



International  
Labour  
Organization



**SHIP TO  
SHORE  
RIGHTS**

# **MID-TERM EVALUATION**

**COMBATING UNACCEPTABLE FORMS OF WORK IN  
THE THAI FISHING AND SEAFOOD INDUSTRY**

ILO TC Project Code: THA/15/03/EUR

Type of evaluation: Mid-term Internal Evaluation

Country: Thailand

Evaluation dates: 20 December, 2017 - 31 March, 2018

Name of consultants: Ruth Bowen (Team leader) and Roisai Wongsuban (Team member)

ILO administrative office: ILO Country Office for Cambodia, Lao PDR and Thailand (CO-Bangkok)

Technical Backstopping Office: ILO Decent Work Technical Support Team for East and South East Asia and the Pacific (DWT-Bangkok)

Date project ends: 31 July, 2019

Donor: European Union

Total project funds: EUR 4,200,000 (including EUR 500,000 from ILO)

Evaluation Manager: Jason Judd - Project Chief Technical Advisor

Key Words: Labour; fishing workers; seafood processing; decent work; child labour

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

LIST OF ACRONYMS .....	ii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	iii
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 Project Description and Context .....	1
1.2 Background of the Evaluation.....	3
II. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY .....	4
2.1. Evaluation Objectives and Scope.....	4
2.2. Methodology .....	5
III. FINDINGS.....	9
3.1 Project Design .....	9
3.2 Relevance .....	14
3.3 Progress towards Objectives .....	17
3.3.1 Overview of Progress.....	17
3.3.2 Strengthened Legal, Policy and Regulatory Framework (Objective 1).....	18
3.3.3 Strengthened Enforcement through Labour Inspection (Objective 2).....	22
3.3.4 Industry Voluntary Compliance (Objective 3) .....	25
3.3.5 Access to Services and Empowerment of Workers in the Sectors (Objective 4) ...	27
3.3.6 Gender strategies.....	32
3.4 Sustainability and Impact Orientation.....	33
3.5. Management Effectiveness .....	35
3.6 Efficiency of Resources .....	40
3.7 Effectiveness of Communication and Visibility Strategies.....	42
IV CONCLUSIONS .....	43
V RECOMMENDATIONS.....	48
ANNEXES .....	51
Annex A Terms of Reference .....	51
Annex B. Data Collection Matrix .....	60
Annex C. List of References .....	64
Annex D. List of Persons Interviewed.....	65
Annex E. Diagram of Project Logic .....	69

## LIST OF ACRONYMS

---

AAC	Aid Alliance Committee for Myanmar Workers
CCCIF	Command Centre for Combatting Illegal Fishing
CTA/PC	Chief Technical Advisor/Project Coordinator
DLPW	Department of Labour Protection and Welfare
DOE	Department of Employment (Ministry of Labour)
DOF	Department of Fisheries (Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives)
DWT-BKK	Decent Work Team for East Asia, South East Asia and the Pacific (Bangkok)
ECOT	Employers' Confederation of Thailand
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
EU	European Union
FED	Foundation for Education and Development
FTA	Foreign Trade Association (Brussels)
GLP	Good Labour Practices Programme
HRDF	Human Rights And Development Foundation
ILO	International Labour Organization
IUU	Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing
	International Transport Workers' Federation
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
MECC	Maritime Enforcement Coordination Centre
MFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
MOL	Ministry of Labour
MSDHS	Ministry of Social Development and Human Security
MWG	Migrant Working Group
MWRN	Migrant Workers Rights Network
NFAT	National Fisheries Association of Thailand
NPC	National Project Coordinator
PIPO	Port-in Port-Out Control Centre
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RTG	Royal Thai Government
SERC	State Enterprises Workers' Relations Confederation
SSO	Social Security Office (Ministry of Labour)
TFFA	Thai Frozen Foods Association
TFPA	Thai Food Processors Association
TOFA	Thai Overseas Fisheries Association
TTUC	Thai Trade Union Congress
TTIA	Thai Tuna Industry Association
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

## Project description and evaluation background

The project, “Combatting Unacceptable Forms of Work in the Thai Fishing and Seafood Industry”, known as the Ship to Shore Rights Project, is a 3.5 year project implemented by the International Labour Organization (ILO) and funded by the European Union with a total budget of EUR 4,200,000. The project duration is from 1 February 2016 to 31 July 2019. The overall objective of the project is “to reduce forced labour, child labour and other unacceptable forms of work, and progressively eliminate the exploitation of workers, particularly migrant workers, in the Thai fishing and seafood processing sectors”.

In the light of global attention in recent years to reports of serious labour rights abuses in the Thai fishing and seafood processing industries, the Royal Thai Government has been making significant efforts to address labour conditions in fishing and seafood. Measures include new law and enforcement regimes for work in fishing and seafood and new regulations for the registration of migrant workers in Thailand. The Ship to Shore Rights Project aims to support the government, as well as industry, trade union and civil society partners to tackle the core labour rights problems remaining in the sector.

The project features four components - addressing the legal and regulatory framework, law enforcement through labour inspection, industry voluntary compliance with labour standards, and improved access of seafood and fishery workers to legal and support services. These components correspond to the following immediate objectives:

- *Immediate Objective 1.* The legal, policy and regulatory framework in the fishing and seafood sectors strengthened by raising labour standards and facilitating more regular migration into the sectors.
- *Immediate Objective 2.* Enhanced capacity of the Thai government, including the Labour Inspectorate, to more effectively identify and take action against human trafficking and other labour rights abuses in the sectors.
- *Immediate Objective 3.* Compliance with the fundamental principles and rights at work (Core Labour Standards) in the industries improved through implementation of the Good Labour Practices Programme, featuring an effective dispute resolution mechanism, and increased awareness and ownership for action across the supply chain.
- *Immediate Objective 4.* Access to support services of workers and victims of labour abuses, including children, enhanced through engagement and empowerment of civil society organizations and trade unions.

The project’s partners include government, industry associations in seafood processing and fishing, and civil society and trade unions. The Ministry of Labour (MOL) is the project’s primary government partner and co-chairs the Project Steering Committee (PSC) with the EU Delegation. Other government partners include the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (MSDHS); Department of Fisheries (DOF), and the multi-agency Command Centre for Combatting Illegal Fishing (CCCIF).

Employer organizations and industry association partners include the Employers’ Confederation of Thailand (ECOT), and the major seafood processing and fishing associations. Trade union and CSO

partners include the Thai Trade Union Congress (TTUC), State Enterprises' Worker Relations Confederation (SERC), Stella Maris, Raks Thai Foundation (RTF), Human Rights Development Foundation (HRDF), Oxfam, International Transport Workers' Federation (ITF), Migrant Working Group (MWG), and the Migrant Workers Rights Network (MWRN).

The project works at the national level and provincial level. Its geographical scope covers 22 coastal provinces, with direct implementation in 10 provinces across five coastal zones: Samut Sakhon, Chonburi (Central Zone), Rayong (East Zone), Surat Thani and Chumporn (Upper Gulf); Songkla and Pattani (Lower Gulf), and Phang Nga, Phuket and Ranong (Andaman).

The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to provide an independent assessment of the project's performance and progress towards its objectives. The intention is to provide the project and its partners with guidance towards improving the achievement of the objectives, including any proposed course correction in the project's second half.

The evaluation was conducted by an international lead evaluator and a national consultant. It was guided by a set of evaluation questions corresponding to the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, coordination and visibility. To answer the questions, the evaluation team collected primarily qualitative data, and also utilized quantitative data collected through the project's monitoring and evaluation system. The team also undertook a desk review of relevant project documents and reports. The evaluation team collected data in Thailand from 15 – 26 January, 2018 using the following methods:

- Interviews with EU delegation representatives; project staff; ILO staff of the country office for Thailand, Lao PDR and Cambodia and the regional Decent Work Team; key informants from government, industry organizations and associations and trade union CSO partners at national level in Bangkok;
- Individual and group interviews with local government, implementing partners and workers reached by the project in four implementation provinces - Phang Nga, Songkla, Pattani and Samut Sakhon.
- Focus group discussion with CSO partners in Bangkok.

The field work culminated in de-briefing meetings with the EU Delegation and the Ship to Shore Rights Project team. Following the preparation of the draft report, the evaluation team presented their findings at a meeting of the steering committee on 7 March 2018 for comment and feedback.

## **Findings and Conclusions**

### *Project Design*

The objectives of Ship to Shore Rights represent a comprehensive and well founded set of strategies to support the Thai government, the industry, trade union and civil society stakeholders in improving the rights and working conditions of workers in the fishing and seafood sectors. Nevertheless, the thematic coverage of the objectives as well as the sectoral scope of fishing and seafood processing, represent an ambitious endeavour relative to the time and human resources available. The project's geographical coverage is also wide. There are advantages of addressing the fishing and seafood processing sectors together in terms of cross-sectoral advocacy with the industries, consumer and buyer advocacy covering ethical seafood as a whole; but either a longer term project or a narrower focus would have been more feasible to deliver. Thematically, the design would have benefited from more focus, especially under the fourth component which extends widely across improvements in access to services, advocacy for migrant children's access to education in seafood and fishery areas; as well as building the capacity of workers to understand and claim

their rights through the formation of worker networks and associations. There is scope to narrow the focus in some areas in the second half.

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Framework provides a systematic basis for assessing the project's progress towards its objectives and outputs, including indicators, indicator targets and baseline values. Most of the M&E indicators are relevant and capture significant outcomes to which the project is contributing. However, the consensus-based approach to developing the framework resulted in a system that does not fully meet results-based management standards. This limits the ability to capture the results that can be attributed to the project and the use of the information as a management tool. The evaluation suggests some modest but important changes to ensure that the "output" indicators relate to changes that can be produced with the project's resources, and overall that the data can be used to improve project results.

### *Relevance*

The project operates in a dynamic, pressured and contentious environment where the reputation of the fishing and seafood industry is at stake. In this context, a key achievement attributed to the ILO is to bring all the actors together to discuss the issues, including those with competing interests.

The project has garnered a high level of engagement and participation among the national stakeholders. It supports the urgent plan of the RTG to bring the legal framework into alignment with international labour standards on forced labour and labour in fishing. It also responds to the changing needs of the labour inspectorate and other enforcement actors in the context of more stringent regulations, especially applicable to fishing vessels.

At the same time there is varying ownership and trust of the project among the stakeholders. This is evident in claims of the fishing industry associations in particular that few labour compliance issues remain, and that improvements that have been made by their members are not sufficiently recognised in project communications. This brings some risks to fully achieving the objectives under the legal reform and voluntary compliance initiatives.

### *Progress towards objectives*

The project effectively commenced work in mid-2016 when the Chief Technical Advisor was recruited. Given a delayed start, the project team together with the key stakeholders has made good progress in setting up the project's governance frameworks and completing major baseline research, gap analysis and needs assessments across the four objectives. Much of the effort during the first half of the project has been devoted to supporting legal analysis and discussion of legal revisions under Objective 1, and strong progress made in the drafting of a proposed law aligned with Forced Labour Protocol 29. The discussion of appropriate legal reforms in line with C.188 is ongoing, but the reforms face some resistance from the fishery industry.

An important knowledge product to date is the baseline survey research which provides valuable data on the state of migrant worker profiles and compliance issues in fishery and seafood processing in early 2017. This has helped the ILO and stakeholders to identify issues needing attention, as well as providing some baseline quantitative estimates intended for evaluation purposes. While an endline repeat survey will provide a useful picture of progress in the industry, due to methodological concerns, the evaluator generally cautions against using this data for direct 'before' and 'after' project comparisons to demonstrate project achievements. Additional qualitative studies of selected outcomes would be valuable to supplement the endline survey to explore the factors contributing to changes observed.

With regard to enforcement (Objective 2), the ILO's technical support to the labour inspectorate is gradually building the skills of the DLPW inspectors in coastal provinces and inspectors under other Ministries who inspect fishing vessels to identify and respond to labour violations. This is being achieved through support to efficient planning, improved inspection tools focused on fishing and seafood processing, improvements to the inspection training curriculum and the roll-out of training in inspection techniques to an expanded cohort of labour inspectors working in the coastal provinces. Further support to adjust the national inspection training curriculum is planned once legal amendments for P.29 and C.188 are introduced. However, the extent to which improved capacity is leading to more effective inspections and detection of labour violations in both fishing and seafood processing remains to be demonstrated.

Under Objective 3, a more rigorous Good Labour Practices (GLP) programme for voluntary industry compliance has been elaborated through multi-stakeholder consultations and internal consultations within the industry. Two of the major seafood associations, TTIA and TFFA, are committed to applying and sustaining the programme. The actual implementation is due to start in 2018. Compared with the original plan there are gaps in membership and sectoral coverage of GLP, which has not reached aquaculture and fishing. For the fishing sector the project plans an alternative pilot approach together with Thai Union seafood to engage vessel owners in its voluntary code of conduct. It appears to be beyond the scope of the project to extend GLP coverage directly to aquaculture farms as originally intended.

The project has directly engaged a range of experienced CSO and trade union partners in improving workers' access to legal support, health services, education for children, and enhancing workers' knowledge of Thai migrant regulation and labour rights (Objective 4). Many of the services are in the early stages of development, having commenced early in 2017 or later, but there is evidence that they are serving important needs of workers for information and legal support. Around 7,400 workers have been reached directly by end of 2017 according to the latest documentation. Promising models of organizing workers through peer networks and more formal associations are also emerging. Provincial tri-partite meetings held in several provinces to discuss issues in the sectors is an emerging good practice towards coordinating services.

### ***Sustainability***

The project efforts on legal and regulatory frameworks stand to bring significant and long-term changes to the legal framework in line with international labour standards for the target sectors. The improvements being made to labour inspection systems and capacity have prospects for far-reaching improvement to detecting labour violations, provided the inspectorate is committed to identifying and prosecuting violations. Regarding industry compliance, two major seafood processing associations are committed to implementing the new model GLP programme among their members and funding governance structures. Achieving wider impact in seafood processing will require engaging other associations and ongoing buyer support for the programme. The prospects for sustaining good labour practice programmes within the fishing industry will depend on the success of the new pilot strategy.

Under Objective 4 the project advocates for workers' sustainable access to services that are financially sustainable and coordinated among government and CSOs; and importantly by developing workers' capacities to understand and claim their rights through ongoing worker networks. The partners are seeking sustainable solutions for the worker drop-in centres and legal supports, with various potential models, either through government funding, public-private partnerships or support from other donors. In the case of worker networks and associations, these will likely require long term CSO and trade union support beyond the project.



### *Management effectiveness and efficiency*

The project staffing and designation of responsibilities is effective and has responded flexibly to emerging needs, while some further balance and adjustments among staff responsibilities are suggested by the evaluation. Overall, the implementation agreements with partners are well managed, after initial difficulties for partners in complying with ILO's requirements which led to some funding lags. The project funds are allocated efficiently to achieve the objectives, and the share allocated to the respective components appears justified.

### *Communications and Visibility*

The project developed a comprehensive communications and visibility strategy and has delivered a range of communications materials for the general public and for workers regarding their rights and services available. At mid-term, the full production of planned communications activities has not been completed and it would be useful to prioritize the strategies going forward. Levels of awareness about the roles of the ILO and the EU and their visibility varied among implementing partners and their clients at the local level. The evaluation also observed that in specific locations anti-EU feeling runs high among local industry groups, and a judicious and varied approach to the association with the EU may be required to avoid risks to local staff.

### **Recommendations**

The agencies responsible for implementation of the recommendations are indicated in parentheses after each recommendation, together with priority and resource implications.

### **Project Management and Overall Implementation**

**1. Make adjustments to the monitoring and evaluation framework.** The project should make adjustments to the M&E framework to ensure that outputs for which the project is responsible to deliver are reported against, and include progress targets at least annually, for all indicators, not only at end of project. Specifically:

- Revise the wording of output 1.4 and its indicators, to reflect a tangible output that the project is responsible for. The number of registered migrant workers should be monitored at the impact level, but not at the output level.
- Include targets for end of 2018 as well as the end of the project, adding another column for annual milestone targets.
- Ensure that the indicator statements match the target statements
- Include qualitative endline studies of outcomes to supplement the endline survey in order to explore the factors contributing to observed changes.

*(Responsible agency: Project staff assisted by ILO M&E Officer DWT; Priority: High; Time implication: Immediate; Resources: Required for qualitative outcomes studies)*

**2. Review the feasibility of the project scope, and in particular the strategic focus of Objective 4 interventions in alignment with the overall objective.** Review the scope as a whole to identify areas of strategic focus going forward. In particular, review the strategy for promoting education access for children of migrant workers and consider removing the strategy as a stand-alone intervention as it is beyond the central focus on working conditions and rights of workers in the sectors. *(Responsible agency: Project*

*team and PSC; Priority: Medium; Time implication: Immediate; Resource implication: Low)*

3. **Explore options to extend the project for at least six months.** Discuss with the EU Delegation the possibility of granting a project extension for six months, either on a no-cost or cost basis. Develop an extension plan and budget proposal to support the request. In particular this would allow more time for the implementing partner projects to be fully realized, and to enable time to consolidate lessons and document good practice models. *(Responsible agency: ILO and EU; Priority: High, Time implication: medium term; Resources: medium)*
4. **Review the security concerns for local partner staff together with partner agencies for sites with anti-EU campaigns.** Adjust the visibility strategy vis-à-vis ILO and EU presence as necessary in selected locations. *(Responsible agency: Project team and EU; Priority: High; Time implication: Short-term; Resource implication: Low)*
5. **Finalize the gender strategy in the form of specific gender mainstreaming and gender-responsive implementation guidelines and monitoring requirements and train partners in its application.** *(Responsible agency: Project team and tri-partite partners; Priority: Medium; Time implication: Ongoing; Resource implication: Medium)*
6. **Develop priorities for the communications and visibility strategy and include communications regarding good labour practice examples within the fishing and seafood industry.** The current communications and visibility strategy is broad and ambitious and would benefit from prioritizing activities and strategies within it. In communications to share and demonstrate project and partner achievements, document and share examples of good labour practices across the fishing and seafood industry, as well as clearly evidenced messages regarding the significant gaps. *(Responsible agency: Project team and PSC partners; Priority: Medium; Time implication: Ongoing; Resource implication: Medium)*
7. **Planning for the final evaluation.** For the final evaluation, extend the time available for the team to conduct interviews at provincial level and include a stakeholder workshop at the culmination of the field visit to enable cross-partner discussion of the achievements and sustainability and provide comment on the preliminary evaluation findings. *(Responsible agency: ILO evaluation manager and project team; Priority: High; Time implication: development of evaluation TOR prior to last 6 months of the project; Resource implication: Medium).*

### **Achievement of Specific Objectives**

8. **To further the impact on the legislative and regulatory framework, support the MOL to develop a plan and guidelines on promulgating the anticipated legal amendments.** *(Responsible agency: Project team and MOL; Priority: Medium; Time implication: Project duration; Resource implication: Medium)*

9. **Support the development of tri-partite monitoring of the application of labour inspection training and new tools in fishing vessels and seafood processing.** The project should support the development of systems to monitor labour inspection for vessels and seafood processing respectively, following the training and adoption of new tools for inspection of vessels. This could be supported by the ILO staff, international expertise and the ILO Labour Inspection Specialist. *(Responsible agencies: Project team, ILO Labour Inspection Specialist, DLPW and MECC; Priority: Medium; Time implication: Remainder of the project; Resource implication: Medium)*
10. **As part of the exit strategy, document the various approaches to worker organizing including good practice models recommended for expansion and share the documentation with interested parties among project stakeholders and the ILO.** This should include resources for documentation and be supported by discussions with the implementing partners of plans to replicate their approaches. *(Responsible agency: Project team and implementing partners; Priority: Medium; Time implication: Ongoing; Resource implication: Medium)*
11. **Pursue efforts to consolidate and sustain the GLP programme.** The project should focus on consolidating the TTIA and TFFA programme and work with tri-partite entities to develop alternative options to sustain the governance of the programme, including alternative funding modalities for the GLP Centre. The industry associations themselves should seek to engage other associations in GLP, while the ILO can help to promote the ILO- supported programme with major buyers. *(Responsible agency: Project team, TFFA & TTIA, tri-partite partners; Priority: Medium; Time implication: Ongoing; Resource implication: Medium)*
12. **Promote increased coordination and exchange among CSO/Trade Union implementing partners.** The CSO and trade union partners should make more use of the opportunities provided by the project for joint organization and advocacy efforts, for example, through the PSC and provincial coordination mechanisms. There is also scope for the ILO to support the organizations to meet to share approaches and tools, either in Bangkok, alongside PSC meetings, or locally. At such meetings the CSOs could share new tools such as the Smartphone App and HRDF legal manuals as well as develop common advocacy messages to feed into the PSC or other forums. *(Responsible agency: CSO implementing partners and project team; Priority: Medium; Time implication: ongoing; Resource implication: Medium)*
13. **Work with provincial tri-partite stakeholder to strengthen and sustain provincial coordination and integration of services for workers in the sectors.** This will require identifying a lead agency to convene provincial tri-partite meetings following the exit of Ship to Shore Rights. *(Responsible agency: Project team and tri-partite partners; Priority: Medium; Time implication: Ongoing; Resource implication: Medium)*

# I. INTRODUCTION

---

## 1.1 Project Description and Context

### Project overview

The project, “Combatting Unacceptable Forms of Work in the Thai Fishing and Seafood Industry”, known as the Ship to Shore Rights Project, is a 3.5 year project implemented by the ILO and funded by the European Union with a total budget of EUR 4,200,000. The project duration is from 1 February 2016 to 31 July 2019. The overall objective of the project is “to reduce forced labour, child labour and other unacceptable forms of work, and progressively eliminate the exploitation of workers, particularly migrant workers, in the Thai fishing and seafood processing sectors”.

The project follows some 15 years of programming by the ILO in Thailand on tackling unacceptable forms of work in the sector, including the Trafficking in Women and Children in the Greater Mekong Subregion project, GMS TRIANGLE (Tripartite Action to Protect the Rights of Migrant Workers in the Greater Mekong Subregion) Project Phase I, the current TRIANGLE in ASEAN project (2015-2025); and the Combatting the Worst Forms of Child Labour in Shrimp and Seafood Processing Areas in Thailand project (2010-2015).

The project implements its interventions through four components relating to 1) improvement of the Thai legal and regulatory framework applicable to fishing and seafood processing workers, especially migrant workers, in line with international labour standards; 2) building the capacity of the labour inspectorate and maritime inspection actors to enforce the regulatory framework; 3) increasing voluntary compliance with core labour standards through partnership with employers’ organizations, industry associations and supply chain actors; (4) improving the access of fishing and seafood workers to support services such as legal assistance, health care and education and their empowerment through formation of peer-networks and workers’ associations. Corresponding to these components, the Immediate Objectives are stated as follows:

Immediate objective 1. The legal, policy and regulatory framework in the fishing and seafood sectors strengthened by raising labour standards and facilitating more regular migration into the sectors.

Immediate Objective 2. Enhanced capacity of the Thai government, including the Labour Inspectorate, to more effectively identify and take action against human trafficking and other labour rights abuses in the sectors.

Immediate Objective 3. Compliance with the fundamental principles and rights at work (Core Labour Standards) in the industries improved through implementation of the GLP Programme, featuring an effective dispute resolution mechanism, and increased awareness and ownership for action across the supply chain.

Immediate Objective 4. Access to support services of workers and victims of labour abuses, including children, enhanced through engagement and empowerment of civil society organizations and trade unions.

**Partners and coverage:** The project cooperates with tri-partite and civil society partners at national level and provincial levels in the delivery of the project.

Government partners include the Ministry of Labour (MOL) and its Departments of Labour Protection and Welfare (DLPW), Department of Employment (DOE), and Social Security Office (SSO); Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), the Ministry of Social Development and Human Security (MSDHS); Ministry of Public Health; Department of Fisheries (DOF) within the Ministry of Agriculture, the Command Centre for Combatting Illegal Fishing (CCCIF) and the Maritime Enforcement Coordinating Centre (MECC).

Employer organizations and industry association partners include the Employers' Confederation of Thailand (ECOT), and fishing and seafood processing associations – National Fisheries Association of Thailand (NFAT); Thai Overseas Fisheries Association (TOFA), Thai Food Processor Association (TFPA), Thai Frozen Foods Association (TFFA), Thai Tuna Industry Association (TTIA), and the Thai Shrimp Association (TSA).

Trade Union partners and CSO partners include the Thai Trade Union Congress (TTUC), State Enterprises' Worker Relations Confederation (SERC), Stella Maris, Raks Thai Foundation (RTF), Human Rights Development Foundation (HRDF), Oxfam, International Transport Workers Federation (ITF), Migrant Working Group (MWG), and the Migrant Workers Rights Network (MWRN).

The geographical focus of the project is the 22 coastal provinces of Thailand, with direct implementation in 10 provinces in 5 coastal zones: Samut Sakhon, Chonburi (Central zone), Rayong (East Zone), Surat Thani and Chumporn (Upper Gulf); Songkla and Pattani (Lower Gulf), and Phang Nga, Phuket and Ranong (Andaman).

The project is governed by a Project Steering Committee (PSC), co-chaired by the Permanent Secretary of the MOL and the EU Deputy Head of the Delegation. Its membership comprises representatives of relevant government ministries and departments, employers and industry associations, workers' organizations and CSOs.

## **Context**

In recent years, reports of serious human and labour rights abuses in the Thai commercial fishing and seafood processing industries, particularly against migrant workers from Myanmar, Lao PDR and Cambodia, have received global attention. With seafood exports in Thailand representing a US\$7 billion dollar industry, the impetus for all parties to address the situation is high.

The Royal Thai Government (RTG) has been making concerted efforts to address labour conditions in fishing and seafood. Regulatory reform includes the Ministerial Regulation on Labour Protection in Sea Fisheries (2014) and the Royal Ordinance on Fisheries (2015), covering

fishery related crime, imposing higher penalties for illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing; which also has an influence on labour conditions. Of relevance during the project implementation period, a Royal Ordinance concerning the Bringing of Alien Workers to Work in the Kingdom of Thailand (2016) and the Royal Ordinance Concerning the Management of Foreign Workers' Employment (2017). Sector-wide, labour protection and anti-trafficking issues in Thailand are governed by the Labour Protection Act (1998, Amended 2008) and the Anti-Trafficking in Persons Act (2008).

Thailand has ratified the ILO Forced Labour Convention (No. 29), but has not yet ratified the 2014 Protocol to the Forced labour Convention, P.29. It has ratified the child labour conventions on the Minimum Age (C.138) and Worst Forms of Child Labour (C.182). It has not ratified the Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining conventions (C.87 and C.98 respectively). Of particular relevance to the Ship to Shore Rights project, the RTG has expressed its intention to ratify P.29 on forced labour and the Work in Fishing Convention, 2007 (C.188), both of which require bringing national laws into greater alignment with these international standards. Considerable gaps in practical application and enforcement of the laws applying to migrant workers and workers in the target sectors existed at the time of the project design, and there was a need to assist the industry to improve its compliance with Thai laws as well as support workers themselves to be able to claim their rights.

## **1.2 Background of the Evaluation**

The ILO policy governing technical cooperation projects as well as the project Agreement with the EU requires a mid-term evaluation to be conducted by external consultants. As the project reached its mid-point in November 2017, the project management commissioned the mid-term evaluation to be conducted by an independent consultant team. The evaluation is managed by the Ship to Shore Rights Project, reporting to the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), and is therefore termed an internal evaluation.

## **II. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND METHODOLOGY**

---

### **2.1. Evaluation Objectives and Scope**

#### **Objectives**

The Terms of Reference (TOR, included at Annex A) direct the evaluation to:

- Review the progress of the project against the expected deliverables and outcomes and to propose any course correction for the project's second half.
- Assess the project design, particularly its relevance for addressing labour rights in the fishing and seafood industry, and possible application to other countries covering the same industry.
- Identify the achievements, good practices and lessons learned from the project.
- Consider options for sustaining the project achievements in the country beyond the end of the project.
- Provide practical recommendations aimed at optimizing performance of the project in the second half, including suggestions to improve project management, constituent coordination and overall implementation.

Knowledge and information obtained from the evaluation is intended to be used to guide improvement in the second half of the project and also as a basis for better design and management of current and future ILO activities in Thailand and elsewhere. The evaluation also supports public accountability of the Thai Government and the ILO, and will be shared with the Project Steering Committee.

#### **Clients**

The intended clients of the evaluation are the Ship to Shore Rights Project team, the EU Delegation, ILO Country Office for Thailand, Cambodia and Lao PDR, the Regional Office-Decent Work Team-Bangkok and ILO Headquarters; as well as the government, employers' organizations and trade union and CSO partners of the project.

#### **Scope**

The scope of the evaluation includes all activities from the start of the project until the time of the evaluation field visit in January 2018. The evaluation assesses the project performance according to the four main evaluation criteria commonly used in ILO evaluations and also defined in the UN Evaluation Group (UNEG) guidelines: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability, as well as two additional criteria – coordination and visibility. Impact was not assessed as it is too early in the project life to observe impacts, but any emerging signs of impacts were noted.

The TOR provided a set of specific questions to be answered by the evaluation corresponding to each of the evaluation criteria (see Annex A). During the inception phase the international evaluator proposed minor adjustments for clarity and additions to the questions which were approved by the Project CTA. These additional questions focused on the coherence of the project

design logic and the effectiveness of the project's monitoring and evaluation framework. The final list of evaluation questions is provided in the Data Collection Matrix at **Annex B**.

## **2.2. Methodology**

### **Approach and evaluation standards**

The evaluation primarily used qualitative data collection methods to answer the evaluation questions based on analysis of interviews with a diverse range of national and regional stakeholders in Indonesia and the region; as well as analysis of project documents and other contextual material. The analysis also incorporates quantitative data obtained from project documents and reports to the extent available. Wherever possible, the analysis of the results is based on triangulation of data collection methods and stakeholder perspectives, to strengthen the credibility and validity of the findings.

In assessing the project against the evaluation criteria, the evaluator utilized the standards for results based evaluation as described in the ILO Policy Guidelines for results based Evaluation (Second edition 2013).<sup>1</sup> The standards used in the analysis of the project design and its monitoring and evaluation framework are additionally based on the evaluation standards of the UN Evaluation Group and the UNDP guidance on the Results Based Management standards for project design.<sup>2</sup>

The team followed United Nations ethical interviewing guidelines, including refraining from asking the interviewed workers directly about their lives and experiences of exploitation. Names of respondents are not directly attributed to comments in the report.

### **Evaluation Schedule**

The evaluation was conducted between December 20, 2017 and February, 2018. In the preparation phase prior to the field mission, the evaluators provided inputs to the TOR, reviewed project documents, developed the methodology and interview guides, conducted key ILO staff interviews and jointly agreed with the project staff on the mission schedule. The work plan, approach and methodology were presented in the Inception Report, finalized on January 10.

The main field mission in Thailand was conducted from January 15 to 26, 2018. The fieldwork culminated in de-briefings with the EU delegation and the Ship to Shore Rights project team. Data analysis and the main report writing occurred during January to February. Following the preparation of the draft report the evaluators presented the findings to the Project Steering Committee on March 7, 2018 and responded to comments and questions on the findings.. The report was finalized following review by the project staff, ILO and stakeholders in March 2018.

---

<sup>1</sup> ILO Policy Guidelines for Results Based Evaluation (2<sup>nd</sup> edition 2013), accessed at [http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS\\_168289/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS_168289/lang--en/index.htm)

<sup>2</sup> United Nations Evaluation Group (2016) Norms and Standards for Evaluation; United Nations Development Program (2011) Results Based Management Handbook, October 2011.



## **Data collection and Analysis**

The evaluation questions were used to develop a Data Collection Matrix showing the evaluation questions and the main sources of data to be used to answer each question (**Annex B**). The matrix was then used as the basis for developing a detailed list of information to be collected and a set of question guides to be followed for interviews with each stakeholder group.

The team used the following methods to gather primary and secondary data:

*Document Reviews:* The team studied a wide range of project documents, context documents and materials produced by the project as well as contextual documents such as Thai legislation. Project materials included the Project Document, Project budget, First Annual Report, Work plan, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (September 2017) and Update on Progress against the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework produced at the request of the evaluator; the baseline research report, Project Steering Committee and taskforce meeting minutes, Legal Gaps Analysis and GLP Programme Report. **Annex C** provides a list of the main documents referenced.

*Key Informant Interviews and Group discussions:* The evaluation team conducted individual and group interviews with EU delegates, ILO Country Office staff, project staff, government officials from the government, employers' organizations, trade unions and as implementing CSO partners. The evaluators met with individual and groups of workers served by the project partners in Songkla, Pattani and Samut Sakhon. The number of interviewees was 108 (46 male and 62 female).

The majority of the interviews were conducted jointly by the evaluation team; however due to time constraints the national consultant conducted several interviews with government representatives and CSO partners at national level in the week prior to the arrival of the international evaluator. The list of persons interviewed appears in **Annex D**.

*Observations:* The evaluation made brief observations of PIPO Centre operations in Phang Nga and the Pattani port seafood market area.

*Data Analysis:* The evaluation team compiled the document reviews and interview notes generated into one set. The evaluators used qualitative data analysis methods including various forms of matrix analysis, to categorize, triangulate and synthesize the raw data from the interviews in accordance with the questions in the TOR.

## Sampling Methodology

The evaluation used a purposive, non-random methodology to select the interviewees.

*Field visit site selection:* The evaluation team visited four sites among 10 provinces where the project has direct activities, agreed with the project team based on meeting the criteria of coverage of the activities in the fishing and seafood processing sectors, representation of several geographical regions, representation of a range of activity types and maximizing the number of partner activities visited. The sites visited were:

- Phang Nga: Andaman region; fishing; project office, PIPO observation and meeting. Partner: Foundation for Education and Development
- Songkla: Southern region; fishing and processing. Partners: SERC, ITF
- Pattani: Southern region; Fishing and processing. Partners: Stella Maris, Raks Thai Foundation
- Samut Sakhon: Central region; seafood processing. Partners: Raks Thai, HRDF

Table 1. Summarizes the populations interviewed, the sample size and the characteristics of the sample.

**Table 1: Population, Methodology, Sample size, and Sample Characteristics**

Population	Method	Sample Size Interviewees	Sample Characteristics
EU Delegation	Group interviews	4	
ILO staff	Individual and group	8	CO staff, DWT specialists, staff of other projects
Project staff	Individual and group	6	Project management and technical teams
Government	Individual and group interviews	29	MOL (DLPW, ICD, MOE, SSO, Permanent Secretary Office), CCCIF, MECC, Department of Fisheries, MFA, PI-PO Phang Nga, DLPW Songkla
Employers and Industry Associations	Group interviews	14	ECOT, TFFA, TTIA, NFAT, TOFA, NFAT-Songkla
Trade Union and CSO partners	Group interviews	30	Implementing partners and collaborating agencies
Workers and worker leaders	Individual and focus group interviews	17	Clients of Stella Maris in Pattani, worker leader of SERC, Raks Thai/AAC community in Samut Sakhon
<b>Total Interviewees</b>		<b>108</b>	

## Strengths and Limitations

The evaluation team was able to meet with a wide range of stakeholders at the national level including Project Steering Committee members. The opportunity to take part in a project coordination meeting among implementing CSO partners was useful in observing the coordination process in action. The cross-partner focus group held with CSO partners was a valuable means of gathering perspectives of the partners in one session.

The scope of the field mission allowed 12 days of field work, which was short to enable an in-depth investigation into work under each of the four objectives. While work at the national level was well covered through the stakeholder interviews, the time available to visit provincial sites was too short to enable an in-depth study of work of the project and implementing partners at the provincial level. Less than one day was available per location, allowing only a short time to interview the partner staff and meet with workers once travelling time was taken into account. In addition, only three of four CSO partners were able to organize groups of workers or family members for the evaluation team to meet in the selected sites, partly due to the work schedules of fishers. The team requested to meet with small groups as far as this could be arranged to enable quality interviews to occur. However, in one location over 100 migrant workers were gathered from different work sectors including seafood processing. Thai-Burmese and Thai-Cambodian interpreters were mainly sourced from the implementing partner staff or from the community and therefore were not necessarily independent.

In reviewing progress under the industry compliance component, the evaluation was limited to meeting with representatives of the national seafood industry associations, the employers' confederation and the fisheries associations. It was not possible within the schedule to visit an enterprise applying the existing good labour practices programme to learn directly about the GLP in practice.

The evaluation recommends that the final evaluation should allow more time in the field to learn about the worker services models and the progress of worker networks and associations; should include coverage of a factory participating in the GLP program, and ideally interviews with a major buyer or buyers.

## III. FINDINGS

---

The findings of the evaluation are presented in the following sections corresponding to the evaluation question categories: Project design; Relevance; Progress toward objectives; Sustainability; Management Effectiveness and Coordination; Efficiency; and Communications and Visibility.

### 3.1 Project Design

This section reviews the rationale underlying the Ship to Shore Rights Project objectives and selected strategies; the feasibility of the project scope; and the logical coherence of the design expressed in the logical framework and the monitoring and evaluation plan assessed according to UN Development Program results-based management standards.<sup>3</sup>

#### 3.1.1 Theory of Change

The project's Theory of Change, or logic of the design, is described in the Project Document and was confirmed through a consultative process that the designers held with key stakeholders during the project inception phase. It aims to reduce forced labour, child labour and other unacceptable forms of work and progressively eliminate the exploitation of workers, particularly migrant workers. It proposes four interlinked outcomes required to achieve this overarching goal; the improvement of the legal and regulatory framework in line with international labour standards along with better migration governance in the sectors; increased capacity of the labour inspection system to identify labour violations and take action; improved systems for voluntary compliance in the industry across the supply chain; and increased access of workers to information and support services and channels for them to claim their rights.

The approach is to build the capacities and commitment of stakeholders at all levels, Thai government, employer associations, unions and civil society organizations to address the core labour problems in the sectors.

The evaluation considers that the four outcomes are all valid and sufficient to contribute the overall objective, are well founded based on the problem analysis in the design document and together provide for a comprehensive response to the issues. The fourth objective contains some ambiguity in its formulation in various documents concerning the extent to which it is intended to build the *capacity* of organizations to provide services, educate and organize workers or to *provide* coordinated and sustainable services, which has led to some lack of clarity under implementation. The design builds on existing achievements under the ILO project on child labour in the shrimp and seafood processing project and the efforts of the TRIANGLE project on labour inspectorate training. The achievement of the outcomes rests primarily on the assumptions of political will

---

<sup>3</sup> United Nations Development Program (2011) Results Based Management Handbook. October, 2011.

among government and industry stakeholder and commitment to collaborate in improvements in these four areas, and the availability of sufficient resources.

### **3.1.2 Feasibility of the Project Scope**

The project design has a very broad intervention scope relative to its time frame and resources, both human and financial. The intended sectoral coverage is broad, encompassing the fishing and seafood processing supply chains, including seafood farming. There are advantages and disadvantages regarding the coverage of both the fishing and seafood processing supply chains. On the positive side, for advocacy effectiveness actors in one sector may influence the other; consumer and buyer campaigns can address ethical seafood as a whole; and migrant workers in fishing and seafood frequently live in the same locations and also move between the sectors, so improvements to services and awareness can reach fishing and seafood processing workers at the same time. There are also economies of scale in training labour inspectors who are responsible for both fishing and seafood processing locations. On the other hand, several of the project's strategies are necessarily specific to one sector or the other. These sector-specific strategies include tailored labour inspection methods and tools for fishing vessels; emerging different approaches for building voluntary compliance in seafood processing and fishing; and separate worker networks for fishers and processing workers. These different sectoral approaches add to the overall range of interventions that need to be implemented.

The geographic coverage of direct implementation in 10 provinces under Objective 4 is also ambitious, as it entails oversight and monitoring by the project staff across a wide area.

Thematically, while all four of the objectives are relevant to improving the situation of fishers and seafood processing workers, the intervention strategies could have been more focused, especially under Objective 4. The aim of advocating for and facilitating education access for migrant children in fishing and seafood hubs falls beyond the central aim of improving workers' rights and working conditions. Comparing this project to others with comparable goals, the duration amounting to three and a half years, is relatively short to achieve the systemic and capacity building changes envisaged.<sup>4</sup> Looking forward, the project is advised to review the scope of interventions for the second half and consider removing or limiting the education access activities which serve children of migrant workers broadly, not only in the target sectors.

### **3.1.3 Design logic and the monitoring and evaluation framework**

In general, a project's logical framework is intended to represent the theory of change through a chain of linked cause-effect statements. That is, if certain activities are conducted, a certain output will be achieved, and if a given set of outputs are achieved, a stated outcome or objective is expected to be achieved.<sup>5</sup> A clearly expressed design logic is important to ensure that the progress

---

<sup>4</sup> Relevant comparisons are the ILO seafood processing project in Thailand with a 5-year duration and the ILO Indonesia PROMOTE project working on domestic workers' rights with a duration of 4.75 years, including no-cost extension.

<sup>5</sup> ILO EVAL Guidance Note 1.

and results of an intervention can be clearly and reliably monitored and measured. This serves the basis of the M&E framework which sets indicators, sources of data and targets to be achieved at specified points in time.

The project's Monitoring and Evaluation Framework has undergone a lengthy review and approval process by the project team and Steering Committee members, and incorporates quantitative data from the baseline study and other data sources for relevant indicators. It was finally approved in September 2017. The evaluator notes that the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework was reviewed by an International Consultant in July 2016 focusing on the indicators and targets. The M&E framework was also shared extensively with ILO Regional Specialists in Bangkok and Geneva for comment, including monitoring and evaluation specialists. However, the project team's understanding was that the wording of the objectives and outputs was not subject to change, which runs counter to the principle that the M&E framework, of which the objectives and outputs form a crucial part, should be a flexible document.

The evaluator assessed the clarity of the project's objectives and outputs and the logic of the linkages between them with reference to the ILO's results based management policy and guidelines for evaluation and the UNEG norms and standards to which the ILO adheres.

### **Objectives and outputs and their linkages**

A diagram of the logical framework is presented in **Annex E**<sup>6</sup>. The Project's four immediate objectives, when read together with the narrative of the Project document are relatively clear in their intention. However, the objectives statements themselves could have been expressed more clearly to state single changes.<sup>7</sup> For example, IO 1 is a complex statement with two linked outcomes, improved legal and regulatory framework strengthened *by* raising labour standards and more regular migration. The intended meaning is that the legal and regulatory frameworks will provide for improved labour standards and more regular migration. Objective 3 wording also contains both the outcome (improved compliance in the industries) and the means to achieve it (implementation of the GLP). At the objectives level, this is not highly problematic as the issue is mostly one of unclear wording and the indicators further clarify the changes that are expected. The analysis here is included mainly for learning purposes for future project designs.

According to Results-based Management guidelines, outputs should be expressed tangible changes in behaviours, skills or systems brought about directly with the project resources. Some of the output statements as they are expressed are too complex and include outcome-level changes. Output 1.2 is one example, and should ideally have been limited to introduction of amendments to legal and policy amendments to prohibit forced labour and child labour in the sectors.

---

<sup>6</sup> This diagram was formulated by the evaluator based on the M&E framework and the diagrammatic model produced by the Project.

<sup>7</sup> According to UNDG guidelines, objectives should be clear, measurable, and express a single state to be achieved and should not generally include the *means by which the result* is to be achieved.

Output 1.4 as expressed (Increased number of migrant workers who obtain regular status in the sectors) is problematic as it is beyond the control of the project to produce an increased number of migrants with regular status, subject as this is to multiple complex factors beyond the project's intervention. The number of regular migrants in the sectors is not an appropriate output level statement, but is more appropriate as an indicator at the level of impact or at least outcome. The activities relate to improving MOU channels, and pre-departure preparation or job linking services for migrants for fishing and seafood sectors, therefore a suggested re-wording of Output 1.4 is:

- “Improvements made to migration MOU channels and pre-migration support for migrants into the sectors”

Objective 2 and its outputs reflect a clear cause-effect chain and the outputs are tangible and specific. Objective 3 and its outputs are also logically linked in hierarchy and represent tangible changes resulting from the project activities that contribute to the objective.

Objective 4 and its composite outputs cover the access of workers to support services, establishment of worker associations, mechanisms for facilitating children's access to education, and more informed policy and sustainable models of service provision. The four outputs are relatively clear in their meaning and scope, but Output 4.4 is not straightforward – it should ideally have been expressed as a key single result, without the “leading to” phrases.<sup>8</sup>

### **Indicators and milestone targets**

The M&E Framework includes indicators, source of data, baselines and target values or descriptions for each objective and output.

According to ILO M&E guidelines, indicators of achievement should be SMART - Specific, measurable, attainable, realistic or relevant and trackable. Overall, the evaluator commends the effort made through the M&E system to capture significant changes, relevant to the stated outcomes and outputs, rather than simply record activity-level measures such as numbers of persons trained. An example of significant change included is the measurement for change in enforcement practices for Output 2.2. The indicator is *Percentage of fishing/seafood labour inspections that identify labour violations, disaggregated by type of violation*. This is a rigorous measure of the desired change in enforcement through the application of training and capacity building provided by the project. The target is specified as “the percentage of inspections resulting in orders is expected to increase with stronger enforcement and decrease with greater compliance”. To help in establishing a direction for achievement, it would be useful to specify that an increase is expected at least for the duration of the project, even though compliance may also be increasing at the same time in the two main industry sectors.

Most of the indicators fulfill the SMART criteria but some are not realistic measures to capture the results of the project. A key example is the indicator for Output 1.4 which like the output is set

---

<sup>8</sup> Output 4.4 reads: Strengthened relations between the Government and NGOs, trade unions, and worker associations on service delivery that leads to more informed policy and sustainable models of service provision leading to greater security for workers and their families.

at too a high a level. As noted, Output 1.4 itself should be set at a tangible level. The corresponding indicator, “The number of migrant workers who gain regular status in the sectors”, is likewise not a realistic measure of the project’s achievements. The M&E Framework records numbers of migrant worker registration per sending country, but it does not report against the project’s own deliverables for this output. There are significant difficulties in interpreting an increase in numbers of workers who obtain regular status primarily due to the attribution issue. Suggested alternative indicators are:

- Pre-departure training in place for migrants to the sectors in selected sending countries;
- Number of amendments to MOUs between Thailand and sending countries related to the target sectors made with ILO inputs.

It is useful to track overall changes in migrant worker registration at the impact level, which may be occurring as a result of various political and programme improvements in the MOUs, but such changes cannot be attributed to the narrow set of interventions delivered by the project, such as pre-departure training in Myanmar. If the project continues to track this data for broader contextual purposes, the number of migrants in the sectors registered would ideally need to be compared with the population who are not registered, as a percentage.<sup>9</sup>

Another indicator which is not expressed clearly is the indicator 3.2.1 for Output 3.2 concerning implementation of the GLP programme: “Extent to which GLP principles are reflected in codes and contracts with buyers, suppliers and standard employment contracts”. However, in this case the target itself is specific, measurable and attainable: “At least three industry groups adopt GLP programmes and publicly report on results”.

**Targets and milestones:** The second main gap in the M&E framework is that the targets for the indicators are not set at clearly timed intervals (milestones), with progress over time. Not all of the indicators include dates for their achievement. Also the indicators, baseline information and targets should be expressed more consistently. If there are insufficient targets it is difficult to assess the progress of the project. An example of a reporting framework is available from the TRIANGLE in ASEAN project.

The evaluator recommends that the Project review the M&E framework as a high priority with assistance of ILO specialists, and at a minimum, revise the outputs and indicators identified above, and set clear milestones for targets to be achieved annually, and by end of project. The practical use of the system to monitor and adjust activities and strategies is discussed in **Section 3.5**.

---

<sup>9</sup> These data have proven quite difficult for the assigned Project Coordinator to gather, particularly as there are numerous migrant worker registration categories and different timeframes for official data.



## **3.2 Relevance**

This section assesses the relevance of the intervention to development policy and planning of the Thai government; the relevance to the needs and interests of stakeholders and target beneficiaries; and the strategic fit with ILO programs and policy. The findings are based on interviews with representatives of the key stakeholders as well as review of RTG policy on labour protection and migration.

### **3.2.1 Relevance to RTG Policy and Planning**

The RTG has continued to express its commitment to addressing the working conditions and labour rights violations in the fishing and seafood sectors and has set a course to ratify P.29 and C.188 in 2018. The project's support for the review and revision of the legal and policy framework is therefore especially timely. The importance for the government was heightened in light of the EU yellow card in 2015 which put Thailand on notice for not taking sufficient measure to tackle illegal (IUU) fishing, which brought global attention on the Thai fishing industry. The Government is committed to combatting human trafficking and its efforts have brought an upgrading in 2016 on the US State Department's Trafficking in Persons report from Tier 3 to Tier 2.

The project design involved extensive consultation with the government stakeholders. Under the co-chairing of the PSC by the MOL and engagement of multiple government entities ensures a high degree of relevance within a dynamic policy and planning situation. The project's relevance to national planning on labour and migration, particularly relating to the target sectors, is seen in project support to various national planning processes – such as the labour inspection plan and national Labour Action Plan.

### **3.2.2 Relevance to needs and interests of stakeholders**

Overall, the evaluation found broad support for the relevance and importance of the project among the national level stakeholders. This is demonstrated in consistently high attendance at the PSC meetings. A view frequently expressed across all tri-partite stakeholders is that as an ILO project, Ship to Shore Rights is able to bring all parties around the table to discuss the highly contentious issues involved. The stakeholders appreciate that it provides a forum for discussion of the application of government regulations such as introduction of the electronic payroll system underway for fishers. The degree of support for the objectives and methods of support provided by the project is highly nuanced however, as described below.

**Government stakeholders:** Within the MOL, the International Cooperation Bureau (ICB) is charged oversight of review of the legal framework for alignment with P.29 and C.188 and coordinating legal drafting teams. The ICD values the technical support provided by the project through the analysis of legal gaps against international standards; but given the pressure on the department to complete legal drafts quickly and their limited staff resources they feel that the ILO could be more responsive to their needs, in particular in providing more intensive staff support within the department. A representative of the Permanent Secretary Office echoed the view that the ILO should be more flexible in its technical support and work in closer partnership with the Ministry. However, these views may represent a misunderstanding of the role of the ILO which is

to support the government technically, but not to replace government functions. The project staff has evidently provided extensive and flexible support to the legal review process, responding to the majority of requests for support, and the ILO justifiably limited the placement of an ILO liaison officer in the MOL to two days a week. The Ministry has now allocated more staff with the necessary legal expertise to the legal drafting process.

The senior representative of the labour inspectorate (DLPW) informed the evaluators that the project is collaborating closely with his department. The Department is highly appreciative of the support of Ship to Shore Rights to inspectorate planning and training and the provision of ILO and international expertise.

The **Social Security Office** is also engaged in the project as the agency responsible for overseeing issues such as access to workers' compensation in cases of workplace injury. They commented that there are both gaps in the laws covering seasonal workers such as fishers, as well as gaps in the proper application of the laws to migrant workers, that can be raised and addressed through the Ship to Shore Rights Project platform.

**Department of Fisheries and CCCIF:** The DOF, while responsible for equipment and environmental standards in fishery, finds the project useful to promote standards in the industry generally, in the context of stricter enforcement of fishing regulations. Similarly, the Director of the CCCIF, the body responsible for coordinating the multi-agency effort to combat IUU fishing through PIPO and at sea inspections finds that the project significantly benefits Thailand through helping to change the face of the fishing industry. The roles of these agencies have in turn benefited the effectiveness of the project through providing updates on the challenges facing the fishing industry and its regulation.

**Employers and Industry Associations:** The associations representing seafood processors as well as the associations representing the fishing industry regularly participate in the PSC. The representatives of the Thai Frozen Food Association (TFFA) and the Thai Tuna Industry Association (TTIA) met by the evaluation both regard the project support to strengthening the existing Good Labour Practices (GLP) programme as highly relevant to their interests to improve voluntary compliance with labour standards among their members. They expressed that the association and collaboration with the ILO brings the international reputation of the ILO and therefore credibility of the programme among members and buyers. The four main seafood associations have been engaging closely with the project through the PSC and the project's Technical Taskforce #2. The representatives expressed that the Steering Committee meetings cover many topics outside of their expertise, and more materials sent in advance would be helpful. However, among the fisheries, farm producers, pre-processing plants and processing plants that make up the industry, GLP has in practice only reached the seafood processing sector.

The fishing industry is under pressure from the government and the EU "yellow-card" to improve its image and compliance with labour laws. In this context, NFAT expressed that they have been disappointed that the project does not promote or publicize the efforts that the industry has been making to stop labour violations. They were dissatisfied with the public presentation of the findings of the baseline survey that reported ongoing violations based on 2017 data and claim that all boats meet the legal requirements. The critique of the survey findings is not well justified,

however, as the report states its limitations, and 80% of surveyed workers come from the commercial vessels covered by the association, rather than smaller vessels. NFAT expressed that they have considered dropping their engagement with the project but it continues to participate in the taskforces and the PSC. Nevertheless, the project could endeavour to highlight examples of good practices implemented by fishing vessel owners in its communications. TOFA representatives also expressed that government regulations are now applied to their members' vessels and that the issues of migrant workers' rights are no longer relevant to their members as the majority of their vessel crews are Thai. They feel that the introduction of new laws or amendments to align with C.188 should be adjusted to the Thai situation (such as vessel design and the electronic payroll system). The PSC and Taskforce discussions do provide a new forum for the associations to raise their concerns and discuss the application of reforms with government and other stakeholders.

**CSOs and Trade union partners:** The representatives of the direct implementing partners interviewed mostly expressed that the Ship to Shore Rights Project activities are closely aligned with their own organizational missions. The implementing agreement project designs were developed collaboratively with the project staff. Some points of disparity emerged between Ship to Shore Rights' aims and the usual approaches of the partners, however; especially those partners that are experienced and accustomed to providing direct assistance rather than supporting worker leadership and networks. Some agencies, such as Stella Maris, find that the project is too limited in its geographical coverage and should also work directly in Nakorn Si Thammarat. The evaluation team view is that expanding direct services provision geographically under the project is not advisable given resources and monitoring constraints.

**Fishing and seafood workers:** The evaluation team met only a small sample of workers, family members and worker leaders and has quite limited direct evidence on the relevance to workers themselves. Nevertheless, those interviewed commented at length on the value of various project supports including:

- the importance of the Stella Maris neighbourhood drop-in centres for workers' health and well-being;
- the importance of sharing information and solidarity through workers networks (SERC and Raks Thai/AAC clients);
- the need for help to deal with pressing issues that migrant workers in the sectors face such as compensation in case of workplace accidents and issues with contracts and payments (workers in Samut Sakhon).

### **3.3 Progress towards Objectives**

#### **3.3.1 Overview of Progress**

This section provides an overview of implementation progress from the project start until the time of the evaluation. The findings are based on project progress reports, work plans, the monitoring and evaluation framework report as of January 2018, and interviews with staff and stakeholders.

Ship to Shore Rights has made steady progress towards its objectives and activity implementation despite a delay of approximately six months in recruiting the project staff following the signing of the funding agreement. The Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) commenced in June 2016, followed by recruitment of one National Project Coordinator (NPC) in August 2016. The second NPC joined the staff in late 2017. During the first months of 2016 the project was supported on a half time basis by one of the TRIANGLE project national staff. When the CTA and the national staff came on board there was pressure to move ahead quickly on implementation. This may have detracted from the team's capacity to establish a solid vision for at the outset, which is only now coming into full realization. With effectively three years for implementation, and 18 months remaining, the project faces challenges to fully realize the scope of deliverables envisaged.

The Project Steering Committee and two technical taskforces were effectively established in 2016 and have been meeting frequently, around every 3 months.

The establishment of the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework began in July 2016 and underwent a lengthy process of discussion and revision through the PSC and taskforce meetings. It was finally approved in September 2017. The participatory stakeholder review process is commendable to ensure the acceptance of measures by the Steering Committee, but consensus was difficult to achieve given the limited knowledge of the counterparts on M&E results-based management principles. Ideally this process could have been completed in 2016, through one or two workshops with stakeholders to confirm the project logic, followed by technical review by the project team and ILO M&E specialists or consultants to finalize and ensure that the framework met results-based management standards.

Inception activities included the conduct of a baseline survey to inform project interventions and provide baseline data against which to measure progress. The baseline research, originally planned for late 2016, was somewhat delayed until March 2017. A communications and visibility strategy was completed in November 2016. A draft gender strategy was produced in October 2017 but has not been finalized, limiting the prospect for its practical implementation.

The project is mostly on track to deliver its activities outputs, with some adjustments to specific activities and focus now taking place in early 2018 as detailed below. The need to strengthen the strategic focus going forward was noted by the CTA and staff and is supported by the evaluators' analysis.

The progress of implementation and results obtained under Objective 1 have been substantial, despite a lengthy process of discussion among the taskforce stakeholders and technical input to the discussion of laws requiring amendment for alignment with international labour standards. A

substantive draft of a new Forced Labour Act has been completed and public hearing and discussion has just commenced. Implementation of activities under Objective 2 has progressed steadily, with substantive contributions made to building the capacity of the labour inspectorate. Under Objective 3, progress has been made towards implementing a more rigorous GLP programme following extensive consultation among the stakeholders. Delays in rolling out the revised programme have mainly been due to extended discussion between the key industry associations on the submission of a joint proposal to roll out the programme. This is now set to proceed in 2018. Under Objective 4, the project has successfully established implementation agreements with CSO and trade union partners, starting from December 2016. However, within the project timeframe the maximum time for roll-out of the partner projects is two years, which is a relatively short time to yield impacts in terms of worker associations, to establish worker drop-in centres and provincial service coordination mechanisms.

The following sections provide a detailed assessment of progress and effectiveness for each of the objectives.

### **3.3.2 Strengthened Legal, Policy and Regulatory Framework (Objective 1)**

**Overall finding:** The major focus of Ship to Shore Rights' support to date has been towards the amendments of legal frameworks to bring Thai laws into alignment with P.29 and C.188. Ship to Shore Rights has contributed quality technical advice to the RTG and tri-partite stakeholders in the deliberation on the legal framework in the context of high level of government commitment to ratification of these standards. The project support has therefore been very timely. The ILO and the project itself cannot be responsible for the quality of the laws themselves, as these are responsibility of RTG, stakeholders and the public hearing process. Work on the migration channels for these sectors has commenced but has not been intensive to date and remains to be consolidated in the second half.

Table 2 shows the progress against objective and output targets. This data is drawn from project team reporting against the M&E framework prepared for the PSC, with additional information added by the evaluation team.

**Table 2. Summary of Progress on Objective 1**

<b>Objective and Output</b>	<b>Indicator Targets</b>	<b>Progress towards Targets</b>
IO 1. The legal, policy and regulatory framework in the fishery and seafood sectors strengthened	Revision of legal framework enabling the ratification of C188 and P29 Drafting of new act to facilitate employment for alien workers	A draft Forced Labour Act completed in January 2018 to bring the legal framework into alignment with P.29, and public hearing underway. Legal drafting revision underway for alignment with C.188. Government commitment to ratification of P.29 and C.188.
Output 1.1 Enhanced knowledge base on employment and working conditions in the fishing and seafood sectors is generated and serves as a basis against which to measure progress and determine areas for more focused policies and interventions	Data available on employment and working conditions in the sectors for use as a baseline for the project, including child labour and victims of forced labour	Baseline survey results completed May 2017, research report completed October 2017.  Research report on electronic payroll implementation draft completed Jan 2018.
Output 1.2 Strengthening of national legal and regulatory framework on forced labour and child labour in the sectors in line with ILS	P29: Increased understanding about the legal gaps by Jan 2017 and action towards ratification by end of 2017  C188: Increased understanding about legal gaps by March 2017 and action taken towards ratification by end of 2017.	Legal gaps analysis completed for P29 and C188 (March 2017) Project support for series of tri-partite discussions Case study review of forced labour cases underway, expected completion Feb 2018 Substantive draft of a new forced labour act completed. Progress on legal revision for C188
Output 1.3 Comprehensive policy and action plan to combat FL, CL and other unacceptable forms of work in the sectors with multi-stakeholder involvement.	Multi-stakeholder action plan for the Master Plan on Labour (2017-2022) (No date target)	ILO project team has provided technical comments on labour standards as requested by MOL, but not specifically for the Master Plan on Labour.
Output 1.4 Increased number of migrant workers who obtain regular status in the sectors	# of migrant workers in fishing and seafood with regular status increased progressively	Note: The project reports against this output with data on changes in the number of migrant workers with regular status but these statistics cannot be attributed to project interventions. <u>Progress:</u> The project has supported a research assessment of the Effectiveness of MOU Channels and Labour Market Status (Report due Q1 2018). ILO provided advice to RTG on MOU channels for the sectors. Plans to conduct pre-departure fisher training in Myanmar in 2018.

## **Enhanced knowledge base (Output 1.1)**

Several research studies have been completed or are planned within the life of the project to help inform policy and practical interventions in the sectors.

The major contribution to the knowledge base is the completion of baseline research on working conditions and forced labour indicators in the fisheries and seafood processing. Its purpose was to provide an evidence base on the status of working conditions in the fishery, seafood processing and seafood farming sectors, both to inform policy and programs development and advocacy, and also to provide a baseline for comparison of progress contributed by the project. The Baseline survey was conducted on behalf of the project by Rapid Asia from March to May 2017 and the full narrative report completed in October 2017.

The study was conducted by a reputable and experienced research group. Based on review of the report by the evaluation team it provides credible information regarding the state of labour conditions and legal compliance rates among fishery and seafood workers among a sample of workers. It does not claim to be a representative prevalence survey. The observation of the evaluation team is that the research is highly useful in providing an understanding of the profile of the workers and to identify persistent issues facing workers in the two sectors around the time of project commencement that need to be addressed.

The research results met with mixed reactions from the stakeholders when presented at the PSC meeting in June 2017. Fisheries stakeholders in particular have contested the accuracy of the findings, claiming that violations are more common among the artisanal boats less than 30 tonnes. In fact, 80% of the workers survey came from commercial fishing vessels of over 30 tonnes, and the caveat regarding the presence of a small number of workers from smaller vessels is made clear in the report. A lesson learned from this experience is that the ILO has to be especially careful when presenting research findings (sources of data, sampling, disaggregation and other qualifications) to those in the industry with strong interest in maintaining their reputation for legal working conditions. This is not to suggest that the project has not presented the results with due care.

Regarding the soundness of the methodology for comparing the findings of the baseline against a planned endline survey in 2019, such an endline would provide a useful broad measure of progress in the industry as opposed to a directly comparable measure of progress achieved by the project. The evaluator urges caution in aiming to conclude from a follow up survey that changes observed can be attributed to the project – there is no “non-intervention” and “intervention” site allocation in the baseline methodology that would enable robust conclusions to be drawn. Further, the provinces covered in the baseline and in the survey are not identical. This issue is discussed further in Section 3.5.5 dealing with the project’s M&E system.

Additional studies underway include the study of the implementation of the government’s newly introduced electronic payroll system for fishery workers, due for completion in early 2018, which

will provide timely support to the responsible officials and the industry.<sup>10</sup> The ILO has also produced information material in migrant worker languages to promote understanding of the system among workers.

### **Legal, policy and regulatory framework (Output 1.2)**

The task force structure set up by the project has provided a platform for all parties to discuss the amendments. The process has been lengthy, but a consensus has recently been reached among the tripartite constituents to draft a stand-alone forced labour act and sanctions for forced labour violations for alignment with the Protocol on Forced Labour No.29.

The project has provided substantial technical and administrative support to the MOL through its International Cooperation Bureau and legal drafting teams to revise the legal framework to align with the international labour standards on forced labour (P.29) and the Work in Fishing convention (No. 188). This was delivered firstly through the provision of two separate legal gaps analyses comparing Thai laws with the requirements for P.29 and C.188, completed in December 2016 and March 2017 respectively.

The MOL's ICD, tasked with overseeing the review and drafting of the legal amendments, lacked sufficient staff resources and comparative international knowledge and the ILO has gone some way to meeting their needs, without taking on the task of the government. It has made technical advice available through an internationally recognized labour standards specialist who has made numerous presentations to the stakeholders during the past year. The project staff noted that recently the Ministry has allocated more staff and shifted the drafting task to the legal department which has helped expedite the process.

At the request of the MOL to support the legal review, the project has commissioned a case study review on the application of forced labour and anti-trafficking laws from other countries that have ratified P.29 and C.188, carried out in conjunction with another EU funded ILO project on supporting the application of fundamental conventions. Several government parties met (MOL ICD, Office of Permanent Secretary, MFA) expressed that the project should provide more extensive examples of how these laws have been drafted in other countries. A difficulty with providing examples on C.188, according to the project staff, is that not many countries have ratified this relatively new convention.<sup>11</sup>

Observers report that the drafting and agreement on legal reforms to align with C.188 is likely to face more obstacles than legal reform for P.29, partly because of the number of ministries involved, but also due to resistance among the fishery associations and questions on the applicability on international regulations to the Thai context. However, the RTG has a strong commitment to

---

<sup>10</sup> The electronic system provides for trackable payments that are made on time and deposited to workers' bank accounts. ATMs are being installed in port areas throughout coastal provinces.

<sup>11</sup> 10 countries have ratified Convention No. 188: Angola, Argentina, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Congo, Estonia, France, Lithuania, Morocco, Norway, South Africa.



ratifying both P.29 and C.188 during 2018, which in due course would mean that Thailand's action to enforce the relevant laws will be monitored by the ILO.

### **National plans of action on forced labour and child labour (Output 1.3)**

The project has provided technical support to the MOL as requested on international labour standards but not specifically on the Master Plan on Labour as indicated in the workplan and M&E framework. The project documentation and discussion with the team did not yield a very clear picture on what the project aims to achieve with regard to multi-stakeholder action planning. The stated target in the M&E framework is the *Development of the Action Plan for the Master Plan on Labour 2017 – 2022*, and each MOL department has developed an internal action plan in line with the Master Plan but the project has not been providing direct support to an overall arching plan. The target for this output indicator may therefore need to be adjusted. Looking forward, there is substantial scope for the project to support an action plan for the roll-out of the anticipated laws through regulations and building understanding among government officials of the application of the laws.

### **Support to regular migration among fishery and sea food workers (Output 1.4)**

The evaluation's main source of information on the progress of strategies toward increased regular migration in the sector is from project reports and the project team. The RTG representatives met did not provide substantial comment. Working alongside the ILO's TRIANGLE in ASEAN project, the project has provided a series of advisory inputs to the RTG on the MOU processes. The project is contributing to understanding of the impact of changes in regulations on fishing and seafood labour markets, including an assessment of the effectiveness of the MOU channels with Cambodia, Laos and Myanmar, with the report expected late January.

A key change of focus under this output planned for the second half of the project is that rather than support job-matching services with sending countries as originally planned, the project will support pre-departure training of migrant fishers from Myanmar, led by a trade union or CSO in cooperation with the Myanmar Ministry of Labour, Immigration and Population (MOLIP) and selected recruitment associations. Expected to commence around April 2018, this initiative has the potential to provide tangible improvements to regular migration and better working conditions for Myanmar migrants. The adjusted strategy was based on the assessment of poor transparency in the recruitment and MOU processes in Cambodia, while Myanmar is not willing to send workers to fishing in Thailand through an MOU. The project did not want to be associated with any potentially corrupt recruitment practices if directly engaged in job-matching,

### **3.3.3 Strengthened Enforcement through Labour Inspection (Objective 2)**

The overall finding of the evaluation is that the project has helped the labour inspectorate to identify the human resource gaps and technical challenges to effective inspection in the sectors, especially focused on fishery. It has provided substantive technical support to DLPW inspection planning and ongoing support to existing and new cohort of labour inspectors in coastal provinces. The effectiveness of the training in terms of improved inspection practices is not yet demonstrable through the project monitoring system, or the government monitoring of inspectors' work on the

job. Shifts in the paradigm for inspection are gradually occurring within the multi-agency inspection partners, as a combined result of the project's technical support and the new approaches taking place in the multi-agency fishery inspection regime through the CCCIF and MECC.

Table 3 presents a summary of progress against the objective and outputs.

**Table 3. Summary of Progress on Objective 2**

<b>Objective and Output</b>	<b>Indicator Targets</b>	<b>Progress</b>
IO 2 Enhanced capacity of the Thai government, including the Labour Inspectorate, to more effectively identify and take action against human trafficking and other labour abuses in the sectors.	Development of integrated cross-ministry database by 2018	Development of an integrated inspection database is in process and study underway to assess the gaps in systems across different departments and other Ministries.
2.1 Adoption of a comprehensive multi-year inspection plan	Multi-year labour inspection plan in place by September 2018 that integrates inspections of fishing vessels and seafood factories	In progress. ILO and New Zealand labour inspection specialist recommendations provided on the development of a multi-year inspection plan.
2.2 More effective application and enforcement of anti-trafficking and labour laws through labour inspection	Increase in number of trained labour inspectors: Short term target of 186 additional inspectors and long term target to reach 1,049 inspectors under DLPW.	Enhanced training curriculum developed focused on fishing and seafood processing Three training courses for labour inspectors delivered covering selected coastal provinces and Bangkok: 81 participants from DLPW and other ministries. 21 Interpreters trained.
	Percentage of labour inspections resulting in orders is expected to increase with greater enforcement and decrease with greater compliance.	The number of inspections taking place in the fishing and seafood sectors has increased substantially (DLPW reports). Rate of violations detected in fishing has <i>not</i> increased (0.98 % for latest available 2017 report), representing a decrease against the 2016 rate. In seafood, 14% of inspections found violations in 2017 reporting, representing an increase.
	All labour inspections using the new tools by the end of the project.	In progress. Tools for labour inspection have been updated with guidelines on food and water. A revised PIPO inspection tool is under discussion
2.3 Expand the reach of inspection services at sea to monitor working conditions through inter-agency cooperation, bilateral cooperation and the use of data and information technology	Effective and permanent coordinating mechanism among government agencies and integrated labour inspection tools, including ICT.	Partially achieved. Joint training sessions with CCCIF, DOF, and MOL on labour inspection held in 2017.

**Labour inspection planning and integrated systems (Output 2.1).** Initial activities during the latter half of 2016 focused on a review of the labour inspection system and identification of gaps

in the system. The ILO has contributed international expertise on labour inspection planning through workshops with the New Zealand labour inspectorate. The opportunity to learn from New Zealand's approach was well received by the DLPW. According to the ILO Labour Inspection Specialist, the leaders of the Inspectorate increasingly support the need for a more qualitative, risk assessment-based approach, rather than attempting to inspect all vessels or factories.

**Capacity of the inspectorate (Output 2.2.)** A major contribution of the project has been the extension and improvement of the labour inspection training curriculum specialized for fishing and seafood processing inspections. This built on the curriculum developed during the TRIANGLE (former phase) project. According to observers from the MOL, there is still a need to make the national training curriculum more systematic, to cover basic, intermediate and advanced levels of inspection, and eventually to deliver the training through a Training of Trainers approach. It will also need to be adjusted following the anticipated changes to the legal framework better accommodate forced labour and the requirements of laws amended in relation C188.

Responding to the immediate needs of the inspectorate, during 2017 Ship to Shore Rights supported the delivery of three rounds of training to a total of 81 existing DLPW inspectors/other ministry officers. This training covered interview techniques, forced labour indicators and occupational safety and health in fishing and seafood processing labour inspection. The first training in Bangkok included participants from the central and eastern region and focused on seafood processing. The second, in Songkla in July 2017, trained inspectors from the lower gulf provinces and focused on fishing sector and PIPO inspection. A third in Phuket (September 2017) addressed PIPO inspections and fishing. In 2018 further advanced trainings are planned for the existing cohort of inspectors as well as delivery of the new curriculum to newly hired inspectors.

Addressing the critical issue of language barriers facing the inspectorate, the project has supported co-training with the DLPW for 21 newly hired interpreters (Burmese and Cambodian) working in PIPO centres.

The effectiveness of the training in improving inspection practices on the ground is not clearly apparent through the project's monitoring and evaluation measures or the observations gathered through the evaluation. A systematic assessment of learning outcomes or application of learning has not been applied following trainings. The evaluation learned from the limited number of interviews with provincial inspectorates that the training is considered useful. Another source of information on the effectiveness of the training is the observations of the ILO Field Officer (based in Phang Nga) of inspections conducted by the PIPO centres. One of her observations is that some inspectors tend to take on the perspective of the employers rather than the workers, for example in noting the tendency for workers to leave their employment without proper notice. This observation was confirmed through limited interviews conducted by evaluation team in Phang Nga. Nationally, the rate of violations detected is very low in fishing (less than 1%), and moderate in seafood processing (14%), according to the latest DLPW data available for 2017, and the inspectorate generally claims that this means that violations are being reduced. There are difficulties interpreting this data as reflecting reduction in detection or reduction in violations, but it is reasonable to conclude that the enforcement practices in fishing at least are not yet proving more effective, as compliance cannot be expected to be almost 100 percent.

A more systematic monitoring of the application of training and the new tools once they are adopted could be supported by the project, working with the chief of the labour inspectorate and with the support of the ILO inspection specialist. Such a system could triangulate review of inspection reports, interviews with inspectors on how decisions were made, and observations of inspections. Beyond the project, a sustainable system for monitoring labour inspection in action for fishing vessels and seafood processing, involving the relevant agencies in the case of fishing vessels, needs to be developed.

### Inspection services at sea (Output 2.3)

In addition to training, the project is supporting the development of inspection tools including a vessel inspection tool for use by PIPO teams. This draft tool is under discussion. There is still considerable scope for the project to support the coordination of inspection mechanisms planned under Output 2.3 and to bring further shifts in skills and efficiencies in the approach. For example, among the ILO plans to support the introduction of labour violation data into the risk categories that are currently used to determine the frequency of vessel inspection.

### 3.3.4 Industry Voluntary Compliance (Objective 3)

The evaluation was able to gather limited data on the progress and effectiveness of this objective, based on interviews with staff and group meetings held with seafood processing and fishing industry representatives, documentation of the revised GLP programme of May 2017 and general progress reports. Since the new GLP programme has not been fully rolled out, it is too early to assess its effectiveness in practice. Table 4 presents the main progress recorded against the objectives and outputs.

**Table 4. Summary of Progress on Objective 3**

Objective and Output	Indicator Targets	Progress
IO 3 Compliance with core labour standards in the industries improved through implementation of the GLP programme	Number of enterprises joining the GLP increased from 88 in 2016 to 150 by 2018.	In progress: A joint proposal on strengthening the GLP implementation agreed with TTIA and TFFA targeting 50 enterprises with new scope.  NFAT and TOFA signed the GLP programme principles but are not actively engaged in it.
3.1 Governance of the GLP programme is operational, credible and sustainable	Independent GLP body established assuming joint financial contributions from industry, global buyers, ILO Ship to Shore and in kind from government in 2017  Three industry groups out of five adopt a workplan to improve compliance with GLP	<b>Not achieved.</b> Financial commitment from TTIA and TFFA but not from other industry associations. No consensus to set up a GLP body.  Two industry groups have adopted a workplan.
3.2 GLP training and improvement programme builds capacity of employers throughout the supply chain to comply with higher	At least 3 industry groups adopt GLP programme and publicly report on the results.	<b>In progress.</b> A joint proposal on introducing the revised GLP programme from two industry associations - TFFA and TTIA - to

<b>Objective and Output</b>	<b>Indicator Targets</b>	<b>Progress</b>
standards, with results and progress reported on a regular basis		start in Jan 2018, that will include public reporting.
3.3 Conciliation and complaints mechanism established and functions to provide appropriate and timely responses and mediation	All participating GLP enterprises have a complaints/mediation mechanism. (By law companies with 50+ workers must establish welfare committees with conciliation and complaints mechanisms).	<b>In progress.</b> Progress towards establishment of an industry-level complaint mechanism jointly by TTIA and TFFA
3.4 Strengthened awareness and commitment of buyers (Thailand, Europe, US and Australia) by actively engaging them in the GLP Programme	At least 8 major global buyers endorse supplier participation in GLP programmes	<b>In progress.</b> Regular dialogue with buyers at the Seafood Taskforce and a GLP event at Thaifex.

The key achievement of the project to date is the elaboration of a comprehensive GLP programme, described in a summary document completed in May 2017. The ILO's research pointed to the need for a revised approach to GLP with stronger accountability features, tripartite governance and engagement of all levels of the seafood supply chain. This programme summary lays out the key features of an improved programme for increased accountability and credibility.

The improved programme model was supported by consultations with the industry associations in late 2016. At the launch of the programme on the sideline of the Thaifex Asia Food Exhibition in May 2017, the GLP Principles were signed by MOL, EU, TTIA, TFFA, NFAT, TOFA, European Foreign Trade Association (FTA), Stella Maris and SERC.

To enable the sustainability of industry-led voluntary compliance, the programme also set out a proposal for the oversight of its operations through a GLP centre in Bangkok, including operating principles and costs. Under the proposal, cost-sharing is required by the participating associations and includes a 15% contribution of the Ship to Shore Rights Project for the first year. However, the plan for the centre has not yet been realized as only two major processing associations, TTIA and TFFA, are willing to commit the necessary funds. TTIA and TFFA representatives stressed that there is a pressing need for more associations to be engaged. The evaluation observes that the project and partners need to consider an alternative strategy for oversight of the GLP programme in the event that a centre cannot be established within the life of the project.

According to representatives of the seafood processing associations interviewed, some of the requirements of the GLP are already being met by their enterprise members including public reporting by the TTIA, and the participation of workers on enterprise welfare committees. The TTIA and TFFA noted that they have been implementing GLP for around 5 years, since it was initiated under the prior ILO seafood processing project on child labour and forced labour. The association representatives reported that they encourage the enterprise welfare committees to include migrant workers on the committees. The associations have dedicated staff to monitor the implementation of the labour standards among their member factories.

The roll-out of the improved programme is set out in a joint proposal by the TTIA and TFFA planned to commence in January 2018. While the association representatives met expressed that progress has been delayed through gaps in ILO staff support, the associations themselves took

considerable time to organize to decide on the host for the programme and to submit their joint proposal. In 2018 the project plans to partner with Ethical Trade Initiative (ETI) in developing the GLP training curriculum, exploring GLP governance structures and conducting research on supply chain purchasing practices to begin in February/March 2018.

The intention of the Programme is to reach all aspects of the supply chain from vessels and farms through to processing plants; however, this goal does not appear feasible within the life of the project. Only the processing associations are currently engaged and committed, while the fishery associations prefer to rely on their own codes of conduct. To engage with the fishery industry the project has decided to pursue an alternative strategy as a pilot under ITF implementation that will work with fishing vessel owners in association with Thai Union seafood to promote the Thai Union Code of Conduct. According to the project staff this COC is well aligned with the ILO-designed GLP programme.

One of the obstacles to gaining a wider take-up of the GLP noted by the project staff appears to be the plethora of codes and certification regimes in the market; but the programme does have the potential to ready the enterprises to meet the requirements of various certification systems. The ECOT representative met by the evaluation noted the need for the project to engage with the major buyers to support the programme and incentivize membership. To this end, the project is engaging with buyers such as Walmart and Tesco through the Seafood Taskforce

### 3.3.5 Access to Services and Empowerment of Workers in the Sectors (Objective 4)

The project is devoting a significant proportion of its funding and staff time to improving access to services for fishery and seafood processing workers and their families and supporting the formation of associations to raise awareness of their rights and provide a collective voice in negotiating with employers. The strategies are delivered through a number of implementing partner agencies through the Implementation Agreement modality. The strategies are divided into the following categories corresponding to the outputs:

- Direct service support to workers and their families, in the form of complaints advice, health advice, legal support and referral (4.1).
- Organizing and strengthening worker associations (4.2)
- Access to educational services for children (4.3)
- Coordination among stakeholders on service provision and advocacy at national and provincial level on ethical seafood supply chains (4.4).

Table 5 presents a summary of progress against the objectives and outputs.

**Table 5. Summary of Progress on Objective 4**

Objective and Output	Indicator Targets	Progress
IO 4. Access to support services of workers and victims of labour abuses, including children, enhanced through engagement and	By the end of the project, 15,000 workers reached with ILO support (representing 80% of workers to be	Recorded services provided to workers have reached 7,400 workers as of December 2017 reporting. [Note that actual number may be

<b>Objective and Output</b>	<b>Indicator Targets</b>	<b>Progress</b>
empowerment of CSOs & trade unions	surveyed at endline compared with 67% in the baseline)	higher as not all partner reports for the period have been submitted]. ITF medical kits and training have benefited 1,080 fishers
4.1 Workers in the sectors have greater access to a range of support services provided by NGOs, trade unions and government.	No. of referrals recorded by CSO partners will increase progressively with project implementation  % of workers seeking access to services increased across service types.	In progress: Implementing partners are tracking the number of cases and referrals in progress reports but summary data of no. of referrals data not available. The CSOs are monitoring the types of service requested. The % increase intended to be assessed at end of project.
4.2 Worker associations established and strengthened to represent workers in the fishing and seafood processing industries	At least 8-10 operational unions or worker associations formed At least 20% increase in no. of workers in a union or association, compared with the survey baseline of 20% At least 30% of women to serve as leaders or in key positions in worker organizations. (Assumed to mean 30% of positions held by women)	SERC has trained migrant workers on forming associations and two worker associations have recently been established in Chonburi and Southern provinces.  Worker leader networks formed by SERC and Raks Thai/AAC in Samut Sakhon and Pattani
4.3 Mechanisms for facilitating access to a range of educational services developed and provide children with appropriate support services	Campaigns to increase school attendance launched in 5 targeted provinces	FED is promoting access for migrant children to education in Phang-Nga.  Field officer engaged with tripartite partners to advocate for migrant children's education rights in Ranong, Suratthani, Chumphon and Pattani.
4.4 Strengthened relations between the government and NGOs, trade unions and workers' associations on service delivery that leads to more informed policy and suitable models of service delivery	An effective (non-project) mechanism for ongoing sectoral policy coordination in place in 2019  20-25 unions and CSOs engage in bargaining and advocacy at national and provincial levels (compared with baseline of 16 unions and CSOs in the baseline research)	Tri-partite meetings at provincial level in Chonburi, Samut Sakhon, Songkla, Phuket, Phang-Nga and Surat Thani and Pattani to discuss services and worker protection issues.  Engagement with the CSO Coalition for Ethical and Sustainable Seafood through Oxfam and through Raks Thai with Aid Alliance Committee for Myanmar workers.

### **Drop-in Centres and community outreach (Output 4.1)**

Stella Maris has established three drop-in centres in Chonburi, Pattani and Rayong. The centres have been operating since June and July 2017, each staffed with a coordinator and Burmese and Cambodian translators. Stella Maris initially experienced difficulty in attracting highly experienced social workers to the positions, and has recruited less experienced but enthusiastic staff, (based on the site visit the evaluators made to Pattani drop-in centre). The centres have been

providing advice to workers and family members on a range of issues including general health, occupational safety and health and workers' rights under Thai law and registration processes.

In Pattani there was a delay of two months in recruiting interpreters, but two female interpreters are now on board. The paid staff are also supported by migrant volunteers from the community. The coordinator has found that it is important to have a male volunteer or staff member who can approach the male fishery workers with more ease. Regarding her skills and background, she is a newly graduated social worker who is very committed to promoting the rights and welfare of the workers. She does not have a legal background but has been supported by the more senior Stella Maris coordinator based at the office in Songkla. The centre has delivered a series of training sessions to workers in the neighbourhood addressing health care, workers' rights, and occupational health.

The evaluators met a group of Burmese and Cambodian workers and family members in Pattani who confirmed the value of the centre services and training/information sessions. The workers said they can get medicine at the centre, get advice regarding their working conditions, have someone accompany to the hospital when sick, help deal with problems at the workplace, for example if they have problems with payment or travel documents.

Seafood processing and fishery workers and family members at Pattani  
Drop-in Centre: What do you like most about the centre?

- *We can learn new things and new information*
- *We know more about workers' rights, working conditions, health care, migrant worker registration and travel documents*
- *We can come here at any time with an urgent problem, even at night.*

They noted that one of their biggest challenges was in not being able to speak Thai. There are no Thai language classes available, so they are not confident when dealing with migrant documentation processes and have to pay someone to assist them.

### **Provision of medical kits on board fishing vessels**

The International Transport Workers Federation's (ITF) provision of 100 medical kits on board fishing vessels in Songkla, working through the Songkla Fisheries Association, and associated training on first aid has met with a positive response among boat captains and fishers according to ITF, and is also appreciated by the provincial DLPW. This approach is proving to have multiple benefits, enabling general health education for fishers and more significantly serving as an entry point to meet workers and discuss their conditions and rights.

### **Peer networks for information and access to remediation**

Raks Thai takes another approach to helping workers access services, training and supporting networks of young migrant leaders through the formation of peer worker leader networks. In Samut Sakhon they have partnered with the Aid Alliance Committee formed by Burmese workers to extend outreach to migrant workers in seafood processing. Based on the meeting with AAC worker leaders in Samut Sakhon, the evaluation team observed that the staff are well informed about workers' rights and issues as former migrant workers themselves. They are closely engaged with



the community of Burmese and Cambodian workers. The leaders mobilize workers to take cases of wage underpayment and compensation to the local authorities. The level of digital and mobile communications literacy is very high among the leaders, and one has a Facebook following of some 6,000 Burmese workers, through which information is shared on rights and issues faced in Thailand. Raks Thai works in Surat Thani, Samut Sakhon and Pattani. In Pattani it also collaborates with Stella Maris in taking up cases of worker complaints.

### **Information sharing through Mobile technology**

The Burmese FED has updated and improved its mobile application for migrant workers in Burmese. This appears to be well researched and useful application. It is updated by a Burmese IT specialist in Yangon. The sharing of the application has been limited to MWRN and there is scope to share the application more widely through other implementing partners.

### **HRDF – manual for legal cases and training**

HRDF works with a network of lawyers dealing with workers' access to legal redress in cases of contract violations and compensation claims. Under the project it is developing a series of three manuals for paralegal staff of CSOs taking up cases in the fishing and seafood sectors that will be followed up by training for users. The content of the manuals is being developed through a consultative process with the CSOs on their needs. The manuals are expected to be finalized in May 2018.

### **Effectiveness of formation of worker associations and unions (Output 4.2)**

At the project outset in 2016 there were very few opportunities for workers in the seafood and fishery sectors, especially migrant workers, to collectively claim their rights as workers. There are no sectoral seafood processing or fishers' unions and few of the seafood processing factories have union representation. The M&E framework notes that there were two migrant worker associations in existence, the Migrant Workers' Rights Network (a Burmese workers' association) and the Aid Alliance Committee for Myanmar workers (AAC) in Samut Sakhon.

Under the project, efforts to establish worker associations or trade unions have mainly been delivered through the partnership with the State Enterprises Workers' Relations Confederation (SERC) Foundation. The strategy is build relationships between Thai trade unions and migrant workers through training and mentoring migrant workers and building the capacity of migrant workers to form unions and/or associations to pursue their collective interests. The initial activity completed was to hold discussions among SERC trade union members on labour protection mechanisms for workers in the sectors.

At the provincial and regional level, SERC has been providing training to migrant workers in the seafood processing sector on worker organizing with the aim of establishing operational unions or worker associations in Chonburi and Songkla. SERC identifies and trains migrant worker leaders from the seafood processing factories who can act as a network to share information about migrant worker rights and to help in cases of labour rights violations. In Songkla, SERC works in collaboration with the MWRN to gain access to workers and train worker leaders. The training topics include migrant worker registration and documentation processes, workers' rights and responsibilities and leadership skills. A cohort of Myanmar and Cambodian worker leaders has

been established serving as an exchange between the workers and the SERC Foundation and MWRN.

A Burmese worker leader met by the evaluation team in Songkla province reported that he has found the training very relevant to workers' needs, building their knowledge on worker rights, minimum wages, and social security entitlements. He shares information at his workplace informally and they also hold meetings outside working hours, usually through social activities or religious activities on Sundays. However there are challenges for many workers to attend meetings because they cannot always take time off on Sundays. The leaders can support workers to take issues to the provincial DLPW or the factory welfare committee.

Based on the interviews with SERC project managers it appears that so far it has helped to establish two worker associations; one in Chonburi representing Cambodian workers "Sa Ha Cheep Gram Ma Gorn", comprising mainly women workers engaged in seafood processing; and one covering southern seafood industry workers, the "Southern Seafood Industry Workers Group". The SSIWG is founded on the coaching of leaders to support the formation of an association representing workers from five major factories in the southern region of Thailand. This association is at the early stages of organization, including the election of a committee of workers representatives. The association is intended to bring a collective voice for the workers, enable a platform for collective bargaining, following the model of the MWRN in Samut Sakhon. Going forward, there is a need for SERC to develop a clear strategy for the support to the associations so that they can remain in operation beyond the project.

The SERC ILO project manager noted challenges for the implementation of their activities, relating to turnover of translators and field staff as well as challenges in keeping SERC staff and workers updated on migrant worker policies and regulations.

SERC also coordinates with ITF in Songkla which is engaged in setting up a fisher rights network. The activities of SERC and ITF are therefore complementary as SERC focuses on seafood processing while ITF focused on the fishery workers. To extend the organizing work to fishery workers, the project has initiated an additional implementing agreement with ITF to replicate fishers' rights networks in two additional provinces to commence in March 2018.

The evaluation team observed that various forms of collective organizing of workers are taking place under the efforts of the partners, ranging from online communications through MWRN, formation of associations with semi-formal structures, to more formal trade unions under ITF. The associations are as yet in the initial stages of formation and operation and effectiveness in raising the voice of workers remains to be seen the next 18 months.

The evaluation recommends that the approaches taken to form worker associations and trade unions should be documented during the latter months of the project, noting the degree of success and extent of membership, to enable further strengthening and replication of the models.

### **Access to education services for migrant children (Output 4.3)**

The Foundation for Education and Development (FED), is working under an initial agreement from August 2017 to July 2018 to promote and advocate for access of migrant children to education services in Phang Nga province. This activity aims to promote access of migrant children to formal and non-formal education. It includes activities to raise awareness among the Burmese community of the need to send children to school, identification of out-of school children; meetings with parents, teachers and life skills and leadership training for students; production of information materials aimed at parents and children.

Based on an initial report from FED (August –November 2017) and the interview with FED staff in Phang Nga, the activities appear to be on track. However, the FED staff note that their work could be strengthened through more technical support from the ILO regarding the labour laws, education policy for children and adults and case management skills.

The progress of this activity is still in the early stages and it was not possible to make a clear assessment of its effectiveness. Moreover, it was not possible to meet members of the migrant communities served by the project during the field visit. Given that FED is a new partner of ILO, the evaluators recommends that the project field officer continues to provide close monitoring and technical support to ensure that their knowledge of the policies is up to date.

#### **Coordination on delivery and advocacy at national and provincial level (Output 4.4)**

The project field officer has initiated provincial level tri-partite meetings for information exchange on issues facing works in Chonburi, Samut Sakhon, Songkla, Phuket, Phang Nga and Surat Thani, as well as policy discussions. These are convened by the DPLW with support from the project field officer in the southern provinces. The stakeholders met conveyed that these are proving to be a valuable mechanism for coordination, with Raks Thai also replicating the approach in Pattani. As yet, the partners have not decided on a sustainability strategy.

The project's contribution to the CSO Coalition on Ethical Seafood through Oxfam works at a national and international level and is focused on campaigning for ethical supply chains among global buyers of seafood and consumers. It is focused on promoting workers' rights and logically bridges the work under objective 4 with supply chain compliance under Objective 3. The project's support to the campaign is relatively new, but provides an opportunity to link with a broad network of CSOs.

#### **3.3.6 Gender strategies**

Gender issues clearly affect workers in these sectors, where fisheries exclusively employs male fishers and the seafood processing sector workforce is predominantly female. The baseline report provides a profile of the sectors by sex and identified gender issues such as significant disparities in wages between men and women in seafood processing for example. At present, gender concerns are integrated in the project monitoring and evaluation through sex disaggregation and the partners provide sex disaggregation for cases and clients served, but strategies to address the different issues affecting men and women workers have not been articulated and shared. A draft gender strategy was prepared by a consultant in October 2017 that provides an extensive analysis of gender dimensions in the sectors and provides a guide for gender mainstreaming in the project work plan. This guide contains a list of “must dos”, “should do” and “nice to do” to promote gender

responsiveness in the activities per project objective. Given that the gender strategy has not been formally shared with partners its practical use is in question after a year of partner implementation under Objective 4. The evaluation suggests that the gender strategy should be finalized in a focused and practical format to share with partners if it is to have an impact on the intervention approaches.

### **3.4 Sustainability and Impact Orientation**

This section assesses the Ship to Shore Rights Project strategy for sustainability as well as the extent to which the models and results of the project are expected to continue beyond the project or be replicated more widely. In doing so, the evaluation notes some of the risks to sustaining the results beyond the project.

#### **Sustainability Planning**

The project document notes that a sustainability strategy including an exit strategy would be drafted during the first year of the project. The project does not have a stand-alone sustainability plan and exit strategy. Nevertheless, the evaluation observes that under the guidance of the CTA the project team endeavours to work with the partners towards sustainability as much as possible. This approach is evident in the approaches taken across the objectives.

Under Objective 1, support for regulatory change is oriented towards medium to long term change in the policy environment governing forced labour and improved channels for the regularization of migrant workers in the target sectors. Under Objective 2 the project aims to support a long-term shift in the quality of labour inspectorate planning and the capacity to identify violations through training and inspection tools. Under Objective 3, discussions of sustainability with the seafood processing associations have focused on the establishment of a GLP centre to be responsible for oversight and promotion of the improved GLP programme.

In promoting workers' access to services and representation the intended strategy is to promote the self-reliance of workers, in terms of ownership of the services established and cost-sharing, as well as strong associations to represent their interests. To this end, Ship to Shore is continuing to negotiate with partners to include sustainable approaches such as cost-sharing for non-formal community learning centres with migrant workers and building self-reliance among workers.

#### **Prospects for Sustainability and Impact Orientation**

The evaluators looked for evidence and prospects for the ongoing results of the project to continue beyond the end of the project across the four objectives, with the following observations.

**Legal frameworks and migration governance (IO 1):** There is a broad consensus among the stakeholders that support of the project and the commitment of the RTG is likely to bring sustained improvements to the legal framework in line with P.29 and C.188. However, the time is short for the project to support the quality of implementation of legal reforms once they are introduced. With regard to reforms related to C.188 there is a risk of resistance from the fishing industry which may weaken the laws themselves and their application. The project can support the MOL in

engaging in full consultation with the players to support the process. With regard to increasing the migration status of workers in the sectors, tangible improvements are expected to be achieved in pre-departure preparation for fishers from Myanmar, and in MOU channels more broadly, though work in this area is just getting underway.

**Labour inspection capacity (IO 2):** The shift towards a qualitative response to labour inspection in the target sectors is still ongoing, and as yet the inspectorate is not identifying a higher rate of violations as would be expected to occur initially under an improved inspection regime. It is not clear whether such a shift will come about within the project lifetime but there are encouraging signs that the parties involved are moving towards a model based on efficiency and quality. Provided that the project can support the inspectorate to establish a comprehensive training curriculum for labour inspectors this promises to have a long term impact on the quality of labour inspection. Discussion of the PIPO Interview protocol is underway, and if adopted this promises to have a sustained impact on detecting labour abuses and contract violations on board commercial fishing vessels.

**Industry self-monitoring and compliance (IO 3):** The continuation and expansion of the GLP programme depends on the continued commitment of financial and human resources by the participation associations, as well as their capacity to incentivize their members to implement the programme. Efforts to establish a GLP centre that would provide the institutional base for the programme have not yet come to fruition as only two associations (TFFA and TTIA) are so far willing to commit the necessary budget. As noted by the ECOT representative, the sustainability of self-compliance among processing enterprises also needs to be supported by the major buyers and consumers to ensure that this approach can be sustained and strengthened.

**Access to services, legal support and worker representation (IO 4):** A number of tangible products are being produced with project funds that have good prospects for continued use beyond the project. These products include the Legal Handbook under preparation by HRDF and the mobile application for migrant workers' rights that is being updated with the project support. There is a need to ensure that this application is shared across the range of networks with Burmese migrant workers, and plans for ongoing updating by the IT expert in Myanmar need to be put in place.

Stella Maris is exploring possibilities for continuing to operate its three new centres and other centres by funding them through a port users levy paid by vessel owners and other users of the ports. This may not come about, and the centres may either not continue operation or will need to be supported by other donors or government. TRIANGLE in ASEAN staff observe that the government is increasingly willing to fund services to migrants implemented by NGOs. The project should therefore explore a variety of models for sustaining the centres with Stella Maris and provincial stakeholders. The forthcoming law reforms associated with P.29 are expected to provide government funds for shelters for migrants removed from forced labour, or other unacceptable conditions, which the project and partners could use as a basis for advocacy.

The broad strategy towards empowering migrant workers to know their rights and represent their own needs shows varying levels of success. Some of the partners are more accustomed to providing direct assistance than building ownership and capacity, and it will be challenging for the project

to enable a major shift in approaches in the short time frame available. Encouraging signs are observed in the work of Raks Thai/AAC and SERC to build worker leader networks to share information and represent migrant workers, but these are still in the early stages of formalizing. More formal associations of seafood and fishery workers to represent their interests have the potential to make an impact on workers' capacity to claim their rights but they will likely need ongoing support from SERC and ITF to be sustained beyond the project. The sustainability and effectiveness of seafood worker and fishery associations remains constrained by the Thai legal context under which Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining are not guaranteed by law in the absence of ratification of C.87 and C.98. The partners will need to pay attention to ensuring the sustainability of the associations and worker networks, for example by looking at funding revenue through worker membership dues. The effectiveness of the associations could be strengthened by linking the members of the members of the GLP and ensuring that association members are represented on enterprise Labour and Welfare Committees.

### **3.5. Management Effectiveness**

This section assesses the extent to which management arrangements are achieving desired results within a timely, effective, and efficient manner. This includes consideration of staffing arrangements; operational and strategic planning; budgeting; management of implementation agreements and sub-contracts; reporting, monitoring and evaluation and coordination efforts.

#### **3.5.1 Effectiveness of staffing arrangements**

The evaluation found that the planned division of responsibilities among the staff team is clear and practical, while changes in the personnel during the first 18 months have required adjustments both among the staff themselves and in terms of working relations with the Ministry of Labour as national the focal counterpart, which have detracted from efficiency.

The staff team consists of the CTA, two national project coordinators based in Bangkok, two administrative staff and a project field officer based in Phang Nga. An additional team member has been recruited on external collaborator basis as of January 2018 to act as liaison with the Ministry of Labour to support Objectives 1 and 2. The latter role has been filled by two different individuals, from February to October 2017, and from January 2018 onwards. The allocation of this position is intended to respond flexibly to the emerging needs of the MOL and the ICD during the intensive period of legal drafting and consultation required for ratification of P29 and C188 and involves a division of her time between the ILO and the MOL. While the MOL expressed they would prefer to have more extensive assistance during the intensive period of law drafting, the project takes a firm line in limiting the time spent in the ministry itself in accordance with ILO policy.

The CTA is responsible for strategic oversight of the project, staff management and reporting to the donor. The programmatic responsibilities are divided among the staff, with one NPC assigned responsibility for supporting and monitoring implementation under Objectives 3 and 4, as well as monitoring and evaluation and reporting updates, and support to the Project Steering Committee; while the second NPC is responsible for supporting implementation of Objectives 1 and 2. In practice the first NPC is currently bearing a greater burden of the programmatic work since the

second NPC did not start until around September 2017 and many of the partners are more familiar with the original staff member many partners and consequently send queries and communications to her. The M&E oversight and reporting that it requires are also large responsibilities. While efforts are underway to transition the responsibilities for secretariat support to the taskforces and the PSC to the responsible NPC, this has not yet fully occurred. An internal team discussion of the allocation of workloads across the team is therefore suggested.

The placement of a Field Officer has assisted in the effectiveness of monitoring activities across the objectives in the Andaman area and in the southern provinces on the East coast. The location is isolated in terms of transport connections, which means practically that the Officer is able to monitor the Phang Nga and Phuket areas more closely than the Lower Gulf and Southern Gulf provinces to the East – such as Surat Thani, Songkla and Pattani. The Bangkok-based NPC is responsible for monitoring partner activities under Objective 4 in the Central and Eastern zones. The field officer has been effective in initiating tri-partite consultation meetings in the provinces in the south. However, based on interviews with provincial DPLW and PIPO officers there may be a need for greater transparency in explaining the role of the field officer, especially regarding monitoring of PIPO inspections.

### **3.5.2 Strategic and operational planning**

The project established a detailed project-wide Workplan for 2016-2017 and reports against the Workplan in the PSC meetings and annual TPR reports to the EU. At the time of the evaluation, the shared Workplan specifies forward activities for 2018-19 only at a general level, not by month. The detailed forward plan for 2018-2019 was currently under review at the time of the evaluation visit and was not available to the evaluation team.

Approvals of key activities such as the conduct of the baseline and the approval of the M&E framework are made by the PSC. This ensures accountability of the project to the stakeholders, but it has also contributed to delays in some areas, such as the approval of the M&E system.

Regarding information sharing and planning and strategizing among the staff team, the Bangkok based staff are in regular communication; but the field officer is not as frequently involved in team-wide communication given her location in Phang Nga. The evaluation suggests that team-wide planning and strategizing meetings could be held more frequently either by Skype or in person to enable fuller participation of the Field Officer. At a general level, the evaluation team observed that project documentation could be more consistently labelled.

### **3.5.3 Budgeting**

Funding from the EU is disbursed in annual tranches. The budget planning and reporting is made against these disbursements. Budget recording and disbursement follows ILO procedures and appears to be well managed and documented. The clarity of communication with partners regarding budget disbursement and efficiency of transfers is discussed below. The administrative

and finance staff provide regular updates to the CTA on expenditure rates, which are also conveyed to the PSC.

### **3.5.4 Management of implementation agreements and other contracts**

Based on the evaluation consultations with the staff and partners, the task of managing the implementation agreements with CSO partners was initially challenging for the project team both administratively and programmatically. Some partners have had difficulty complying with the ILO's narrative and technical reporting requirements which led to delays in onward funding. The CSO partners shared that delayed transfers of funds by the ILO due to ILO internal procedures following approved agreements meant that they had to forward fund the start-up of some activities themselves. In addition, some implementing partners felt that the ILO's technical and financial reporting requirements were not explained clearly enough from the outset.

Partner reporting on their implementation agreements is intended to occur at six monthly intervals within the cycle of each agreement. The partner reports have tended to be submitted up to a month late, however. Only one round of reports had been submitted as of end of January, 2018, while some reports were due end of December 2017. Partner capacity to prepare reports varies, and the ILO staff have provided guidance as far as possible but do not have time to coach partners extensively. The ILO staff expressed that the early difficulties have been overcome and most partners are now able to meet ILO's requirements. It would be advisable to reiterate to the partners the importance of timely reporting to help identify obstacles and take action as well as to expedite implementation.

### **3.5.5 Effectiveness of Reporting and Monitoring and Evaluation**

#### **Reporting**

The project provides technical progress reports to the donor annually in March. The first annual report, submitted January 2017, revised July 2017, provides a comprehensive overview of progress and challenges. Progress reporting takes place at the national governance level through the PSC approximately three or four times per year and is presented through a report against the workplan, M&E Framework and narrative report presented by the CTA. The frequency of reporting to the PSC is considered by the evaluation as a good practice keeping all stakeholders informed of progress.

#### **Effectiveness of the M&E System**

As discussed in section 3.2, the M&E framework was developed in full consultation with the PSC partners and approved in September 2017 once baseline information was available against the relevant indicators. The performance reporting framework sets out the indicators for performance against each objective and output, data sources and agencies responsible, baseline values and targets, and progress against the targets.

The use of the Monitoring and Evaluation Framework to guide project management decisions and adjust strategy has only recently come into operation, with a first update made against the



indicators and targets in January 2018. It was therefore difficult for the evaluator to assess the application of the system so far as a management tool. Much of the reporting against the framework is in narrative form, and quantitative data are not consistently available, suggesting that such data may not be practical to collect.

Overall, the framework does provide useful information on the progress towards the objectives; specifically, the progress of legal and regulatory change under Objective 1; the progress of labour inspection planning and capacity building and rate of violations detected under Objective 2; progress in implementing the strengthened GLP programme under Objective 3; and numbers of cases assisted under the project under Objective 4. One of the key purposes of M&E systems is to capture results that the project itself has brought about as deliverable outputs, as well as the significant outcomes to which the project will contribute by the end of the project. As mentioned in Section 3.1, the evaluation recommends that some elements at the output level of the framework should be adjusted to more effectively capture results that can be attributed to the project. Most obviously, Output 1.4, it would be improved by recording adjustments in MOU regulations and pre-departure practices that can be attributed to the project's interventions.

With regard to monitoring direct support to workers under Objective 4, each partner has a client report recording system which is being used to track cases served. It is not clear to the evaluator whether the project staff are monitoring the accuracy and completeness of the data collected, and occasional spot checking of the data collected should be conducted.

Regarding milestones for the indicator targets, in other words, what is expected to be achieved by when, the framework lacks consistent timelines for the indicator targets. This could be accommodated going forward either by adding column for 2018 and end of project, or by ensuring that the current framework includes a time indication for each indicator.

With regard to assessing the situation of working conditions at the end of the project in the sectors and areas covered, to which the project is assumed to contribute, the project plans an endline study in 2019, replicating the baseline study. The evaluator cautions that the project and stakeholders need to clarify the purpose of such a survey and to be clear on what it would accomplish.

Methodologically, an endline survey corresponding to the design of the baseline survey would describe workers' conditions at the end of the project which may demonstrate overall improvements in the situation, but not necessarily changes attributable to the project. Changes or improvements in working conditions that may be identified by such a survey among a sample of fishery and seafood workers in the project areas could not be clearly attributed to the interventions under the Ship to Shore Rights project as there are a host of other influences in such a complex environment, and there is no control sample comparison available through the baseline.<sup>12</sup> In addition, the baseline survey covered a slightly different set of provinces to those where direct interventions have been made to date, although it would be possible to disaggregate findings by province. Some selected indicators could provide valid comparisons of baseline-endline results as

---

<sup>12</sup> This may be contrasted with the approach taken under the TRIANGLE in ASEAN project in which the baseline survey covered intervention and non-intervention locations.

an indicator of project impact; for example, whether workers recall being asked by an official about labour compliance.

To better understand the contribution of the project and its partners to outcome – level changes, the project could consider recruiting an evaluation consultant to conduct selected interview studies on specific thematic areas – for example, how the labour inspectors or PIPO teams are conducting vessel inspections and how project training has contributed; tracing of improvements in conditions in specific factories through the application of GLP; or case studies of the formation of workers’ associations and workers’ access to remediation services.

### **3.5.6 Coordination with partners and systems at national and field level**

#### **With national tri-partite plus stakeholders**

The project coordinates effectively with tri-partite the partners at the national level through the PSC and two technical taskforces; Taskforce 1 dealing with Objectives 1 and 4; and Taskforce 2 dealing with Objectives 2 and 3. Given that many of the partners are common across the two Taskforces, combined meetings are now held to discuss issues under both taskforces. The PSC and Taskforce arrangements have proven useful in ensuring that the tri-partite plus stakeholders are well informed about the progress and directly involved in strategic decisions, according to most stakeholders interviewed. The MOL commented that the agenda is determined by the ILO with insufficient opportunity for input by the participants, and suggested that the agenda needs to be circulated with an invitation for items to be included. The ILO team at the same time is considering how to encourage the participants to take a more active role in discussions.

#### **Coordination at field level and among implementing partners**

The project field office in Phang Nga province was established to enable a field presence for monitoring provincial-level roll out across Objectives 2, 3 and 4. The Field Officer is fulfilling a valuable role in monitoring the application of training to inspection procedures in ports as well as in building tri-partite coordination mechanisms under Objective 4 as discussed in Section 3.3. Raks Thai is also instrumental in replicating coordination meetings in provinces not covered by the field officer such as Pattani.

The project staff promote linkages between implementing agencies working in the same site as discussed in Section 3.3. There is also an effort to support coordinated advocacy on ethical seafood supply chains through the Thai CSO Coalition on Ethical Seafood led by Oxfam Thailand. One of the factors hindering coordination is the flood of donor interest in the fishing and seafood industry, competition for funding, and many new players and projects entering. Project staff and others observed that the partners are not always willing to cooperate with each other and are protective of their territory. Cross-partner meetings for discussion and exchange such as the one observed by the evaluation team have been held by the project but infrequently. The agencies present recommended that such meetings be held more often to promote cross-fertilization and cooperation. On the other hand, the CSOs themselves could do more to organize jointly to avail of the opportunities provided by the project to present joint messages to national and provincial fora.

### 3.6 Efficiency of Resources

#### Financial efficiency

The evaluator considered financial efficiency by examining the breakdown of the total budget according to operational costs and the costs allocated to the implementation of activities including the four objectives.

**Table 6** provides a summary of the project's major line items that include overheads costs and costs of implementing project activities. Costs that can be classified as overheads include staff salaries, travel, equipment, office expenses, contingency and the ILO indirect costs.

These non-implementation costs amount to EUR 2,352,671 or 56% of the project's total budget, which is considered relatively high. Direct implementation costs include M&E, conferences and translation, communications and visibility and objective-specific line items. These costs associated with direct implementation comprise the remaining 44% of the budget. Staff salaries (including travel per diems) is the largest line item and accounts for 46% of the total budget.

**Table 6: Project Budget Line Items (US Dollars)**

Item	Budget (EUR)	Percent
Human resources	1,950,675	46.44%
Travel	21,250	.51%
Equipment	21,760	.52%
Office expenses	82,980	1.98%
M&E	50,000	1.19%
Conferences & Translation	44,575	1.06%
Communications campaigns	202,000	4.81%
Objective 1	245,254	5.84%
Objective 2	168,000	4.00%
Objective 3	142,500	3.39%
Objective 4	995,000	23.69%
Contingency	1,326.42	.03%
Indirect cost	274,679.58	6.54%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4,200,000</b>	<b>100%</b>

The budget for the four objectives amounts to EUR 1,550,754, or about 37% of the project's budget. The fourth objective has the largest allocation. It amounts to almost one million EUR or 24% of the total project budget. The budgets for the other 3 objectives are much smaller, ranging from 3% for objective 3 to around 6% for objective 1. In terms of efficiency, the amounts allocated

to legal and policy work, labour inspection capacity and support to the GLP programme are relatively modest considering the expected results and potential impacts.

Objective 4 is relatively costly (approximately one quarter of the budget, close to EUR 1 million) and one would therefore expect that it will achieve significant impacts in terms of direct beneficiaries reached as well as sustainable services and worker associations formed. The project plans to reach 15,000 workers or family members during the project lifetime, which represents a cost-benefit ratio of EUR 66.33 per individual. However, this objective is much broader in its aims than direct services, and given additionally that 10 provinces are covered, the costs appear justified. The costs of the drop-in centres are relatively high however, underlining the importance of establishing their sustainability.

The amount of EUR 202,000 allocated to communications campaigns and visibility strategies appears quite high at 5% of the budget. The evaluation team was not able to observe substantial activities for communications and visibility other than the operation of the project website and the production of project brochures and leaflets. However, the Communications and Visibility strategy also includes the production of documentary videos that are not yet produced.

Comparison of actual spending to date with the budget for year one shows that the project has an expenditure rate of 72% of the budget disbursed until December 2017 (EUR 1767,533 spent or committed against EUR 2,451,209 disbursed). This suggests the project is close to being on track in terms of budget use to date.

### **Efficiency of the field office location**

The evaluation and stakeholders found that it is valuable for the project to have a field office to enable the Project to have a visible provincial presence. The selection of this location was made by the PSC and based on access to the target sites in the Andaman ports, location of the Region 3 Naval Base, as well as proximity to the target provinces in the southern Gulf zone. The justification of the implementing sites was based on the number of fishing vessels, large fishing and seafood workforce, and possible incidents of labour violations. However, the Field Officer noted that it is time consuming to travel from Phang Nga to other provincial sites, especially those on the Eastern seaboard as there is only one flight daily to Hat Yai. The costs of travel to these provinces and to and from Bangkok are also high. In terms of time and cost-efficiency it may have been preferable to base the provincial office in one of the East coast provinces or even in Bangkok, given that there are many flights from Bangkok to the provinces. However, the Phang Nga location has the advantage of enabling outreach to Ranong and Phuket, which would otherwise be isolated.

### **Efficiency of partner selection**

The project is working with 7 implementing partners in total for Objective 4 activities. Partners were selected based on their background working on migration and workers in the seafood and fisheries sectors as well as their presence in the locations. In some instances, there are several partners are working in one province, such as Songkla, Samut Sakhon and Chonburi. In these cases, there are efficiency gains in terms of partners such as Stella Maris being able to refer cases to Raks Thai. In Songkla the partners' efforts are complementary with SERC focused on seafood workers and ITF on fishery worker organizing.

Efficiencies have been gained by utilizing existing partner offices, such as those of Raks Thai in Samut Sakhon. However, Stella Maris does not have an existing office in Songkla, and therefore staff have to travel to Pattani to monitor the new centre there.

### **3.7 Effectiveness of Communication and Visibility Strategies**

The project completed a comprehensive Communications and Visibility Strategy in November, 2016. This strategy maps out an ambitious range of communications and visibility methods to be employed with internal and external project stakeholders.

The project has produced and distributed a variety of communication materials including leaflets on workers' rights for use by CSOs, leaflets and a video to demonstrate to workers how to use the electronic banking system; and a video promoting the GLP on the project website. Another video on good practices in enforcement is in the pipeline. The effectiveness of the communications materials in reaching and influencing the various audiences does not appear to have been monitored. Moreover, the broad range of planned communication activities may be not be practical within the remaining time available and warrants review.

Based on the observations of the evaluation team, limited to brief field visits, the project has ensured that the ILO, EU and MOL logos are displayed on leaflets and banners on the project field office and drop-in centres for example. The awareness of the EU as the donor of the Ship to Shore Rights Project varies among internal partners at the local level. For example, staff of the Stella Maris centres are aware that the project is EU funded, whereas AAC leaders under Raks Thai are not aware that their efforts are supported by the ILO through EU funding, but are more familiar with their direct funding agency, Raks Thai.

As observed, there is room to improve the level of awareness of the Ship to Shore Rights Project messages and also the role and visibility of both the ILO and the EU. However, given the observed intensity of anti-EU feeling among fisheries operators in some port areas it may be advisable to modify or reduce EU profile in some areas in the interests of protecting staff safety as well as promoting the project interventions.

## IV CONCLUSIONS

---

The following conclusions synthesize the evaluators' key findings, organized according to the themes of project design; relevance to stakeholder needs; progress and effectiveness in achieving objectives; sustainability; management effectiveness and efficiency; communications and visibility strategy and good practices and lessons learned.

### **Project Design**

- The four objectives of the Ship to Shore Rights Project represent a valid and comprehensive set of strategies to support the Thai government, the industry and union and civil society stakeholders in improving the rights and working conditions of workers in the fishing and seafood sector.
- The sectoral and thematic scope of the project is broad relative to the time and human resources available, and its geographical coverage is also wide. There are advantages in taking an integrated approach to addressing labour rights in fishing and seafood, especially for advocacy purposes, but this broad coverage would have been better served by a longer term project with more extensive resources. Thematically, the design would have benefited from a more focused approach, especially under Objective 4, where the provision of children's education services and health services falls into the area of migrant workers' family welfare rather than the central focus on improvements to working conditions and access to remediation services.
- The Monitoring and Evaluation Framework provides a systematic basis for assessing the project's progress towards its objectives and outputs, including indicators, sources of data, indicator targets and baseline values. The project has also made considerable effort to ensure that partners understand and support the framework. However, there is scope to improve some elements of the framework to effectively capture the results that can be attributed to the project and to use the data to guide adjustments to the project's strategies.

### **Relevance**

- In a dynamic, pressured and politically contentious environment, a key achievement of Ship to Shore Rights is to bring together stakeholders with competing interests to discuss the issues.
- The project has garnered a high level of engagement and participation among the national stakeholders. It supports the urgent plan of the RTG to bring the legal framework into alignment with international labour standards on forced labour and labour in fishing. It also responds to the changing needs of the labour inspectorate and enforcement actors in the context of more stringent regulations, especially those applicable to fishing vessels.
- There remains varying ownership and trust of the project, particularly among fishing industry stakeholders, which brings risks to achieving the desired changes in that sector.

However, the ILO team, together with other project partners, is taking a flexible approach to maintain engagement with the fishing industry.

### **Progress towards objectives**

- Given a delayed start, the project team together with the key stakeholders has made good progress in setting up the project's governance frameworks and completing major baseline research and gap analysis and needs assessments across the four objectives.
- Much of the effort of the project and stakeholders during the first half of the project has been on supporting legal analysis and discussion of legal revisions for alignment with international labour standards. Strong progress has been made in the drafting of a proposed law aligned with P.29. The discussion of appropriate legal reforms in line with the Work in Fishing Convention C.188 is progressing, but completion will likely take longer given its complexity and the resistance to elements of the reforms among the industry.
- A key knowledge product to date is the baseline survey research, providing valuable data on the state of migrant worker profile and compliance issues in fishery and seafood processing in early 2017. This has helped document the issues needing attention and provides some quantitative baseline estimates for evaluation purposes.
- The ILO's technical support to the labour inspectorate is gradually building the inspection systems tailored to fishing vessels and seafood processing, and building the capacity of an expanded cohort of labour inspectors in coastal provinces. The extent to which this capacity is translating into more effective inspection and action on labour violations remains to be demonstrated, and will depend on the commitment of the labour inspectorate and other inspection actors, both centrally and at the front line to identify and take action on labour violations.
- A more rigorous Good Labour Practices (GLP) programme for voluntary industry compliance has been elaborated and two major seafood associations (TTIA) and (TFFA) are committed to applying and sustaining the programme. This is a considerable advance beyond the existing GLP practice and promises to bring a substantial part of the Thai industry under the umbrella of the programme. Although the extent of industry engagement is not as wide as originally envisioned, the key task is to consolidate the programme within the organizations that are committed, secure the governance arrangements and attract ongoing buyer commitment to prefer GLP member suppliers.
- Implementation agreements with a wide range of CSO and trade union partners have been underway for varying periods, from around one year to just beginning. The evaluation observed tangible progress being made on migrant drop-in centres in port areas, capacity for legal support among CSOs, and capacity building of migrant workers themselves in the sectors to understand and their rights and seek remediation and other services. Different models of organizing workers through peer networks and more formal associations are emerging but are still in their infancy. Provincial tri-partite meetings held in several provinces to discuss issues in the sectors appears to be an emerging good practice towards coordinating services.

### **Sustainability**

- The project efforts stand to bring significant and long-term changes to the legal framework through alignment with international labour standards.

- Improvements to the labour inspection systems and inspectorate skills applicable to fishing vessels and seafood processing appear likely to be sustained in the long term, provided that the DLPW can continue to implement the training program and monitoring of inspection beyond the project.
- Given the commitment of major seafood associations, the GLP programme has good prospects for being sustained and of having a significant impact in the seafood processing sector. Achieving wider impact in seafood processing will eventually require engaging other large associations in the programme. The project is pursuing alternative approaches to sustainably improving self-compliance in the fishing industry, including support via the major seafood processor and exporter, Thai Union, to implement their labour code among fishing vessels in selected ports.
- The project advocates for workers' sustainable access to services through providing for support services that are sustainable and coordinated among government and CSOs; and importantly by developing worker's capacities to claim rights and seek remediation through ongoing networks. The partners are seeking sustainable solutions for the drop-in centres, including private sector support. Government funding of services implemented by NGOs might also be an option, as well as ongoing donor support. The worker networks and associations will likely require long term CSO and trade union support beyond the project.

### **Management effectiveness and efficiency**

- The project staffing and designation of responsibilities is effective and has responded flexibly to emerging needs, while some further balance and adjustments to staff responsibilities are suggested by the evaluation. Overall, the implementation agreements with partners are well managed, following some initial challenges regarding partners' reporting responsibilities and capacities.
- The project funds are allocated efficiently to achieve the objectives, and the share allocated to the respective components appears justified. However, the budget for communications strategies appears relatively high compared to its importance in the overall project effort.

### **Communications and Visibility**

- It was difficult for the evaluation to ascertain the effectiveness of the project's communications and visibility strategy with limited information available on the reach of the various forms of media both among internal partners and the wider public. The strategy itself is ambitious and it would be practical to set priorities for the remainder of the project. Among some stakeholders the appropriate level of visibility is lacking, while in others EU and ILO visibility can pose a risk to local staff, and there is a need for a moderated approach.



## Emerging Good Practices

The evaluation observed several emerging good practices which may provide models for other projects and warrant further nurturing under Ship to Shore Rights:

- **Project steering committee role**  
The Project Steering Committee is functioning well as a decision making body for the project and as a platform for discussion among the stakeholders. While there is room for the partners to take a more active role in raising issues, the PSC provides a good model for other ILO projects for enabling ownership among project tri-partite partners.
- **Nurturing digital literacy among migrant workers**  
The evaluation team observed several migrant worker leaders using mobile social networking applications very effectively. As noted in the baseline survey, social media usage among the migrant worker population is high and the majority own smartphones. The methods used could be shared and further supported across the partners. It was evident that this social media information sharing reaches both intending migrant workers in sending countries as well as migrant workers in Thailand. The mobile phone application for migrant workers' information developed by FED is a useful tool that should be shared across other migrant worker networks including MWRN.
- **Worker leader networks**  
The identification and training of migrant worker leaders by CSOs such as Raks Thai and AAC, and the formation of associations and networks supported by trade unions SERC and ITF, are still in their early stages, but the evaluation observed that these are gaining strength. By the end of the project these networks may offer replicable models for the fishing and seafood sector, and potentially for other industries that do not yet have formal union coverage.

## Lesson Learned

The following lessons for future projects were noted by the interviewees and the evaluation team.

- **Developing the monitoring and evaluation framework**  
The consensus-based process of developing the M&E framework, resulted in a framework that includes the key elements required, but does not fully meet results-based management standards. Although it is essential for transparency and relevance to secure the contribution and agreements of the stakeholders to the design elements and promote their understanding of results-based management principles, the final framework should be the role and responsibility of the ILO and completed by an officer or designated consultant with relevant M&E expertise.
- **Design feasible and targeted project scope for greater impact.**  
The scope of the project design has stretched the human resource capacity of the project, especially given the project duration. Project designers need to be more cognizant of time and resource limitations when designing projects intended to address labour rights along

entire supply chains. The thematic components also need to be carefully targeted and focused on the key issues, especially the locally applied interventions.

## V RECOMMENDATIONS

---

The following recommendations are directed to the Project, including the ILO project team, the PSC and implementing partners, to improve performance in the second half of the project. Each recommendation is followed by an indication of the responsible agency, priority, time implication and resource implication.

### **Project Management and Overall Implementation**

- 1. Make adjustments to the monitoring and evaluation framework.** The project should make adjustments to the M&E framework to ensure that outputs for which the project is responsible to deliver are reported against, and include progress targets at least annually, for all indicators, not only at end of project. Specifically:
  - Revise the wording of output 1.4 and its indicators, to reflect a tangible output that the project is responsible for. The number of registered migrant workers should be monitored at the impact level, but not at the output level.
  - Include targets for end of 2018 as well as the end of the project, adding another column for annual milestone targets.
  - Ensure that the indicator statements match the target statements
  - Include qualitative studies of outcomes to supplement the endline survey in order to explore the factors contributing to observed changes.*(Responsible agency: Project staff assisted by ILO M&E Officer DWT; Priority: High; Time implication: Immediate; Resources: Required for qualitative endline studies.)*
- 2. Review the feasibility of the project scope and in particular the strategic focus of Objective 4 interventions in alignment with the overall objective.** The project is advised to review the scope as a whole to identify areas of strategic focus going forward. In particular, review the strategy for promoting education access for children of migrant workers and consider removing the strategy as a stand-alone intervention as it is beyond the central focus on working conditions and rights of workers in the sectors. *(Responsible agency: Project team and PSC; Priority: Medium; Time implication: Immediate; Resource implication: Low)*
- 3. Explore options to extend the project for at least six months.** Discuss with the EU Delegation the possibility of granting a project extension for six months, either on a no-cost or cost basis. Develop an extension plan and budget proposal to support the request. In particular this would allow more time for the implementing partner projects to be fully realized, and to enable time to consolidate lessons and document good practice models. *(Responsible agency: ILO and EU; Priority: High, Time implication: medium term; Resources: medium)*
- 4. Review the security concerns for local partner staff together with partner agencies for sites with anti-EU campaigns.** Adjust the visibility strategy vis-à-vis ILO and EU presence if necessary. *(Responsible agency: Project team and EU; Priority: High; Time implication: Short-term; Resource implication: Low)*

5. **Finalize the gender strategy in the form of specific gender mainstreaming and gender-responsive implementation guidelines and monitoring requirements and train partners in its application.** (*Responsible agency: Project team and tri-partite partners; Priority: Medium; Time implication: Ongoing; Resource implication: Medium*)
6. **Develop priorities for the communications and visibility strategy and include communications regarding good labour practice examples within the fishing and seafood industry.** The current communications and visibility strategy is broad and ambitious and would benefit from prioritizing activities and strategies within it. Further, in communications to share and demonstrate project and partner achievements, document and share examples of good labour practices across the fishing and seafood industry, as well as clearly evidenced messages regarding the significant gaps. (*Responsible agency: Project team and PSC partners; Priority: Medium; Time implication: Ongoing; Resource implication: Medium*)
7. **Planning for the final evaluation.** For the final external evaluation, extend the time available for the team to conduct interviews at provincial level and include a stakeholder workshop at the culmination of the field visit to enable cross-partner discussion of the achievements and sustainability and provide comment on the preliminary evaluation findings. (*Responsible agency: ILO evaluation manager and project team; Priority: High; Time implication: development of evaluation TOR prior to last 6 months of the project; Resource implication: Medium*).

#### **Achievement of Specific Objectives**

8. **To further the impact on the legislative and regulatory framework, support the MOL to develop a plan and guidelines on promulgating the anticipated legal amendments.** (*Responsible agency: Project team and MOL; Priority: Medium; Time implication: Project duration; Resource implication: Medium*)
9. **Support the development of tri-partite monitoring of the application of labour inspection training and new tools in fishing vessels and seafood processing.** The project should support the development of systems to monitor labour inspection for vessels and seafood processing respectively, following the training and adoption of new tools for inspection of vessels. This could be supported by the ILO staff, international expertise and the ILO Labour Inspection Specialist. (*Responsible agencies: Project team, ILO Labour Inspection Specialist, DLPW and MECC; Priority: Medium; Time implication: Remainder of the project; Resource implication: Medium*)
10. **As part of the exit strategy, document the various approaches to worker organizing including good practice models recommended for expansion and share the documentation with interested parties among project stakeholders and the ILO.** This should include resources for documentation and be supported by discussions with the implementing partners of plans to replicate their approaches. (*Responsible agency:*

*Project team and implementing partners; Priority: Medium; Time implication: Ongoing; Resource implication: Medium)*

11. **Pursue efforts to consolidate and sustain the GLP programme.** The project should focus on consolidating the TTIA and TFFA programme and work with tri-partite entities to develop alternative options to sustain the governance of the programme, including alternative funding modalities for the GLP Centre. The industry associations themselves should seek to engage other associations in GLP, while the ILO can help to promote the ILO- supported programme with major buyers. *(Responsible agency: Project team, TFFA & TTIA, tri-partite partners; Priority: Medium; Time implication: Ongoing; Resource implication: Medium)*
  
12. **Promote increased coordination and exchange among CSO/Trade Union implementing partners.** The CSO and trade union partners should make more use of the opportunities provided by the project for joint organization and advocacy efforts, for example, through the PSC and provincial coordination mechanisms. There is also scope for the ILO to support the organizations to meet to share approaches and tools, either in Bangkok, alongside PSC meetings, or locally. At such meetings the CSOs could share new tools such as the Smartphone App and HRDF legal manuals as well as develop common advocacy messages to feed into the PSC or other forums. *(Responsible agency: CSO implementing partners and project team; Priority: Medium; Time implication: ongoing; Resource implication: Medium)*
  
13. **Work with provincial tri-partite stakeholder to strengthen and sustain provincial coordination and integration of services for workers in the sectors.** This will require identifying a lead agency to convene provincial tri-partite meetings following the exit of Ship to Shore Rights. *(Responsible agency: Project team and tri-partite partners; Priority: Medium; Time implication: Ongoing; Resource implication: Medium)*

## ANNEXES

### Annex A Terms of Reference



**TERMS OF REFERENCE**  
**Internal mid-term project evaluation**  
**Combatting Unacceptable Forms of Work in the Thai Fishing and Seafood Industry**  
**Or Ship to Shore Rights Project**

<b>Project Title</b>	“Combatting Unacceptable Forms of Work in the Thai Fishing and Seafood Industry” or Ship to Shore Rights
<b>TC project code</b>	THA/15/03/EUR
<b>Donors</b>	European Union
<b>Total approved budget</b>	Total: EUR 4,200,000 with EUR 500,000 from ILO
<b>ILO Administrative unit</b>	ILO Country Office for Cambodia, Lao PDR and Thailand (CO-Bangkok)
<b>ILO Technical Units</b>	ILO Decent Work Technical Support Team for East and South East Asia and the Pacific (DWT-Bangkok)
<b>Evaluation date and field work dates</b>	15 November 2017 – 28 February 2018
<b>Evaluation focal person</b>	Jason Judd, Project CTA
<b>TOR preparation date</b>	21 October 2017
<b>Deadline for Bidding Submission</b>	8 November 2017

#### Introduction and Rationale for the mid-term evaluation

---

This terms of reference document (TOR) concerns a mid-term evaluation of the project “Combatting Unacceptable Forms of Work in the Thai Fishing and Seafood Industry”. The project is implemented by the ILO and funded by the European Union.

The official project dates are from February 2016 to July 2019. In accordance with the evaluation commitments under the project agreement<sup>13</sup> and in line with the ILO's policy governing technical cooperation projects, an internal mid-term evaluation is required.

## **Background of the Project**

---

The fishing and seafood industry in Thailand is diverse and fragmented with a large number of players operating in different parts. The industry is characterized by poor working conditions in terms of low wages, long working hours and limited social protection.

The Project on Combatting Unacceptable Forms of Work in the Fishing and Seafood Sector or “Ship to Shore Rights” Project aims to address labour abuses in the fishing and seafood industry by using for four different objectives:

- (1) Strengthening of Legal and regulatory framework
- (2) Enhanced capacity of labour inspectorate
- (3) Compliance with core labour standards through the implementation of the Good Labour Practices (GLP) Programme.
- (4) Worker organization and access to support services of workers and victims of labour abuses.

Specifically, the project aims to address labour abuses by using different levers. At the foundation is the legal and regulatory framework, which currently suffers from significant gaps in application, but also needs to be strengthened in line with international standards (Objective 1). Given the extent of serious rights violations, it is essential that enforcement (Objective 2) is central to the programme. Objectives 1 and 2 are related to developing and enforcing a regulatory framework. This is complemented by voluntary compliance initiatives (Objective 3) that is developed through a broader partnership of different stakeholders, fostering positive learning and practice, dispute resolution, and can help to separate the good employers from the negligence. This component also provides a means through which to channel the influence of the private sector supply chain actors, in Thailand and internationally. It is also critical to have a strong component with trade unions and civil society organizations that can hold the Government and industry accountable to the standards in the law and in the voluntary initiatives; and also provide much-needed services and assistance that would otherwise be unavailable (Objective 4). This work is managed through subcontracts to NGOs and trade unions, and monitored closely by the ILO, with analysis of the results conducted on a regular basis to inform policy and capacity gaps.

### **Key partners:**

The key partners in the delivery of this project are the European Delegation, Ministry of Labour (DLPW, DOE, SSO, Bureau of International Coordination), Department of Fisheries, CCCIF - MECC, MFA, MFA, MSDHS Marine Dept., Industry Associations (TTIA, TFFA, TFPA, NFAT, and TOFA), ECOT, and trade union and CSO partners (Stella Maris, SERC, Raks Thai, HRDF, FED, Oxfam, and MWRN)

---

<sup>13</sup> The project agreement and Approval Minute (dated 15 January 2016) noted that the project is submit to both a mid-term and final evaluation – one of which must be independent, and an internal evaluation will be done for the mid-term.

### **Management set-up:**

The Project Team consists of:

- One international expert and Chief Technical Adviser (P4), recruited by the project (ILO), in charge of the daily management of the project and technical reporting to all parties involved.
- Two National Officer (NO-B) to support the CTA in the delivery of project
- One National Officer (NOA) and one administrative and financial officer based in Phang-ngha.
- Two Administrative and Financial Assistant recruited by ILO, who works full time for the project.

Technical backstopping for the project is provided by Specialists based in the DWT-Bangkok and Geneva.

### **Donor Management Mechanism:**

The project is funded by the European Union. The project also has a Project Steering Committee (PSC) that meets on a bi-annual basis and two Task Forces on the Legal, Policy and Regulatory Framework and Access to Support Services of Workers and Victims of Labour Abuses (Objectives 1 and 4) and Labour Inspection, Enforcement, and Good Labour Practices (Objectives 2 and 3). The Task Forces meet 3 - 4 times a year.

### **Objectives of the evaluation:**

---

The purpose of this evaluation is to review progress against the expected project deliverables and outcomes and to propose any course correction for the project's second half. In so doing it will identify the achievements, good practices and lessons learned from the project. It is further intended to assess the project design, particularly for the fishing and seafood industry and possible application to other countries covering the same industry. Lastly, the evaluation will consider options for sustainability of project goals and results in the country beyond the end of the project. Knowledge and information obtained from the evaluation will be used as a basis for better design and management of current and future ILO activities in Thailand and elsewhere. The evaluation also supports public accountability of the Thai Government and the ILO, and will be shared with the PSC.

Clients and users of the evaluation:

- Project team
- ILO Country Office for Thailand, Cambodia and Lao PDR, ILO HQ and RO/DWT-Bangkok
- European Delegation
- Ministry of Labour (DLPW, DOE, SSO, Bureau of International Coordination), Department of Fisheries, CCCIF - MECC, MFA, MSDHS Marine Dept., Industry Associations (TTIA, TFFA, TFPA, NFAT, and TOFA), ECOT, and trade union and CSO partners (Stella Maris, SERC, Raks Thai, HRDF, FED, Oxfam, MWRN)

### **Scope of the evaluation:**

---



The evaluation cover **all activities undertaken up to 1 November 2017**. The evaluation will verify good practices and lessons learned from the implementation of the project. A set of practical recommendations will be included in the evaluation report aimed at improving project management, constituent coordination and overall implementation.

In particular the evaluation should focus on the following:

- The progress of the project against output and outcome targets
- The extent to which management arrangements are appropriate to achieve desired results and outcomes within a timely, effective and efficient manner.
- The level of engagement with and satisfaction of project constituents and direct beneficiaries.
- Assess the quality of operational work planning, budgeting and risk management
- Lessons learned and good practices

The aim is to cover the four main evaluation criteria to determine the relevance and fulfilment of objectives, development efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability, except for impact, which will be difficult to be determined for the mid-term evaluation. Two additional criteria on coordination and visibility have been added to the evaluation mix as important consideration for the success of the Project.

1) Relevance

- To what extent does the intervention comply with development policy and planning of the Thai government?
- How important is the project intervention for the target beneficiaries and to what extent does it address their needs and interests?

2) Effectiveness

- Is the project making progress towards the achievement of the project objectives? To what extent are the defined project interventions realistic and do they still meet the most recent developments?
- To what extent are the target beneficiaries reached?
- What factors were crucial for the achievement or failure to achieve the project objectives?

3) Efficiency

- Are the project objectives being achieved economically? What is the cost-benefit ratio on project interventions?
- Were the financial resources and other inputs efficiently used to achieve results? Was the criteria used for the selection of implementing partners efficient?
- Are there any alternatives for achieving the same results with less funds?

4) Sustainability

- To what extent will activities, results and effects be expected to continue after project activities have ended?
- What risks are visible regarding the sustainable effectiveness of interventions? Will the effectiveness of the intervention most likely improve or worsen the situation in the future?
- To what extent are the target beneficiaries able to adapt sufficiently to external changes and shocks?

5) Coordination

- Were there any national, provincial and local coordination structures? How did the organizations harmonize and coordinate their interventions with other partners?

- What partners were involved in the coordination and how? Why were they included? Where any organizations not involved?
- 6) Visibility
- Does the project conduct communication activities according to the communication and visibility strategy of the project?
  - To what extent is the project's communication and visibility strategy being achieved, in particular in raising awareness about the role of the EU and ILO in supporting changes in the industry?

## Methodology

---

The ILO's policy guidelines for results-based evaluation (2<sup>nd</sup> edition) 2012 provides the basic framework. While an internal evaluation, it will be carried out according to ILO standard policies and procedures. The ILO adheres to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) norms and standards on evaluation as well as to the OECD/DAC evaluation quality standards.

The evaluation will use a combination of methods and the detailed methodology will be elaborated by the Evaluation Consultant on the basis of these TORs, subject to approval by the project CTA.

It is expected that the evaluation will apply mixed methods that draw on both quantitative and qualitative evidence and involve multiple means of analysis. These include but are not limited to:

- A desk review relevant documents related to project performance and progress, including the initial project document, progress reports, project outputs, monitoring and evaluation framework, etc.
- Interviews with ILO Country Office management, CTA and staff, and other ILO technical staff who contributed to project activities.
- Interviews with other key project stakeholders e.g. tripartite constituents, donors, implementing partners, direct recipients (staff of relevant government departments) and direct beneficiaries (workers in fishing and seafood industry) in selected provinces, such as Chonburi, Rayong, Samut Sakorn, Phang-nga, Songkla/Pattani. The provinces will be selected based on discussion with partners in the provinces.
- Debriefing meeting with EU delegation after interview and mission findings.
- Stakeholder consultation on the findings of the evaluation.

Where possible, all data should be sex-disaggregated and the particular concerns of women, men and vulnerable groups of workers should be considered throughout the evaluation process.

The gender dimension should be considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation. In terms of this evaluation, this implies involving both men and women in the consultation, evaluation analysis and evaluation team. Moreover the evaluators should review data and information that is disaggregated by sex and gender and assess the relevance and effectiveness of gender-related strategies and outcomes to improve lives of women and men. All this information should be accurately included in the inception report and final evaluation report.

## Main deliverables

---

1. **Inception Report on Methodology** In consultation with the Project Team, the Evaluation Consultant will draft a brief methodological note that will briefly set out:
  - the evaluation methodology based on these terms including the approach to data collection, key stakeholder identification, interviews and indicators
  - the work plan for the evaluation, indicating the phases of the evaluation, the key deliverables and milestones;
  - the list of key stakeholders and other individuals to be interviewed
2. **Draft evaluation report**, later the **final report**, when comments of the ILO have been received and incorporated. The quality of the report will be assessed against the EVAL checklist 5, 6 and 7 (see Annex 2). The report should include sections on output and outcome level results against milestone targets as well as sections on lessons learned, good practices and recommendations.
3. An **evaluation summary** will also be drafted by the Evaluation Consultant after the evaluation report is finalized according to the ILO format (see Annex 2).
4. Presentation for debriefing meeting with EU Delegation after the meetings with stakeholder meeting and field missions.
5. **Powerpoint presentation** for the Project Steering Committee in late January/February 2018.

All outputs of the evaluation will be produced in English. Copyright of the evaluation report rests exclusively with the ILO. Key stakeholders can make appropriate use of the evaluation report in line with its original purpose and with appropriate acknowledgement.

### Evaluation Management Arrangements:

#### Evaluation Consultant

The mid-term evaluation will be led by a team comprised of an international Evaluation Consultant and national consultant, who will be responsible for the deliverables under the TORs. The international consultant will provide oversight and management of the evaluation and this will include the selection, supervision and guidance to the national consultant. The national consultant will support the evaluation team, including conduct of research work, assist in the translation work, including the review of evaluation report in Thai, and the facilitation at meetings with national counterparts.

The team will be supported by the Project Team and will be required to ensure the quality of data (validity, reliability, consistency, and accuracy) throughout the analytical and reporting phases.

#### Qualifications of the Evaluation Consultant Team:

- Have at least 5 years of experience in project development and evaluation work
- Technical knowledge and work experience in the fields of labour law and workplace compliance and/or labour inspection

- Knowledge of the ILO’s roles and mandate and its tripartite structure
- Knowledge of labour issues in Thailand would be an asset
- Demonstrated experience, especially within the UN system, in M&E and results-based management
- Comprised of an international and national consultant
- Demonstrated ability to write well in English

### Quality assurance

The ILO Project Team will provide oversight of the internal mid-term evaluation with technical advice provided by Regional M&E officer ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok (Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka).

### Administrative and logistical support

The Project Team, together with the ILO Country Office for Thailand, Cambodia and Lao PDR (in Bangkok) will provide relevant documentation, administrative and logistical support to the evaluation. The Project Team will also assist in organizing a detailed evaluation mission agenda and in confirming meetings. Also the Project Team will ensure that all relevant documentation is up to date and available to the Evaluation Consultant.

### Roles of other key stakeholders

All stakeholders, including the donors, tripartite constituents, relevant government agencies, and other key partners – will be consulted at different stages in the process.

The following is a tentative calendar covering key outputs and milestones of the mid-term evaluation.

	Action	Tentative Dates (2017 -2018)	Responsible person(s)
1	Preparation of the contract for the Evaluation Consultant	By 1 December 2017	Project team
2	Finalization of the evaluation methodology and mission schedule	15 December 2017	Evaluation Team and Project Team
3	Desk Review of documents by the Evaluation Consultants (from start of consultancy per team member)	December to first week of January 2018	Evaluation Team
4	Meetings with the Project Team and project stakeholders including some selected field visits	8 - 19 January 2018 (Dates – TBC)	Evaluation Team and Project Team
5.	Debriefing meeting with EU Delegation on findings	22 January 2018	Evaluation Team and Project Team
7	Preparation of draft report for submission to the Project Team	2 February 2018	Evaluation Team
8	Project Team and ILO Regional Specialist to review	Within a week of report submission	Project Team

9	Draft report is revised and translated into Thai and shared with PSC	By early February 2018	Outsourced to external translators and reviewed by National Evaluation consultant
10	Draft report is circulated for review prior to meeting	By third week February 2018	Project Team
11	Powerpoint Presentation to Project Steering Committee (PSC)	By mid-February 2018 (15 February – TBC)	Evaluation Team
12	Revised report and Evaluation Summary submitted to the Project Team	By end February/early March 2018	Evaluation Team

## Resources

---

Funding for this evaluation will come from the Project and will cover:

- 1) the consultant's agreed fee and the Daily Subsistence Allowance (UN rate) and international travel as per ILO rules and regulations to cover the anticipated mission costs
- 2) additional transportation as required during the in-country visit(s)

The consultant will be contracted from 10 November 2017 to 28 February 2018

## Request for Proposal and Budget Breakdown

---

Interested bidders are invited to submit a proposal (five pages is the suggested maximum limit) detailing technical expertise and proposed research methodology and a breakdown of proposed cost.

Proposals are due by **8 November 2017** to Jason Judd at [judd@ilo.org](mailto:judd@ilo.org) and Supavadee Chotikajan at [chotikajan@ilo.org](mailto:chotikajan@ilo.org). Scoring of proposals will be weighted 70% for technical expertise and methodology, and 30% for cost.

## Annexes

---

### Annex 1: Preliminary list of documents to be reviewed:

- Project document and logical framework
- Technical annual progress reports
- Project Work Plan
- Mission, activity and meeting reports
- Key project outputs including baseline research, ILO analyses including legal gap analyses, training materials, implementation agreements, and other research papers.

### Annex 2: Relevant ILO evaluation guidelines and standard templates

Preparing the evaluation report

[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165967/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165967/lang--en/index.htm)

Rating the quality of evaluation report

[http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS\\_165968/lang--en/index.htm](http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165968/lang--en/index.htm)

Template for evaluation summary:

<http://www.ilo.org/legacy/english/edmas/eval/template-summary-en.doc>

## Annex B. Data Collection Matrix

Evaluation Question	Document Review	Stakeholder Group and Methodology				
		Project staff	ILO staff EU Delegation	Steering committee & Tripartite representatives	CSO & Trade Union partners	Workers
<b>Relevance</b>						
1. To what extent are the project objectives and interventions relevant to the key issues relating to labour rights in fishing and seafood processing?	x	x	x	x	x	
2. To what extent does the intervention comply with development policy and planning of the Thai government?	x	x		x		
3. How important is the project intervention for the target beneficiaries, <i>including the direct recipients and fishing and seafood workers</i> , and to what extent does it address their needs and interests?	x	x		x	x	x
4. How well does the project fit with ILO programs and policy?	x	x	x			
5. Is the project design clear and coherent, including clearly stated objectives, outputs and assumptions, to provide a clear basis for evaluation in accordance with the ILO's results-based management principles?	x	x	x	x		
6. Is there a monitoring and evaluation framework in place and are the indicators appropriate and feasible? Have appropriate targets and milestones for achievement been established?	x	x		x		
<b>Effectiveness</b>						
<b>Progress toward objectives</b>						

Evaluation Question	Document Review	Stakeholder Group and Methodology				
		Project staff	ILO staff EU Delegation	Steering committee & Tripartite representatives	CSO & Trade Union partners	Workers
7. To what extent is the project making progress towards the achievement of the project objectives?	x	x	x	x	x	
8. To what extent are the defined project interventions realistic and do they still meet the most recent developments? Has the project made any adjustments to the interventions to respond to recent developments?	x	x	x	x	x	x
9. To what extent are the target beneficiaries being reached?	x	x		x	x	x
10. What factors have been crucial for the achievement or failure to achieve the project objectives?	x	x	x	x	x	
<b>Management effectiveness</b>						
11. To what extent are the management arrangements appropriate to achieve desired results and outcomes within a timely, effective and efficient manner?	x	x	x	x	x	
12. How effective are the operational work planning, budgeting and risk management processes?	x	x		x	x	
13. Is the monitoring and evaluation system being implemented and reported against effectively? Will the M&E system provide adequate and sufficiently frequent information to guide the project management in making adjustments to the interventions?	x	x	ILO RO M&E Officer	x		
<b>Efficiency</b>						



Evaluation Question	Document Review	Stakeholder Group and Methodology				
		Project staff	ILO staff EU Delegation	Steering committee & Tripartite representatives	CSO & Trade Union partners	Workers
14. Are the project objectives being achieved economically? Are the financial resources and other inputs being used efficiently to achieve results? Assess the cost-benefits of project interventions where feasible.	x	x		x	x	
15. Were the criteria used for the selection of implementing partners efficient?	x	x		x	x	
16. Are there any alternatives for achieving the same results with less funds?						
<b>Sustainability</b>						
17. What plans has the project put in place to promote the sustainability of its achievements?	x	x		x	x	
18. To what extent will activities, results and effects be expected to continue after project activities have ended?	x	x	x	x	x	
19. What risks are visible regarding the sustainable effectiveness of interventions?	x	x	x	x	x	
20. Will the effects of the intervention most likely improve or worsen the situation in the future						
21. To what extent are the target beneficiaries able to adapt sufficiently to external changes and shocks? Is this as a result of the project?		x		x	x	x
<b>Coordination</b>						
22. How effectively does the project coordinate its interventions at national, provincial and local level, including with existing structures?	x	x		x	x	

Evaluation Question	Document Review	Stakeholder Group and Methodology				
		Project staff	ILO staff EU Delegation	Steering committee & Tripartite representatives	CSO & Trade Union partners	Workers
23. What partners are involved in the coordination and how? How do the implementing organizations harmonize and coordinate their interventions with other partners? Why were they included? Were any organizations not involved?	x	x		x	x	
<b>Visibility</b>						
24. Does the project conduct communication activities according to the communication and visibility strategy of the project?	x	x		x		
25. To what extent is the project's communication and visibility strategy being achieved, in particular in raising awareness about the role of the EU and ILO in supporting changes in the industry?		x	x	x	x	

## **Annex C. List of References**

### **Project Documents**

ILO Technical Project Proposal, 2015

Ship to Shore Monitoring and Evaluation Framework, September 2017

Project Budget

### **Documents produced under Objectives**

#### **Objective 1: Legal Framework and Knowledge Base**

ILO Gap analysis of P29

ILO Gap analysis of C188

ILO comment on Draft Forced Labour Act

ILO. Ship to Shore Baseline Research Findings on Fishers and Seafood Workers in Thailand. Bangkok 2017.

#### **Objective 2: Labour Inspection**

Training workshop agenda November 2017

Draft PIPO Labour inspection tool

#### **Objective 3: Good Labour Practice (GLP)**

Good labour Practices Programme Report

Thaifex Workshop Agenda

TTIA-TFFA proposal (October 2017)

GLP Stakeholder consultations

#### **Objective 4: Access to Services**

Partner Implementation Agreements & Technical Reports

Minutes of Taskforce Meeting Minutes

Communications and Visibility Strategy (November 2016)

Draft Gender Strategy (October 30, 2017)

Project brochure and leaflets for worker communications

### **Evaluation and Project Design Guidelines**

ILO Policy Guidelines for Results Based Evaluation (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 2013).

United Nations Evaluation Group (2016). Norms and Standards for Evaluation.

United Nations Development Group (2011). Results Based Management Handbook, October, 2011.

## Annex D. List of Persons Interviewed

Organization	Name	Position	M	F
<b>EU</b>				
European Delegation	Luisa Ragher	Deputy Head of Delegation		F
	Jerome Pons	Counsellor/Head of Operations Section	M	
	Khobkul Inieam	Program Officer		F
	Kakkanang Gyte	Political Officer		F
<b>International Labour Organization</b>				
ILO Country Office – DWT Thailand	Jittima Srisuknam	Programme Officer		F
	Arun Kumar	Workers Specialist, DWT-ILO ROAP	M	M
	René Robert	Labour Administration and Labour Inspection Specialist	M	
	Nilim Baruah	Regional Migration Specialist	M	
	Anna Engblom	CTA. TRIANGLE in ASEAN Project		F
	Ben Harkins	M&E Officer, TRIANGLE in ASEAN	M	
	Ms Kuanruthai Sisipattanakosol	National Project Coordinator		F
	Pamornrat Pringsulaka	ROAP M&E Coordinator		F
Ship to Shore Rights Project	Jason Judd	Chief Technical Advisor	M	
	Supavadee Chotikajan	National Project Coordinator		F
	Chonikarn Phochanakij	Programme Officer		F
	Anyamanee Tabtimsri	Provincial/Field Coordinator, Phang-nga		F
	Chadapa Krailassuwan	Administrative and Finance Assistant		F
	Poolkhao Thitikorn	Administrative Assistant		F
<b>Government</b>				
Ministry of Labour	Wilaiwan Koykaewpring	Senior Expert, International Cooperation Bureau Permanent Secretary Office		F
	Nonglak Chevapakdee	Department of Employment		F
	Sukanna Pornpati	Department of Employment		F
	Kannika Boonmee	Department of Employment		F
	Chanbodee Ditcharoen	Department of Employment		F
	Somboon Traisilanant	Senior inspector, Department of Labour Protection and Welfare	M	
	Saichon Jamthong	Head of prevention and protection division, Department of Labour Protection and Welfare	M	
Ampan Sittitrai	Director of Inspection bureau, Social Security Fund Office		F	

Organization	Name	Position	M	F
	Wattana Kerdpetch	Senior expert, Inspection Bureau, Social Security Fund Office, Social Security Fund Office		F
	Sudara Jamjang	Senior expert, Inspection Bureau, Social Security Fund Office		F
	Suppawich Wachusak	Foreign relations officer, Social Security Fund Office	M	
	Akkanit Wangkai	Legal Officer, Social Security Fund Office	M	
	Pheingphab Karnkul	Adviser to Permanent secretary office		F
	Tassanee Makanakorn	Member of boat inspection team , Department of Employment, Tab La Mu Pipo		F
	Ari	Member of boat inspection team, Department of Labour Protection and Welfare		F
	Sompop Khongrod	Office of Labour Protection and Welfare, Songkla	M	
	Samorn Kumnee	Office of Labour Protection and Welfare, Songkla		F
Command Center for Combating Illegal Fishing	Captain Dorne Tipnant	Director	M	
Department of Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives of Thailand	Dr. Adisorn Promtheb	Director	M	
	Pongsak Wongsawang	Senior technical specialist	M	
	Wasan Homfoong	Fishery technical officer	M	
	Malinee Smithritte	International unit		F
	Cherdsri Chukong	technical specialist	M	
	Chairath Bamrungsook	technical specialist	M	
	Kanyarath Sridanon	technical specialist		F
	Nattamorn	Member of Boat inspection, Pi-Po Tablamu		F
Royal Thai Navy	Chalermpon	Member of Boat inspection, Pi-Po Tablamu	M	
Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Natapanu Nopakun	Director of Social Division	M	
	Chompunut Phasuphan	Officer		F
	Pathawee Trikarunasawat	Senior Counsellor	M	
<b>Employers</b>				
	Attapan Masrungson	President		F

Organization	Name	Position	M	F
Thai Tuna Industry Association (TTIA)	Varaphon Patananukit	Officer	M	
Thai Frozen Foods Association (TFFA)	Watchrawan Chomdong	Senior Deputy Executive		F
	Nareerat Junthong	Assistant Executive		F
Employers' Confederation of Thailand (ECOT)	Pran Siamwalla	Deputy President	M	
National Fisheres Association	Mongkol Sukcharoenkhana	President	M	
	Kamolsak Lertpaiboon	Vice President	M	
	Naphatr	Manager		F
National Fisheries Association- Songkla Chapter	Niwat Binthong	Deputy	M	
	Chorphaka	Deputy		F
	Chanon Atthanon	Committee member	M	
Thai Overseas Fisheries Association	Mr. Aphisit Techanitsawad	President	M	
	Mr. Pornpoj Ngamviriyathum	Manager	M	
	Mr. Chukiert	Deputy	M	
<b>CSO and Trade Union Partners</b>				
Stella Maris	Apinya Thajit	Stella Maris		F
	Napassorn Thajit	Project Coordinator, Stella Maris	M	
	Nattaya Petcharat (Ni You)	Social Worker		F
	Kai Ti Oo	Burmese Translator		F
	You Von	Cambodian Translator		F
SERC Foundation	Satien Thanprom	Project Manager, SERC	M	
	Saneh Janthong	Project Coordinator, Bangkok		F
	Wiroon Sangkham	SERC- Songkla Secretariat	M	
	Puttarn Sangkham	SERC Foundation Coordinator		F
	Ba Yee	SERC- MWRN Volunteer	M	
	Tin Tu On	SERC- MWRN Volunteer	M	
Migrant working Group	Adisorn Kerdmongkol	MWG Coordinator	M	
Raksthai Foundation	Promboon Panichapakdi	Country Director	M	
	Pakpoom Saweangkham	Technical Officer	M	
	Thidar Oo	Field Officer- Pattani		F
	Ye Min	Field Officer- Samutsakorn		F
	Kha KhaHlaing	Field Officer- Samutsakorn		F
Human Rights Development Foundation	Papop Siamharn	Project Coordinator	M	
	Kanjana Arkkarachat	Case manager		F
	Inthira Oonjaoban	Coordinator		F
	Chonticha Tangworamongkon	Manager		F
Foundation for Education	Ei Ei Chaw	Deputy Director		F
	Saw Mu Don	Project Coordinator	M	

<b>Organization</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>F</b>
	Tin Tin Naing	Staff	M	
OXFAM	Jacques-Chai Chomthongdi	Campaign Coordinator	M	
	Nawaphon Supawitkul	Advocacy Officer		F
	Rapatsa	Officer		F
The International Transport Workers' Federation (ITF)	Jon Hartough		M	
	Lin Chompoo	Cambodian Translator		F
	Pairaya Gernat	Thai Translator		F
<b>Worker leaders and workers</b>				
Songkla	1 seafood processing worker	Trained Worker Leader	M	
Pattani	Seafood processing workers and families	Direct beneficiaries for drop-in and community outreach services	4	6
Samut Sakorn	Seafood processing workers (among a large group of migrant workers from different sectors)	Claim to experience labour violation on overtime payment and sudden contract termination	3	7

## Annex E. Diagram of Project Logic

Overall objective: To reduce forced labour, child labour and other unacceptable forms of work, and progressively eliminate the exploitation of workers, particularly migrant workers, in the Thai fishing and seafood processing sectors

