face severe difficulties upon return, in particularly in terms of decent livelihood opportunities. As a consequence a large proportion, in some cases up to 75 percent, chooses to re-migrate, putting them at risk of re-trafficking and exploitation.<sup>4</sup> This is often the case when return and reintegration programs do not squarely address the needs of return migrants especially those who have had negative migration experience.

Since February 2009, the ILO, with funding support from the European Union, has been implementing a project: "Going back – moving on : Economic and Social Empowerment of Migrants including Victims of Trafficking returned from the EU and Neighbouring Countries".

The Project's overall objective is to contribute to the reduction of labour and sexual exploitation of migrants including victims of trafficking through support to a humane return and reintegration process emphasizing economic and social empowerment. It aims to support migrants from Thailand and the Philippines to the EU and neighbouring countries who have experienced labour and sexual exploitation, including victims of trafficking, by addressing the problems they encounter on return to their respective countries. It does so by improving the capacities of service providers and by supporting direct assistance in order to improve their well-being and to protect them from further exploitation including re-trafficking. The project has two specific objectives:

**Specific objective 1:** By the end of the project, the capacities of service providers to return and reintegrate migrants who have experienced labour and sexual exploitation including victims of trafficking will have been improved in Thailand, Philippines and the EU and neighbouring countries through enhanced coordination and referral among focal agencies and key stakeholders.

**Specific objective 2:** By the end of the project, return migrants in Thailand and the Philippines who have experienced labour and sexual exploitation including victims of trafficking from the EU and neighbouring countries will have been assisted and

---

<sup>4</sup> Bjerkan 2005

economically and socially empowered to protect them from further exploitation including re-trafficking.

The project has two major components – Institutional Development and Direct Support to Migrants.

A first step to enhance capacity and coordination will be to improve the knowledge base on the situation of Thai and Filipino migrants emphasising in particular labour exploitation and cases of human trafficking and to map out existing support services and current practices. Next steps will include bringing service providers in both regions together in a series of technical workshops and trainings in order to develop better referral mechanisms and guidelines and conducting trainings for service providers such as social workers, employment officers, career counsellors, embassy staff, overseas labour welfare officers etc. to be able to provide professional and high quality assistance to exploited migrants, including victims of trafficking.

The direct assistance objective will be fulfilled by providing Thai and Filipino migrants who have experienced exploitation, including victims of trafficking, with appropriate interventions and assistance throughout the process of return and reintegration – from pre- to post-return. These include a range of support options, determined and carefully planned with beneficiaries, livelihood support including career counselling, skills training, job-placement, grants to start up business and support to safe and regular remigration. The main aim is to provide individualised and rights-based return and reintegration assistance to Thai and Filipino migrants through a holistic and coherent approach that, based on the strengthened capacity of service providers, ensures safe and systematic case management and referral between services providers at inter-regional level and between service providers at national and sub-national levels.

It is expected that the specific objectives of the project will contribute to increased social protection of migrant workers and respect for their rights, and reduced irregular migration including human smuggling and trafficking, and here in particular reduce the risk of (re)trafficking, through social and economic empowerment of vulnerable return migrants.

## **2.2 Management arrangements**

The overall management and implementation of the project is the responsibility of a Chief Technical Adviser/Programme Officer based at the ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific. S/He works under the administrative and technical supervision of the Regional Director and the Senior Regional Migration Specialist. Other specialists on gender, skills, child labour, communication, workers and employers in the region as well as migration specialists in MIGRANT provide additional technical support as may be necessary. Technical backstopping and monitoring are provided by PARDEV.

National project officers in Thailand and the Philippines coordinate country implementation. The team is supported by an Administrative and Finance Assistant in

Bangkok and an Administrative Secretary in Manila. ILO Country Directors provide administrative and technical supervision to national staff of the project.

### **2.3 Implementation arrangement**

Project activities are either directly carried out by ILO or implemented in partnership with a few government agencies that are responsible for migration management and protection of migrants as well as with non-government organizations that advocate for the rights of migrant workers and provide direct support services to migrants. They undertake specific activities such as victim identification; community outreach; provision of psycho-social, medical, legal and other appropriate interventions; skills and livelihood training; family and community support; among others. For instance, the project works directly with the Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (OWWA) in the Philippines and the Department of Employment in Thailand in the delivery of return and reintegration services to migrants. Non-government organizations such as Batis Center for Women and Kanlungan Centre Foundation in the Philippines are tapped for local advocacy, community outreach and also for direct assistance. In Thailand, the project works with the Thai Labor Campaign for legal assistance and direct support to returned Thai migrant workers.

The project contracts-out individual experts and institutions to undertake researches and studies, curriculum development, conduct of specialized training, and other technical requirements of the project.

The project team provides technical assistance in, and monitors, the implementation of sub-contracted activities to make sure that they are implemented based on a terms of reference and remain within the overall project context.

### **2.4 Progress to date**

The first half of the project focused on building-up knowledge base on migration to, and return migration from, the EU and neighbouring countries. Rapid assessments in Thailand and the Philippines were completed, an experts meeting and service providers' meetings were held, a training manual completed, and several service providers' training done. Community outreach for victim identification also started during that period.

Based on the project's most recent technical report – covering the period 16 November 2010 to 15 November 2011 - significant progress was noted in the implementation of project activities in Thailand and the Philippines – from institutional development initiatives to direct assistance to return migrants who have experienced abuse and exploitation including victims of trafficking. The project was able to provide the platform and the means for key national and local migration stakeholders to discuss and address issues and challenges affecting return and reintegration particularly on enhancing coordination between them. At the same time, more return migrants were identified, processed, assisted and extended with various services.



In Thailand, the signing of a Letter of Understanding (LOU) on ILO-Department of Employment (DOE) Cooperation on recruitment practices and protection of migrant workers on May 26, 2010, following a several of preparatory work, is a way to sustain many initiatives during this reporting period. The project supports the implementation of the LOU through a work programme that seeks to address recruitment malpractices and support the reintegration of return migrants. This is the first time that the DOE systematically works with several external partner agencies. The creation of a multi-stakeholder Technical Working Group (TWG) to coordinate and monitor the implementation of the LOU enhances the achievement of project objectives and guarantees the mainstreaming and sustainability of the Action outcomes even beyond the project duration.

With the growing concern over the recruitment of seasonal migrant workers from Thailand and their working conditions in Sweden, project activities in Thailand focused on addressing the issues confronting these migrant workers, while remaining within the project's overall context. Materials and manuals on safe migration and pre-departure orientation were developed and disseminated and trainings were given to return migrants and jobseekers. This also gave the project the opportunity to collaborate with Thai authorities on strengthening coordination between service providers in Sweden and Thailand, and between service providers in Thailand. The participation of three key agencies such as the Ministry of Labour (MOL), Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (MSDHS) in addressing the problems of seasonal migrants through the LOU technical working group demonstrates their common resolve and aspiration for the protection of Thai migrant workers.

In support of the LOU objectives, the project has partnered with the TWG in the implementation of project activities, among which is the development of an online facility for migrants to access government services including an avenue to lodge complaints or ventilate grievances.

The project in Thailand also linked-up with 846 national and local service providers including heads and staff of key ministries; relevant provincial, district and sub-district committees; multi-disciplinary teams; community leaders and its network; and community volunteers. They were oriented about the project and on labour migration issues such as trafficking, safe migration and protection of migrant workers. Their roles and responsibilities in providing assistance to returnees were likewise clarified. This linkage led to the signing of Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) among members of the provincial and district multi-disciplinary teams for the provision of assistance to return migrants.

In the Philippines, key migration stakeholders fleshed out coordination issues that will hopefully result in practical arrangements not only between national and local authorities but potentially between Philippine authorities and service providers in destination countries. The project works with the Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE) and its attached agencies and staff bureaus including the Overseas Workers Welfare Administration, which is primarily mandated to protect and promote the welfare of Filipino migrant workers; the Office of the Undersecretary for Migrant Workers Affairs

(OUMWA) of the Department of Foreign Affairs (DFA) and other relevant national government agencies, non-government organizations and other migration stakeholders.

The project contributed to the roll-out of the National Referral System and Philippine Anti-Trafficking Database through support to training for anti-trafficking focal persons of the Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) and key service providers including those of the project's geographical focus. Fifty-one (51) sub-national and local service providers in the Philippines were trained by DSWD on trafficking and related laws, administrative policies, the nature and dynamics of victim assistance, case management, and systems and procedures to facilitate service delivery. The training included relevant modules from the manual developed by ILO's International Training Centre in Turin under the project. Further trainings are scheduled for local service providers on employment services, in partnership with the Bureau of Local Employment, a staff bureau of DOLE.

A number of local service providers and other stakeholders were also reached out and oriented about the project, the state of labour migration in the Philippines and the need for greater collaboration among agencies and non-government organizations at the local level. Approximately 50 local officials in Nueva Ecija and Ilocos Sur either joined project meetings, or attended community education sessions, or tapped for victim identification. In La Union, local chief executives and officials from eight municipalities were oriented on the project and on the promotion and protection of the rights and welfare of migrant workers. Through consultation meetings, available services and opportunities for accessing assistance for migrants were identified.

The work with a few pilot local governments in the Philippines has raised the consciousness of local authorities on the critical role they play in the overall labour migration governance. With the sustainability of project outcomes in mind, the project supported the advocacy for the inclusion of labour migration issues in local development planning through the formulation of local migration and development plans and the creation of local support mechanisms for the reintegration of return migrants. Fourteen of the 20 municipalities in La Union participated during consultation meetings. All these processes resulted in the adoption of a 5-year La Union Migration and Development Strategic Plan. Hopefully, this plan will be replicated in the other target provinces of Ilocos Sur and Nueva Ecija.

During the reporting period, there is likewise an increase in the number of project beneficiaries who were provided with economic and social interventions. Despite of natural calamities and dengue outbreak that plagued project areas in Thailand and the Philippines during the second half of 2011, a total of one thousand nine hundred seven (1,907) return migrants, jobseekers and would-be migrants had been reached and benefited from the project. Legal assistance and various psycho-social and other social services were provided to return migrants. Start-up capital was granted to a number of them after going through business counselling services, mentoring and skills trainings. A large number of seasonal migrant workers from Thailand have received safe migration and pre-departure orientation, ensuring that they receive appropriate and timely information about overseas migration as well as an idea on where to seek assistance where necessary.

### **3. Purpose, scope and clients of evaluation**

#### **3.1 Purpose**

The final independent evaluation is aimed to highlight good points, areas for improvement and recommendations for sustainability. It is also aimed identifying possible lessons learnt and good practices for learning and knowledge sharing purposes.

This independent final evaluation will therefore seek to assess the key achievements of the project as per project framework, the extent to which the project partners in Thailand and Philippines, local communities and beneficiaries have benefited, and will continue to benefit, from the project's outcome, strategy and implementation arrangements specifically in terms of:

- relevance
- effectiveness
- efficiency
- sustainability
- gender equality promotion
- monitoring and evaluation
- knowledge sharing and learning environment

To achieve the abovementioned objectives this independent final evaluation will assess the following:

- To what extent the project has acted upon the midterm evaluation recommendations
- the achievement made in relation to the planned results and the immediate objectives, including any intended/unintended impact of the project
- the project management, coordination mechanisms among various stakeholders and tripartite constituents, at the provincial level and at the national level, as well as among ILO relevant projects and the effectiveness and efficiency of project implementation in general
- institutional arrangements with the partners, the role of tripartite constituents, the governments agencies at various levels to monitor the implementation of the project during and beyond the timeframe of the project
- project's experiences that can be learned with regard to achieving gender equality and environmental sustainability

#### **3.2 Scope**

The scope of the evaluation is the start until the time of the evaluation and it covers all geographical coverage of the project in Thailand and the Philippines.

#### **3.3 Clients**

The primary clients of the evaluation are the governments and social partners in Thailand and the Philippines, ILO units (ROAP, MIGRANT, CO-Bangkok, CO-Manila) directly involved in the implementing and backstopping the project, and the donor.

#### **4. Suggested Methodology and framework**

ILO's Evaluation Guidelines provides the basic framework, the evaluation will be carried out in accordance with ILO standard policies and procedures. The ILO adheres to the United Nations system evaluation norms and standards as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards.

The evaluation is an independent evaluation and the final methodology and evaluation questions will be determined by the Evaluator in consultation with the Evaluation Manager. Several methods will be used as a minimum to collect information including:

- Review of documents related to the project, including the initial project document, progress reports, project midterm evaluation report, and reports to the Steering Committee Meetings, project M&E documents
- Review of other relevant documents such as the Decent Work Country Programmes, ILO regional migration strategy
- Field visits, interview and group discussion with key stakeholders and beneficiaries in Thailand and the Philippines. The selection of locations for field visits will be done randomly or based on sound selection criteria

At the completion of the field mission, a stakeholder workshop will be organized to present the preliminary findings and proposed recommendations. Draft evaluation report will be shared with relevant stakeholders for their comments and inputs.

All data should be sex-disaggregated and different needs of women and men and those marginalized groups should be considered through-out the evaluation process. The suggested analytical framework for the final evaluation is set out below:

##### **4.1 Relevance and strategic fit**

- The extent to which the project approach is strategic and it is based on the ILO comparative advantages
- Did (and how) the project interventions align with and support relevant national development plans and, national action plan on relevant issues e.g. on migration, anti-trafficking etc. as well as programmes and priorities of the social partners?
- Did (and how) the project align with and promote the ILO's Asian Regional Strategy on Labour Migration, Asian Regional Plan of Action, and the ILO Multilateral Framework on labour migration?
- Did the project support and to what extent contribute to the DWCP of Thailand and the Philippines and complement and fit with relevant ILO projects and programmes in the region?

##### **4.2 Validity of design (to what extent the design is logical and coherent)**

- To what extent the issues related to the design (defining the project's focus and

target group) that were pointed out in the midterm evaluation, has been taken into consideration by the project?

- What have been the lessons learnt in the design of the project?

#### **4.3 Project progress and effectiveness (and gender equality and promotion)**

- To what extent the project's immediate objectives have been achieved vis-a-vis the project logical framework and taking into account the midterm evaluation recommendations
- Has the project's monitoring plan ensure that the project has been on track with regard to the expected results?
- How is gender being mainstreamed? Has there been any effort to mainstream gender throughout the project?
- In which areas of project implementation where social partners has been integrated meaningfully?
- What are the lessons learnt and good practices?

#### **4.4 Efficiency of resource use**

- Did the project results from economically resources (funds, expertise, time, etc.)?
- Has there been any arrangements in the implementation of the project at various level (inter-agencies, national, provincial, district, and community) to leverage resources?
- What are the lessons learnt and/or possible good practices noteworthy of documentation for knowledge sharing purposes?

#### **4.5 Effectiveness of management arrangements (including monitoring and evaluation)**

- Are management capacities and arrangement adequate and do they facilitate good results and efficient delivery? Is there a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities by all parties involved?
  - Does the project receive adequate political, technical and administrative support from its national partners, especially local governments at the district level? Do implementing partners provide for effective Project implementation?
  - Has cooperation with Project partners been efficient?
- How effectively did the project management and ILO monitor Project performance and results?
  - Is a monitoring and evaluation system in place and how effective is it?
  - Have appropriate means of verification for tracking progress, performance and achievement of indicator values been defined?
  - Is relevant information and data systematically being collected and collated? Is reporting satisfactory? Is data disaggregated by sex (and by other relevant characteristics, if relevant)?
  - Is information being regularly analysed to feed into management decisions?

- Has relevant gender expertise been sought? Have available gender mainstreaming tools been adapted and utilized?
- Has the Project made strategic use of coordination and collaboration with other ILO projects and with other donor's projects in Thailand and the Philippines?

#### **4.6 Impact orientation, and sustainability of the intervention**

- What are the impacts of the project?
  - What are the emerging impacts of the project and the changes that can be causally linked to the project's interventions?
  - What are the arrangements to measure the project's impact during and at the end of the project? Are these arrangements adequate and will they deliver reliable findings?
  - In how far has the project made a significant contribution to broader, longer-term development impact?
  - What are realistic long-term effects of the project on better migration management, reduction of labour migration exploitation, poverty levels and the decent work conditions?
- What is an effective and realistic exit strategy for the project? Is the Project gradually being handed over to the provincial/local government partners? Once external funding ends will local government and other implementing partners be likely to continue the project or carry forward its results?
  - Are local governments and implementing partners able, willing and committed to continue with the Project? How effectively has the project built national ownership and capacity?
  - Has the Project successfully built or strengthened an enabling environment (laws, policies, technical capacities, people's attitudes, etc.)?

### **5. Main outputs**

The evaluator will draft a **short inception report** upon the review of the available documents and an initial discussion with the project management. This inception report should set out the clear evaluation instrument (which include the key questions and data gathering including questionnaires /and analysis methods/ the choice of site visits within Thailand and Philippines –the selection of location should be done randomly or based on sound selection criteria) and any changes proposed to the methodology or any other issues of importance in the further conduct of the evaluation. The inception report will be approved by the Evaluation Manager.

At the end of the evaluation mission, the Evaluation Team will present the preliminary findings at a stakeholders' workshop. The presentation should highlight the good points, areas for improvement and recommendations for sustainability.

The participants will include Governments at all levels, project staff, relevant ILO officials, representatives of Thailand and Philippines' governments, and ILO constituents. In this occasion, the project's stakeholders will have a chance to jointly assess the adequacy of

the findings and emerging recommendations as well as recommend areas for further considerations by the Evaluation for the preparation of the Evaluation Report.

The main output will be first a draft report, later transformed into a final report when comments of the ILO, and other stakeholders have been received on the draft. The report should not be longer than 35 pages, excluding annexes. It will contain an executive summary, a section with project achievements to date, findings and recommendations for short and medium term action. The report should be set-up in line with the 'Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports in the ILO' which will be provided to the team leader. The final report is subject to final approval by ILO Evaluation Unit.

ILO management will prepare management response to the evaluation recommendations and action to act upon the recommendations will be undertaken and report to ILO Evaluation Unit.

***Quality recommendations in the evaluation report must meet the following criteria: -***

The ILO Evaluation guidelines to Results-based Evaluation: Principles and rationale for evaluation – Version 1 includes the following criteria for drafting quality recommendations in evaluation reports: (1) *recommendations are based on findings and conclusions of the report*, (2) *recommendations are clear, concise, constructive and of relevance to the intended user(s)*, and (3) *recommendations are realistic and actionable (including who is called upon to act and recommended timeframe)*. In addition to The ILO Guidelines, EVAL has also issued guidance for formatting requirements for evaluation Reports, establishing the following criteria for the drafting of recommendations: (1) *actionable and time-bound with clear indication of whom the recommendation is addressed to*, (2) *written in two to three sentences of concise text*, (3) *numbered* (no bullet points) and (4) *no more than twelve*. Also, recommendations must be (5) *presented at the end of the body of the main report, and the concise statement should be* (6) *copied over into the Executive Summary and the Evaluation Summary* (that is, the concise statements of recommendations should be verbatim identical in the recommendation section of the main body of the report, the Executive Summary, and the Evaluation Summary).

**The evaluation summary** according to ILO template will also be drafted by the evaluation team leader after the evaluation report has been finalised. The evaluation manager will finalise the evaluation summary.

## **6. Management arrangements and time frame**

### **6.1 Evaluation management and roles of evaluators and stakeholders**

The evaluation manager is Ms Pamornrat Pringsulaka, Regional Evaluation Officer- ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific. She will be in charge of the selection of the consultants in consultation EVAL. The project office in Bangkok will handle all contractual

arrangements with the evaluator and provide any logistical and other assistance as may be required.

The evaluation team reports to the evaluation manager, Ms Pringsulaka.

**Evaluator's roles:** The international consultant who has no prior involvement in the project will undertake the evaluation and will be responsible for delivering the above evaluation outputs using a combination of methods mentioned above. National consultant provides support to the team leader particularly during the evaluation mission as requested by the team leader.

**Selection/Qualifications of Evaluator:** One independent international evaluation specialist with degree. He/she should have a proven track record in the evaluation of similar complex projects, experience with country situations similar to that of Thailand and the Philippines. Experience in the labour migration field will be an advantage.

**Stakeholders' role:** All stakeholders in Thailand and the Philippines particularly the project teams, ILO CO-Manila, CO-Bangkok, ILO technical unit at HQ, and donor will be consulted and will have opportunities to provide inputs to the TOR and draft evaluation report.

**The tasks of the Projects:** The project management will provide logistic support to the evaluation and will prepare a more detailed evaluation mission agenda. Also the project needs to ensure that all relevant documentations are up to date and easily accessible by the evaluator.

## 6.2 A work plan and timeframe

| Task   | Responsible person                     | Time frame         |
|--|--|--------------------|
| Preparation of the TOR –draft1   | Evaluation Manager/<br>project manager | Nov 2011           |
| Sharing the TOR with all concerned for comments/inputs                                       | Evaluation Manager                     | Dec 2011           |
| Finalization of the TOR  | Evaluation Manager                     | Jan 2012           |
| Approval of the TOR  | EVAL                                   | Jan 2012           |
| Selection of consultant and finalisation   | Evaluation Manager                     | Jan 2012           |
| Draft mission itinerary for the evaluator and the list of key stakeholders to be interviewed | Project Manager                        | Jan 2012           |
| Ex-col contract based on the TOR prepared/signed   | Project                                | Jan/early Feb 2012 |
| Brief evaluators on ILO evaluation policy  | Evaluation Manager                     | 15 Feb 2012        |
| Evaluation Mission   | Evaluators                             | Mar 2012           |



| Task   | Responsible person                       | Time frame             |
|--|--|------------------------|
| Inception report submitted to Evaluation Manager   | Evaluators                               | 29 Feb 2012            |
| Stakeholders' Workshop (Present preliminary findings during the project-end conference ) | Evaluators/ project management           | March 2012 (last week) |
| Drafting of evaluation report and submitting it to the Evaluation Manager                | Evaluators                               | 10 April 2012          |
| Sharing the draft report to all concerned for comments                                   | Evaluation Manager                       | 25 April 2012          |
| Consolidated comments on the draft report, send to the evaluator                         | Evaluation Manager                       | 26 April 2012          |
| Finalisation of the report and submission to Evaluation Manager                          | Evaluator                                | 2 May 2012             |
| Review of the final report   | Evaluation Manager/ROAP                  | 4 May 2012             |
| Submission of the final report to EVAL   | Evaluation Manager/ROAP                  | 7 May 2012             |
| Approval of the final evaluation report  | EVAL                                     | 11 May 2012            |
| Follow up on recommendations   | EVAL ILO Director/ ILO Country Directors | June 2012 onwards      |

**Workdays for the evaluation:** the evaluation should start on 20 February 2012. The evaluation is estimated at the total of twenty-eight (28) workdays as indicated below:

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Preliminaries (3 days)</b>                        |   |
| 26-28 Feb 2012                                       | Desk review of documents. Preparation time off-site, project will provide extensive background materials. <b>(3 days)</b>   |
| <b>Meetings and Site Visits in Thailand (7 days)</b> |   |
| 5-6 March  | Discussion with project team at ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific including interview relevant ILO Specialists. <b>(2 days)</b><br>Leaving BKK to Phetchabun 14.00 on 6 March  |
| 7-8 March  | Visit to Phetchabun to meet with the Multi-disciplinary Team at various levels and discuss approaches to service delivery for migrants, in partnership with local authorities led by the Department of Employment. The schedule will include home visit/discussion with project beneficiaries. <b>(2 days)</b><br><b>7 March</b> – meet with returnees at Nongpai District and Berng Grajab District (legal assistance and economic activities)<br><b>8 March</b> - 09.00 – 11.00 meet with Provincial Employment officer(s)<br>11.15 – 12.00 leave for Nongpai District<br>13.00 – 16.00 meeting with MDT Nongpai<br>17.00 leaving Phetchabun to Bangkok |
| 9 March  | Discussion with project partners such as the Asian Research Centre for Migration (ARCM), Foundation for Women (FFW). <b>(1 day)</b>   |
| 12 March   | Discussion with the Thai Labour Campaign (TLC) and a lawyer from the SR   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | Law Office on their activities. <b>(1 day)</b>  |
| 13 March  | Discussion in Bangkok with the Technical Working Group of the DOE-ILO Letter of Understanding on Cooperation on improving recruitment practices and protection of migrant workers. <b>(1 day)</b>   |
| <b>Meetings and Site Visits in the Philippines (9 days)</b>                 |   |
| 14 March  | Leaving Bangkok to Manila   |
| 15 March  | Leaving Manila to Laoag by Plane and travel by van from Laoag to Vigan  |
| 16 March  | Discussion with project beneficiaries in Vigan, Ilocos Sur on assistance received and with the provincial government on partnership with NGOs on community outreach and victim identification. <b>(1 day)</b>   |
| 17 March  | Leaving Vigan to Manila   |
| 19-20 March   | Site visit to San Fernando City, La Union to discuss with local partners on local level mechanisms and partnerships where a local strategic plan on migration and development was adopted through multi-stakeholder partnerships. <b>(2 days)</b>         |
| 21 March  | Discussion and site visit with a few project beneficiaries in Taytay, Rizal. These beneficiaries returned from labour exploitation in Romania and were assisted by the project through the Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (OWWA). <b>(1 day)</b> |
| 22 March  | Discussion with national level agencies (DOLE, OWWA, DFA, DSWD, NRCO, NGOs, IACAT). <b>(1 day)</b>  |
| 23 March  | Meeting with ILO Manila Officer(s). <b>(1 day)</b>  |
| 26 March  | Formulation/writing of preliminary assessment and findings based on the results of the meetings and visits in the Philippines and Thailand. <b>(1 day)</b>  |
| 27-28 March   | Presentation of preliminary assessment and findings to project partners and stakeholders during the Project's Final Conference in Manila. <b>(2 days)</b>   |
| <b>Post-mission activities (Report preparation and submission) (9 days)</b> |   |
| April 1-10  | Produce a draft report for submission to the Evaluation Manager who will disseminate it to relevant partners for comments. <b>(7 days)</b>  |
| April 10-24   | Draft report is shared with key stakeholders and constituents for comments.   |
| April 26-27   | Finalize the draft report in light of the comments received and prepare the Evaluation Summaries for submission to the Evaluation Manager. <b>(2 days)</b>  |
| April 30  | Final report sent to EVAL for final approval.   |
| May 2012  | Management response to the recommendations prepared.  |

## **7. Resources Required**

The following resources are required from the project.

Cost of External International Evaluator (Fee+ travelling expenses)

Cost of local transportation in the field

Cost of Stakeholders workshop

## **Annex 1: RESULTS FRAMEWORK**

## **Annex 2: ILO Evaluation quality checklist and templates**



## Appendix 2: List of persons and organisations interviewed

| Name   | Position/Organisation   |
|--|---|
| <b><u>ILO &amp; Project Team</u></b>   |   |
| Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka  | Monitoring & Evaluation Officer<br>ILO ROAP   |
| Ms. Maria Gallotti<br>Ms. Panudda Boonpala<br>Mr. Robert Larga   | Successive POs of the project   |
| Ms. Kusumal Rachawong<br>Mr. Mitchell Duran  | National Project Coordinator Thailand<br>National Project Coordinator Philippines   |
| Mr. Jiyuan Wang  | Director ILO Country Office for Thailand,<br>Cambodia & Lao PDR   |
| Ms. Wimon Pumsavai<br>Ms. Desiree Joy Granil   | Administrative Assistant Thailand<br>Administrative Assistant Philippines   |
| Ms. Thethis Mangahas   | Deputy Regional Director  |
| Mr. Nilim Baruh  | Senior Regional Migration Specialist ROAP   |
| Mr. Max Tunon<br>Ms. Kuanruthai Siripatthanakosol  | Programme Officer TRIANGLE project<br>National Project Coordinator TRIANGLE project   |
| Ms. Sikharin Singsakorn  | Project Coordinator Petchabun Province  |
| <b><u>THAILAND</u></b>   |   |
| Mr. Marut Podtukpai  | Employment Office Petchabun   |
| Mr. Manusak Sangthong<br>Ms. Orawan Kaenkaow<br>Ms. Siripon Singtasang<br>Mr. Marut Podtukpai<br>Mr. Pakpoon Kaewmongkol<br>Mr. Kittisak Wadusirisak<br>Mr. Sitasak Suwannanont<br>Ms. Nongnart Luetraku | <u>Multi-Disciplinary Team Nong Phai</u><br>Deputy District Director Nong Phai<br>Provincial Social Welfare Office<br>TAU – Education Department<br>Employment Office Petchabun<br>Agriculture Bank<br>Agriculture Bank<br>Police<br>Chairperson of Lawyers Association |
| Families in Nong Phai District<br>Returnees in Wichien Buri District   | Returnees from Sweden and Laos<br>Returnees from Sweden   |
| Mr. Luca Pierantoni  | EU Delegation in Thailand   |

---

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Ms. Matthama Chetamee</b>               | Foundation for Women   |
| <b>Ms. Sinee Chongchit</b>                 | <u>Technical Working Group of the DOE-ILO LoU</u>  |
| <b>Mr. Sombhat Phodhiwatana</b>            | Deputy Director General, DOE   |
| <b>Ms. Phateharintr Harneharoem</b>        | Senior Labour Officer  |
| <b>Ms. Chalobon Kachonpadungkitti</b>      | Senior Labour Officer  |
| <b>Ms. Piengpahp Withyachumnarnkul</b>     | Labour Specialist  |
| <b>Ms. Lupthanan Walsh</b>                 | Chief of Foreign Relations   |
| <b>Ms. Nattakan Sajumpa</b>                | Senior International Affairs Officer   |
| <b>Ms. Satuporn Wongkaew</b>               | Senior Labour Officer  |
| <b>Ms. Ratchada Jayagupta</b>              | Asian Research Center for Migration (ACRM)   |
| <b>Mr. Samarn Laodumrongchat</b>           | Chulalongkorn University   |
| <b>Ms. Suthasinee Kaewleklai</b>           | Thai Labour Campaign   |
| <b>Ms. Siriwan Vongkietpaisa</b>           | SR Law Office  |
| <br><b><u>PHILIPPINES</u></b>              |  |
| <b>Ms. Vivian S. Tornea</b>                | <u>Overseas Workers Welfare Administration (OWWA)</u>                                      |
| <b>Ms. Marivic C. Clarin</b>               | Director, National Reintegration Center for OFWs   |
| <b>Ms. Carmelita T. Raquiza</b>            | Regional Operations Coordination Service   |
| <b>Ms. Emma V. Sinclair</b>                | National Reintegration Center for OFWs   |
| <b>Ms. Ching V. Burgos</b>                 | Director, Regional Welfare Office, National Capital<br>ILO Project Coordinator             |
| <b>Ms. Andrea Luisa C. Anolin</b>          | Executive Director, Batis Center for Women   |
| <b>Ms. Perlita C. Rigunay</b>              | Public Employment Service Office (PESO) Vigan  |
| <b>Mr. Bernard Salva</b>                   | Community Affairs Officer & Migrant Desk Officer,<br>Ilocos Sur                            |
| <b>Mr. Ferdinand Conception</b>            | Provincial Social Welfare & Development Office,<br>Ilocos Sur                              |
| <b>Returnees in Magsingal, Ilocos Sur</b>  | Returnees from Jordan & Lebanon  |
| <b>Returnees in San Fernando, La Union</b> | Returnees from Lebanon, Syria and Cyprus   |
| <b>Returnees in Taytay, Rizal</b>          | Returnees from Romania   |
| <b>Mr. Geoffrey S. Tilan</b>               | Provincial Administrator, La Union   |
| <b>Ms. Charito C. Dator</b>                | Provincial PESO Manager  |
| <b>Mr. Ranilo P. Ipac</b>                  | Provincial Social Welfare & Development Officer  |
| <b>Mr. Mauro A. Libatique</b>              | Provincial Planning & Development Coordinator  |
| <b>Mr. Enrico T. Fos</b>                   | Office of the Undersecretary for Migrant Workers<br>Affairs, Department of Foreign Affairs |
| <b>Ms. Rose P. Bayon</b>                   | Kalungan Center Foundation, La Union Office  |

---

**Ms. Camilla Hagstroem**  
**Mr. Margarito Raynera Jr.**

Deputy Head of Operations, EU Delegation  
Programme Officer, EU Delegation

**EUROPE**

**Ms. Nonglak Trepp**

President, Thai Women Network in Europe

**Mr. Winston Dean S. Almeda**

Third Secretary & Vice Consul  
Embassy of the Philippines in Paris

**EVENTS ATTENDED**

**Exploring the Migration, Human  
Rights and Development nexus in  
Ilocos Sur**  
**Project Closing Conference**

Vigan City, Ilocos Sur, 15 March 2012

Manila, 27 March 2012

---

## **Appendix 3: List of documents and publications consulted**

- Terms of Reference for the Final independent Evaluation
- Contribution Agreement EU/ILO signed in December 2008 and relevant Annexes (The Action, the Logical Framework, the Budget)
- Flash Report 01 February 2009 – 31 May 2009
- Flash Report 21 November 2009 – 30 June 2010
- Flash Report 16 November 2010 – 15 May 2011
- Interim Narrative Report 01/02/2009 to 20/11/2010
- Interim Narrative Report 20/11/2009 to 15/11/2010
- Interim Narrative Report 16/11/2010 to 15/11/2011
- Mid-Term Self Evaluation Report (January 2011)
- Update on Activities: November 2011 – February 2012
- ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration
- Report of the 14<sup>th</sup> Asia and the Pacific Regional Meeting, Busan 2006
- Report of the 15<sup>th</sup> Asia and the Pacific Regional Meeting, Kyoto 2011
- ILO Implementation Report 2010-2011
- ILO Asian Programme on the Governance of Labour Migration
- International Labour Migration: a rights-based approach (2010)
- Strengthening Migration Governance (2010)
- Independent Evaluation of ILO's Strategy for the Protection of Migrant Workers (2001-2007)
- Asian Decent Work Decade resource kit: protecting migrant workers
- Implementation Report 2010-2011 for Thailand
- Implementation Report 2010-2011 for the Philippines
- From Europe to Asia and back
- Meeting Report of the Advisory Group Meeting on Economic and Social Empowerment of Thai and Filipino Migrants including victims of Trafficking returned from EU and neighbouring countries (Bangkok, 2-3 December 2009)
- TOR and Final Report “Development of inter disciplinary team for Monitoring and Assisting Return and Outgoing Migrants of Petchabun Province
- TOR and Report on “Strengthening Bilateral Cooperation between Local Communities in Source and Destination Countries (Thailand and Sweden) for the Protection and Safe Return of Thai Migrant Workers from Sweden
- TOR and Final Report “Development Mechanism for the Monitoring and Assisting for Returned and Outgoing Migrants of Petchabun Province
- Project Proposal “Development of Training Curriculum on the Protection of returnees and the Prevention of Labour Exploitation including Human Trafficking; Concepts notes of Experts Working Group
- TOR “Post-training validation of the Community Surveillance Volunteers for Safe Migration in Petchabun and Chiang Rai provinces

- Community Consultation “Solution to Unfair Recruitment Practices”
- TOR and Final Report “Confronting Labour Trafficking: Empowerment for Sustainable Solutions”
- DOE-ILO Cooperation Pre-Departure Training Workshop for Job-seekers
- Report on Seminar on the “Protection of Job seekers and the Prevention of Human Trafficking”
- Report on workshop on “Enhancement of Recruitment Standard on Overseas Employment”
- Proposal for Training Workshop for Government Officials on Practical Guide for Complaint Taking Procedures and Online Services
- “Network Building with Thai Communities and Stakeholders in Sweden and Poland”
- Workshop “Strengthen Network and Referral System for Thai Migrant Workers to Europe”
- TRIANGLE Project brief: Tripartite Action to Protect Migrant Workers from Labour Exploitation
- TRIANGLE Project Update December 2011
- Situation Analysis of Outbound and Return Migration and Local Institutional Mechanisms to Support Migrants in La Union, Ilocos Sur and Nueva Ecija
- Seminar Evaluation Report “Workshop on building peer support for return migrants and ILO-EEC Migration Project Beneficiaries
- La Union Migration and Development Strategic Palm (2012-2016)
- Draft Report on “Developing a system of linkages, cooperation and coordination of service providers in Italy, France and the Philippines to improve delivery of services to distressed Filipino migrants, in particular victims of exploitation and trafficking” (March 2012)
- The Philippines and return migration: Rapid appraisal of the return and reintegration policies and service delivery (Stella P. Go, August 2010)
- “Going Home, Making Good”: Stories of triumph and hope as told by Filipino women migrants returned from Europe and neighbouring countries
- Meeting/ Round Table Discussion report on Sharing of Good Practices on Local- and Community-Level Mechanisms to Protect and Promote the Rights of Migrant Workers in Thailand and the Philippines (January 2012)