



Photo credit © Francisco Blaha

MIDPOINT REVIEW REPORT

PROJECT: LABOUR STANDARDS
ON FISHING VESSELS

Project

Implemented by: IOM, FFA, ILO and UNODC

Funded by: New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT)

Project implementation dates: January 2021 – December 2024

Midpoint Review

Commissioned by: IOM Country Office in Solomon Islands

Evaluator: Maite de Muller, IOM – Pacific Program Support Unit in Canberra (Australia)

Report date: November 2023 (Year 3 of project implementation)

CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS	2
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
CONTEXT AND PURPOSE OF THE MIDPOINT REVIEW	8
Context/Project background	8
Midpoint review background, scope and purpose	10
Midpoint review criteria and questions	10
Midpoint review approach and methodology	11
MIDPOINT REVIEW FINDINGS	13
Relevance	13
Effectiveness	17
Efficiency	21
Sustainability	25
Impact	26
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	27
Conclusions and recommendations	27
ANNEXES	33
Annex 1: Evaluation terms of reference	33
Annex 2: Midpoint Review Inception Report	33
Annex 3: Evaluation Matrix	34
Annex 4: Data collection tools	41
Annex 5: List of persons interviewed or consulted	44

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AGG	Activity Governance Group
EEZs	Exclusive Economic Zones
FFA	Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency
FSM	Federated States of Micronesia
HMTCs	Harmonized Minimum Terms and Conditions (MTCs) for Crew Employment Conditions
IOM	International Organization for Migration
ILO	International Labour Organization
KII	Key Informant Interviews
MCS	Monitoring, Control, and Surveillance
OECD-DAC	Organization for Economic Cooperation on Development – Development Assistance Committee
PICs	Pacific Island Countries
RMI	Republic of the Marshall Islands
TIP	Trafficking in Persons
TOT	Training of Trainers
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
WCPFC	Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission
WCPO	Western and Central Pacific Ocean

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The project “*Labour Standards on Fishing Vessels*” aims to support PICs to address the issue of poor working conditions, labour rights violations and human trafficking on fishing vessels in the Pacific and contribute to making employment on fishing vessels in the region safe, decent and worthwhile. The project is funded by the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT), and implemented jointly by FFA, ILO, IOM and UNODC. In the Pacific, working conditions on fishing vessels can be characterized by long hours, high levels of risk, poor living conditions, low pay and extended time at sea. Those employed on fishing vessels may face a range of challenges from poor working conditions to labour rights violations and human trafficking. Moreover, national labour standards implemented by Pacific Island Countries (PICs) are rarely applied to those working on fishing vessels and may not be appropriate or effective in ensuring that working conditions on fishing vessels are safe, decent and worthwhile. Fisheries management measures implemented by PICs have historically not addressed working conditions on fishing vessels, either for national or foreign crew.

Over nearly three years, the project has made significant strides, overcoming challenges and achieving commendable milestones. Notable achievements include comprehensive stakeholder engagement across the Pacific, and a pivotal regional workshop fostering collaborative dialogue. The project played a crucial role in developing and fortifying legal and institutional frameworks supporting labour standards on fishing vessels in Pacific Island Countries (PICs). Capacity-building initiatives, research and data initiatives, and efforts addressing Trafficking in Persons (TIP) showcased the project's multifaceted impact. Specific country prioritization strategies tailored to Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, RMI, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, and the Federated States of Micronesia yielded varied but impactful results. Despite initial implementation challenges, the project demonstrated good adherence to plans, gaining momentum once delays were overcome. Flexibility and responsiveness from donors played a pivotal role in accommodating necessary revisions.

The Midpoint Review, commissioned by the Activity Governance Group (AGG) for Labour Standards on Fishing Vessels, adheres to the donor's expectations outlined in the project document. With the AGG endorsing the Terms of Reference (TOR) in 2023, IOM initiated the evaluation process, conducted during the third year. The review aims to document lessons learned, assess project relevance and sustainability, identify measures for strengthening interventions, highlight process improvements, and propose potential activities for Phase II. Utilizing remote primary data collection, the report's secondary audiences encompass stakeholders from labour, counter-trafficking, and fisheries sectors, donors, trade unions, industry, and relevant UN agencies and civil society organizations, emphasizing the review's significance in guiding future programming decisions.

A purposive sampling technique was used to identify relevant evaluation participants from stakeholders who were directly involved or affected by the project in coordination with the project team. A total of 23 representatives from stakeholder organizations participated in the Key Informant Interviews (KIIs). The findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation are presented against the evaluation criteria - relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact – against which the project performance was assessed.

Relevance. The project's objectives and outcomes are well aligned with context and needs, considering the critical role of the fishing industry in Pacific countries, contributing substantially to their economies. Despite the industry's importance, the project addresses a historical neglect of working conditions on fishing vessels, emphasizing the urgency of its objectives. Challenges such as unclear data and cross-jurisdictional operations are tackled, positioning the project as a gap-filler in addressing poor working conditions, labour rights violations, and human trafficking in the Pacific. Context drivers, including legal frameworks and market access concerns, amplify the project's relevance. Innovative collaboration with diverse stakeholders, breaking down silos and fostering dialogue, is evident. The project design demonstrated effectiveness in addressing stakeholder needs, with extensive consultation and collaboration. However, the project has an overly ambitious scope. Moreover, while there is a commendable vertical logic in the results matrix, there is a lack of clarity in indicators, work plans, and budget distribution. Discussions on flexibility and accountability highlighted challenges in specificity, potentially impacting project efficiency. The multi-agency approach is valid, but discussions on flexibility and accountability reveal challenges. Overall, the project is perceived as a unique and vital opportunity for comprehensive regional development.

Effectiveness. Over nearly three years, the project has navigated challenges, achieving substantial progress in addressing labour standards on fishing vessels in Pacific Island Countries. Key successes include stakeholder collaboration, a pivotal regional workshop, capacity building efforts, progress on TIP assessments, and the development of legal frameworks. Despite delays in 2021, the project showcased resilience by adapting to the COVID-19 context and demonstrating agility. Programmatic priorities highlight the need for national implementation focus, capacity building, and converting the results of ILO research consultancies into actionable plans. Secondary priorities emphasize private sector engagement, engagement with labour source countries, engagement with trade unions, crew awareness initiatives, and efforts on ratification of C-188. Looking ahead, developing a clear program identity, strategic prioritization, and evidence-based programming are critical. Effective risk mitigation measures and collaborative governance contributed to the project's success, emphasizing the pivotal role of the project manager and the Activity Governance Group (AGG). As the project concludes, recommendations underscore the importance of prioritization, collaboration, and a well-defined Phase II to build on achievements. Overall, the project exemplifies commendable progress, adaptability, and dedication to addressing complexities in the fishing industry.

Efficiency. The project has navigated a complex landscape of challenges, with internal and external factors contributing to delays, notably the impact of the COVID-19 context and delayed government responses. However, Years 2 and 3 showcased remarkable progress, urging an intensified effort in Year 4. Strategic adaptability was evident in critical revisions and budget reallocations, reflecting a thoughtful response to evolving circumstances. The Activity Governance Group brought structure, yet the involvement of diverse delivery partners prompted a call for a more cohesive program identity. Budget constraints led to necessary revisions, and while the burn rate reflects effective disbursements, challenges in real expenses demand sustained budgetary attention. Human resource hurdles in the initial stages necessitate strategic optimization. While the monitoring and evaluation system and reporting packages are robust, improved responsiveness from Implementing Partners is crucial for heightened effectiveness.

Sustainability. The project has strategically positioned itself for long-term impact, emphasizing sustainability through robust national legal frameworks, as well as FFA's regional HMTCs, continued mandates of Implementing Partners (IPs), and strong government support. Successful integration into national and regional structures is evident, driven by capacity-building initiatives and technical assistance. However, the absence of essential structures, resources, and processes poses challenges to sustained continuation, emphasizing the need for a Phase II to ensure full-fledged national ownership. Anticipating a broader programmatic scope post-establishment of national monitoring mechanisms, limited capacity requires careful consideration in Phase II formulation. While IOM secured substantial funds from other donors during Phase I, other stakeholders' express confidence in securing additional resources during Phase II, even as the team anticipates developing an exit strategy contingent upon Phase II confirmation or denial.

Impact. The Midpoint Review underscores the project's substantial positive impact, serving as an "eye-opener" to the complexities of labour conditions on fishing vessels and initiating discussions on role clarification among government institutions. The project's influence extends to enhanced awareness within Labour Departments in Pacific Island Countries (PICs), promotion of Trafficking in Persons (TIP) issues, and advancements in legal frameworks. The indirect impact is evident in influential events such as the Forum Fisheries Committee Ministerial meeting and acknowledgment by ASEAN Member States of the importance of collaborating with countries of destination outside ASEAN in their Declaration on the Placement and Protection of Migrant Fishers, highlighting the project's regional significance. Importantly, the absence of negative effects reinforces the project's constructive implementation and positive trajectory.

Based on the findings and conclusions that have emerged from this evaluation, **some key recommendations have been identified** by the evaluator to guide future programming of similar initiatives. Recommendations are not presented in priority order, but classified by evaluation criteria.

Relevance

- **Recommendation 1.** The design process of a project document should incorporate not only extensive consultation but also a validation of the final product with implementing partners. This validation is crucial to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the feasibility and operationalization of the proposed results matrix and budget.
- **Recommendation 2.** For future projects, formulation of an effective "Results Matrix" will facilitate project management, follow up, monitoring and evaluation purposes. To bolster accountability, foster innovative approaches, establish a concrete scope, and expedite implementation, a project document should incorporate a precise definition at the activity level. This includes a linked workplan and budget.
- **Recommendation 3.** It is advisable for the project team to adopt a more robust approach to gender issues during implementation. Despite the male-dominated nature of the fisheries sector, a robust Gender Strategy is crucial, especially as implementation scales up.

Effectiveness

- **Recommendation 4, on programmatic priorities.** Please refer to page 18 for details
 - Ensure National Implementation
 - Strengthen Capacity Building Efforts
 - Reconvert ILO's research consultancy outputs into concrete activities (mapping and situational analyses of private sector actors, mapping of labour source countries, and options for increasing worker representation and voice
 - Secondary programmatic priorities: Private Sector Engagement (A.4.1.). Source Countries (A.1.3.). Trade Unions (A.3.1.). Crew Awareness Raising (A.4.3). Ratification and Implementation of C-188.
- **Recommendation 5, on general project implementation.** Please refer to page 19 for details.
 - Establish a clear "program identity".
 - During the last year of implementation (2024), strategically "prioritize" activities and countries.
 - Research and Data for Evidence-Based Programming

Efficiency

- **Recommendation 6.** There is a recognized need to enhance implementation discussions and create formal spaces for Implementing Partners (IPs), potentially through the establishment of an Implementation Unit, as well as more frequent and formalized bilateral discussions between the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) and the International Labour Organization (ILO).
- **Recommendation 7.** Additionally, there is a call for coordination spaces among stakeholders at the national level.
- **Recommendation 8, for an eventual Phase II.** Facilitate an open joint discussion among Implementing Partners and the donor to deliberate on the leading agency role. This discussion should aim to clarify the pros and cons of various options and arrive at the best decision collaboratively.
- **Recommendation 9, for an eventual Phase II.** Ensure that the Phase II project document provides a concrete description of activities and that the budget is accurately adjusted to facilitate correct implementation and avoid eventual budget revisions.
- **Recommendation 10.** It is highly recommended to engage in further discussions with Implementing Partners (IPs) to ensure that the prioritization exercise for 2024 aligns with programmatic priorities. This process may eventually involve conversations with MFAT for comprehensive coordination.
- **Recommendation 11, for an eventual Phase II.** Ensure appropriate staffing for the project within each Implementing Partner (IP), securing both technical and managerial expertise. Additionally, consider exploring the feasibility of having dedicated "project staff" representing all IPs at the national level in priority countries.
- **Recommendation 12.** Implementing Partners (IPs) should assume full responsibility for ensuring timely, comprehensive, and coherent reporting exercises in its various formats (monthly donor updates, AGG planning exercises, March reporting packages).

This proactive approach is essential to meet deadlines, fulfil requirements, and foster an effective and unified project vision through a collaborative approach.

- **Recommendation 13.** Strengthening group accountability is crucial, transcending individual reporting exercises conducted by each Implementing Partner (IP). The emphasis should be on collaborative efforts to collectively monitor progress for each output, evaluate implementation effectiveness, address challenges, and assess changes in activities. This concerted approach will significantly enhance overall project accountability and cohesion.

Sustainability

- **Recommendation 14.** To enhance sustainability, it is recommended that ongoing capacity building initiatives incorporate Training of Trainer methodologies to ensure replicability and a cascade effect. Additionally, it is recommended that training materials exhibit coherence and alignment with other concurrent training efforts, and are contextualized for the Pacific.
- **Recommendation 15.** Building on the positive outcomes and active stakeholder engagement during Phase I, and recognizing that national ownership and autonomy have not yet been fully achieved, it is recommended that MFAT explores funding options for a Phase II of the project. This exploration should involve efficient coordination with other potential donors interested in the project's focus areas, including Australia's DFAT, the EU, and the US, among others.
- **Recommendation 16.** Prior to the project's conclusion, a sustainability plan should be collaboratively discussed with all stakeholders. This plan should include a clear timetable for the transfer strategy and delineate roles and responsibilities for managing and utilizing project products.

CONTEXT/PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Western and Central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) has the largest tuna fishery in the world and supplies approximately 60% of the global supply of tuna. The Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs) of Pacific Island Countries (PICs) cover half of the WCPO and supply approximately 34% of the global supply of tuna. Fishing is of significant importance to PICs, for food security and for the economic benefits derived from fisheries resources. Fishing is a cornerstone to long-term prosperity in the region. The Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) was established to support its members to effectively manage and utilise their offshore fishery resources. FFA supports and enhances regional cooperation to ensure the maximum long-term social and economic benefits from the sustainable use of PICs offshore fishery resources.

Working conditions on fishing vessels operating in the Pacific can be characterized by long hours, high levels of risk, poor living conditions, low pay, and extended time at sea. Those employed on fishing vessels may face a range of challenges from poor working conditions to labour rights violations and human trafficking. Being at sea often means being away from professional medical care, which can be particularly dangerous in the case of serious accidents or illness. The fatality rate of fishers is typically several times higher than for other workers. Those employed on fishing vessels are often paid based on a share of the value of fish caught, in whole or in part, by the vessel (rather than receiving a fixed wage) and thus are not employees in the conventional sense and are considered to be self-employed.

National labour standards implemented by Pacific Island Countries (PICs) are rarely applied to those working on fishing vessels and may not be appropriate or effective in ensuring that working conditions on fishing vessels are safe, decent, and worthwhile. Fisheries management measures implemented by PICs have historically not addressed working conditions on fishing vessels, either for national or foreign crew. This has recently changed with FFA's adoption of Minimum Terms and Conditions (MTCs) for Crew Employment Conditions, but challenges remain in the effective implementation and enforcement of these MTCs. This creates a significant gap in the legal, institutional, and operational frameworks that should be in place to protect the rights of those working on fishing vessels, resulting in a significant "decent work deficit".

The project "Labour Standards on Fishing Vessels" aims to support PICs to address the issue of poor working conditions, labour rights violations and human trafficking on fishing vessels in the Pacific and contribute to making employment on fishing vessels in the region safe, decent, and worthwhile. Funded by the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT), and implemented jointly by FFA, ILO, IOM and UNODC, this objective is achieved through a focus on three distinct but mutually reinforcing long-term outcomes:

- Outcome 1: Fishing entities in PICs promote and maintain safe, decent, and worthwhile working conditions on fishing vessels, including on foreign flagged vessels operating in the region and including with respect to foreign nationals working on those vessels.
- Outcome 2: Clear regional labour standards, drawing to the extent possible on international labour standards, are effectively promoted, implemented,

monitored, and enforced at the national level for fishing vessels flagged to, or fishing in the Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs) of PICs.

- Outcome 3: Effective local, national, regional, and international coordination and collaboration is established that promotes and protects the rights of those employed on fishing vessels.
-

The project, spanning from January 2021 to December 2024, has marked substantial progress over nearly three years of implementation. The following highlights some of the key achievements reported for the project:

- *Project Start-up Activities:* The initiation phase successfully established the project's Activity Governance Group (AGG), recruited staff for Implementing Partners (IPs), and finalized agreements with IPs, albeit with certain delays in 2021.
- *Stakeholder Engagement:* The project demonstrated comprehensive engagement with a diverse array of stakeholders throughout the Pacific, fostering a clear and visible understanding of the Activity's objectives.
- *Regional Workshop (January 2023):* A pivotal regional workshop brought together government representatives, worker advocates, industry stakeholders, and civil society representatives, fostering collaborative dialogue.
- *Legal and Institutional Frameworks:* The project played a key role in developing and fortifying national legal, institutional, and operational frameworks supporting labour standards on fishing vessels. Technical support extended to Pacific Island Countries (PICs) for implementing the crewing component of the FFA's Harmonised Minimum Terms and Conditions (MTCs) and effective national coordination. Notable achievements include the formulation of national crewing policies in Fiji and the Solomon Islands, licensing conditions in the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI), and the impending implementation of Tuvalu's Crew Regulation in January 2024.
- *Research and Data Initiatives:* The project conducted mapping and situational analyses of private sector actors, labour source countries, and opportunities within trade unions. Efforts were directed toward recognizing qualifications and establishing employment pathways for fishers.
- *Capacity Building:* Extensive capacity-building initiatives were undertaken to uphold decent working conditions, including ILO global online training opportunities.
- *Trafficking in Persons (TIP):* The project developed a comprehensive country capacity assessment tool on trafficking in persons. It contributed evidence-based training materials for media counterparts and engaged in capacity-building activities, with extra funding mobilized from other donors for expanded training content and additional countries.
- *Regional Initiatives:* The project supported work on a Regional Monitoring, Control, and Surveillance (MCS) Strategy, which included a focus on labour rights and crew employment conditions.
- *Country Prioritization:* Specific countries, including Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, RMI, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, and the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), were prioritized with tailored approaches, yielding varied but impactful results.

MIDPOINT REVIEW BACKGROUND, SCOPE AND PURPOSE

This Midpoint Review has been commissioned by the “Activity Governance Group” (AGG) for Labour Standards on Fishing Vessels, in coordination with the donor, the New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT). As outlined in the project document under the “Appendix A: Results Framework (Results Diagram, Results Measurement Table, Monitoring and Evaluation Workplan)” section, an evaluation was anticipated at the conclusion of the second year and the resulting report was meant to include “clear recommendations to identify challenges with implementation to ensure these are addressed early in the activity. This will also inform the requirements for the remainder of the Activity implementation period. Report should include results achieved, lessons learned, challenges with implementation, recommendations to overcome challenges and identify recommended next steps. It is important that this review assesses progress with a view to reporting on sustainability issues for developments achieved (need for further activities)”.

The AGG was tasked with defining the Terms of Reference (TORs) for the evaluation and in 2023, the AGG members endorsed the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Midpoint Review (see Annex 1). IOM designated an internal evaluator to commence the evaluation process by October 2023. Consequently, the midpoint review was conducted during the third year of the project, aligning with the provisions outlined in the Midpoint Review TORs.

This assessment encompasses the implementation of the full spectrum of project activities to date, with primary data collection conducted remotely. As outlined in the Midpoint Review TORs, the resulting report will serve the following purposes:

- Document lessons learned and best practices.
- Assess the relevance of the project to intended beneficiaries, as well as the sustainability of project interventions.
- Identify measures that could be applied to strengthen the impact of project interventions in the final year of programming.
- Highlight process improvements for future joint agency projects, in terms of project development, project implementation and project management and coordination.
- Document potential activities or initiatives that could be envisaged in Phase II of the project, to address remaining gaps and to build on achievements to date.

Additionally, as the report will be used to assist decision-making with respect to future and ongoing programming to counter labour exploitation and trafficking in persons in the fishing industry, secondary audiences for the midpoint review findings may include labour, counter-trafficking and fisheries actors from PICs, donors (including the IOM Development Fund, DFAT and USAID), trade union representatives, industry stakeholders, and relevant UN agencies and CSO counterparts.

MIDPOINT REVIEW CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

In alignment with the Midpoint Review's objectives and scope, the evaluation encompasses five OECD/DAC evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. Furthermore, the Terms of Reference suggested considering additional criteria

to assess the project's innovative aspects and its ability to maintain effectiveness during the COVID-19 pandemic.

These additional aspects have been integrated into the Relevance and Efficiency criteria, and the evaluation questions have been modified accordingly as sub-questions. Innovation is tackled under the area of project design (Relevance) and COVID-19 is addressed under the major factors that influence or influenced efficiency and timeliness of delivery (Efficiency). Similarly, the Coherence criteria has been consolidated into the Relevance criteria to streamline the evaluation process, and the corresponding evaluation questions have been adjusted as sub-questions.

For all details regarding the evaluation questions and sub questions see the Evaluation Matrix in Annex 3.

MIDPOINT REVIEW APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

Considering the Midpoint Review objectives, the evaluation exercise was conducted using mixed data collection methods, and optimizing existing information already collected during the project implementation and reporting. Thus, this Midpoint Review has focused on the results of the activities carried out during this period, the satisfaction level of stakeholders, and the project's overall impact.

The evaluator worked closely with the Evaluation Manager – Project Manager, Ms. Nathalie Hanley, IOM –, as well as with the four Implementing Partners (IPs) staff from FFA, IOM, ILO and UNODC involved in project implementation (“project team”). They provided country specific information, relevant documents, and information on progress and achievements of the project.

After an initial rapid desk review, the evaluator compiled the Midpoint Review Inception Report (see Annex 2) to articulate the purpose, methodology, and final work plan of the Midpoint Review, along with specifics outlined in the Evaluation Matrix and data collection tools.

A combination of qualitative methods were employed to collect data addressing the overarching evaluation questions pertaining to the project's merit and significance. The evaluation process involved several crucial steps, including:

- **Initial reflection session with the donor MFAT and Project Manager** in October 2023 to review TORs and the proposed methodology, ensuring a comprehensive understanding of Midpoint Review objectives.
- **In-depth review of documentation.** During the last two weeks of October 2023, the evaluator reviewed relevant project documentation provided by the project team, and included in a very well-organized SharePoint for easy reference, including: internal reports; external reports to the donor; financial information; result and activities outputs and related documentation; policy briefs; etc.
- **In-depth interviews with key informants.** In-depth interviews with key informants were conducted remotely (online) during the initial two weeks of November 2023. Participants were selected in collaboration with Implementing Partners, coordinated by the Program Manager, following a comprehensive “stakeholder mapping” exercise conducted during the Evaluation Inception Report phase. The interviews, lasting 60

minutes or longer, utilized a semi-structured guide tailored for each targeted interviewee, as per data collection tools (see Annex 4).

- **Debriefing session at the end of the primary data collection phase.** On 15th November 2023, a debriefing meeting was organized with the four IPs (FFA, IOM, ILO and UNODC) to validate the preliminary evaluation findings and conclusions and explore potential recommendations.

The evaluator strived to promote participation of all stakeholders, taking into consideration gender and human rights cross cutting issues. At the start of each interview, the evaluator explained the purpose and scope of the evaluation and asked for stakeholders' opinions regarding recommended actions.

Sampling

A total of 23 representatives from stakeholder organizations took part in the Key Informant Interviews (KIIs). The selection of participants followed a purposive sampling technique, identifying individuals directly involved or affected by the project in coordination with the project team.

To ensure a comprehensive representation of the project's intentions, design, and results, deliberate efforts were made to construct a sample that encompasses both upstream and downstream stakeholders. This inclusive approach involved representatives from national government entities, intergovernmental organizations, UN Agencies, private sector, trade unions, project development and management teams, ensuring a balanced gender distribution among the participants. The sample categories and representatives' numbers are detailed in the table below:

	Donor	UN	Gov	Intergov	P.Sec	T.Un	TOTAL		
Tuvalu			1				1		
Samoa			1				1		
Fiji			3			2	5		
Solomon Islands			1			1	2		
PNG					1		1		
Other	4	7		2			13	Male	Female
	4	7	6	2	1	3	23	13	10
								23	

Data analysis

A qualitative data analysis was undertaken to analyse data. All key project documents including reports and other information products were considered for analysis. The analysis followed a systematic coding in line with relevant pre-defined project criteria and classified according to relevant thematic rubrics aligned to the midpoint review questions and OECD-DAC criteria. During the data analysis process, relevant text segments were assigned to their respective codes, categories, and themes which formed the basis for evaluation finding synthesis, through inductive evaluation reasoning. Data from different sources were triangulated through an iterative constant comparison to identify patterns and themes emerging across different data strands to substantiate the evaluation findings and conclusions about the project performance.

MIDPOINT REVIEW FINDINGS

The findings are clustered into the evaluation criteria being applied and are aligned with the evaluation purpose, questions and approach outlined in the previous sections.

RELEVANCE

Guided by the OECD/DAC definition of relevance, the evaluator assessed the extent to which the project design and implementation have been consistent with stakeholders' needs and expectations, and context situation.

Relevance and alignment with regional and national development strategies and priorities.

The significance of the fishing industry in all Pacific countries is evident, with the annual tuna catch in the national waters of FFA's 17 members¹ valued at USD 2-3 billion. This industry plays a crucial role in the livelihoods of many Pacific residents. However, historically fisheries management measures implemented by PICs have often failed to address working conditions aboard fishing vessels, whether for national or foreign crews. Workers on fishing vessels may encounter various challenges, ranging from subpar working conditions to violations of labour rights and instances of human trafficking. Given the paramount importance of the fishery industry in the Pacific and the historical neglect of labour standards on fishing vessels, **the project's objectives and outcomes are well-aligned with the prevailing context and needs.**

Stakeholders have highlighted challenges in working conditions on Pacific fishing vessels, influenced by factors such as vessel types and flag States, further complicated by a lack of comprehensive data. There is a notable lack of clarity in understanding the complexity, scope, and scale of the issue, further complicated by the vessels' operations across multiple jurisdictions and the presence of migrant workers (foreign crew not from Pacific countries).

Pacific Island Countries (PICs) appear to infrequently apply their national labour standards to individuals employed on fishing vessels, in part because of jurisdictional constraints. Despite the recent adoption of Minimum Terms and Conditions (MTCs) for Crew Employment Conditions by the FFA, effective implementation and enforcement of these MTCs remain challenging. This highlights a substantial gap in the legal, institutional, and operational frameworks needed to protect the rights of those employed on fishing vessels, compounded by resource and capacity limitations within relevant national agencies in PICs. **The project seems to be appropriately positioned to address these gaps by tackling issues related to poor working conditions, labour rights violations, and human trafficking on Pacific fishing vessels.**

Throughout the evaluation process, stakeholders underscored various "context drivers" that highlight the significance of this project. These include:

- (a) **The Right Legal Context:** Emphasizing the presence of the fisheries-specific labour convention "Work in Fishing Convention" (C188)² and the recent adoption of the FFA's Harmonized Minimum Terms and Conditions (HMTCs).

¹ FFA members: Australia, Cook Islands, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru, New Zealand, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tokelau, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu

² C188 entered into force in November 2017. To date no PICs have ratified C188 and ratification across the broader WCPFC membership is low.

(b) **Growing Concerns and Opportunities in Market Access:** Recognizing the importance of new international certifications, labels, and audits that restrict access to specific markets (such as the EU and the USA), crucial for the Pacific Island Countries (PICs).

(c) **The Need for a Regional Approach:** Ensuring enforcement as vessels operate across multiple jurisdictions.

(d) **Reported Human Rights Abuses:** Addressing the lack of protection mechanisms for fishers, including inadequate worker representation and voice.

Stakeholders emphasized that the project is not only well aligned with regional and national development strategies and priorities, but **it has also sparked momentum for creating operational spaces for addressing the issue in a coordinated manner.** There was a unanimous agreement on the substantial opportunity presented by this project to enhance labour compliance and "break down silos," where organizations operate in isolation without collaboration. The project is viewed as a chance to initiate new dialogues among partners who traditionally did not share common discussion spaces, such as the Ministries of Fisheries and the Ministries of Labour or FFA and ILO. While there is consensus on the urgent need to clarify roles and ensure coordination between institutions, **the project is recognized as a catalyst for positive and lasting change,** aiming at fostering broader understanding and identifying common and complementary areas of work.

"This project is a tremendous opportunity for all of us to courageously tackle labour conditions in fishing vessels, especially within a sector that has historically been managed solely by Fisheries ministries, focusing on economic aspects such as catches and vessels, rather than social and labour issues concerning the workers. We cannot afford to miss the chance to incorporate and improve labour standards in this challenging sector."

National civil servant, Ministry of Labour

The intervention objectives and design appear to efficiently address the needs, policies, and priorities of beneficiaries, both at the regional and country levels, as well as those of partner institutions. Implementing Partners (IPs) have conveyed that the intervention **not only complements but also adds significant value to past and ongoing initiatives** led by their organizations in the region. It has opened avenues for UN Agencies to explore new areas of work in the Pacific, particularly in addressing fisheries issues. Simultaneously, it has broadened the scope for FFA to focus on and promote working conditions on fishing vessels. National entities have acknowledged the project's complementarity with their existing interventions, emphasizing the added value it brings to address a crucial gap. Despite the significance of labour conditions on fishing vessels, **there appears to be a lack of other specific initiatives jointly addressing this issue.**

The project has successfully motivated countries to come on board and actively engage in addressing labour conditions on fishing vessels in the Pacific. **This intervention has sparked considerable interest and engagement among stakeholders and is perceived as a unique opportunity that should be fully optimized.**

The intervention's **innovative approach** shines through as it addresses human rights issues at both regional and national levels, executing coordinated efforts with an extensive array of

stakeholders. This involves mobilizing various actors and ensuring widespread awareness and outreach, essentially **sparkling a reported "awakening"**. Notably, the collaboration extends to national governments, intergovernmental institutions, UN Agencies, trade unions, and the private sector. A groundbreaking aspect of this initiative is consistently reported as the unprecedented collaboration between Fisheries and Labour departments. This marks a significant milestone, showcasing the complementarity of roles and mandates, and successfully identifying spaces for working together in a coordinated manner to ensure the protection of fishing vessel crews.

Relevance and Validity of project design and logic of intervention

The project design effectively addressed the needs and priorities of both countries and partner institutions. Notably, **there is excellent evidence highlighting significant stakeholder involvement in the project design**, with the donor's financial contribution further underscoring the large collaborative process undertaken by the project developers. However, there is a lack of clear evidence regarding the direct involvement of final beneficiaries, specifically migrant fishers, in the project design. Although there is an indirect representation through trade unions, a specific needs assessment for the group is not evident, relying on existing studies on related topics such as trafficking in persons.

The project underwent extensive consultation, yet the **validation of the final product, the "Activity", with the consulted stakeholders (or at least with the proposed implementing partners) did not seem to occur**. Stakeholders have emphasized that this step would have been essential for a better understanding of the feasibility and operationalization of the proposed results matrix, along with the budget. Such validation would have significantly improved a faster implementation and accountability, ensuring alignment with the needs and expectations of all stakeholders involved.

The validity of the project design and the logic of intervention, as reflected in the results matrix (RM), present certain observations:

1. **The design appears to be overly ambitious**, considering both the allotted time and the diverse range of issues addressed, ranging from: awareness raising, national coordination mechanisms, engaging with labour source countries, legal institutional and operational frameworks, measures to monitor working conditions on fishing vessels; identify, refer and support victims of labour rights violations; capacity building and training for national agencies; regional and national data and information collection capacity and systems; explore options to establish a fishers' trade union for Pacific Island nationals employed on fishing vessels; disseminate information resources for those employed on fishing vessels; training sessions for Pacific Island journalists; code of conducts for fishing companies; recognition of qualifications and employment pathways; and initiatives for crew on their rights and obligations.

"This project is overly ambitious in its current design and cannot be achievable within the given timeframe. However, it should be regarded as an excellent "roadmap" for all stakeholders to follow in the coming years".

Project team, Implementing Partner

Moreover, all these areas of work are to be implemented across fifteen (15) countries, with four (4) different Implementing Partners (IPs), based in different locations (IOM and FFA in Honiara, ILO in Suva and UNODC in Bangkok), over four years, and with a budget of NZD 5.6 million.

2. **The vertical logic of the RM is commendable**, demonstrating high-quality results formulation and clear linkages between objectives, outcomes, and outputs.
3. However, **the horizontal logic of the RM is less clear**, particularly regarding the quality of indicators, the absence of baselines and targets, the lack of a detailed workplan and deadlines, and an unspecified budget distribution at the activity level.

During the evaluation process, an important discussion unfolded regarding the balance between “flexibility and accountability” in project design outputs. Project developers contended that flexibility was crucial given the broad spectrum of issues, involving 15 PICs at varying levels of implementation, data gaps, rapid changes in the context, and diverse stakeholders’ approaches. They emphasized that the IPs would need time to develop and agree on their workplans, working together to achieve clarity and a shared understanding of the intended goals, and that this process in itself was part of the project’s objectives.

The openness and flexibility of the donor to accommodate the program’s decision has been praised, however, implementing partners expressed concerns about the lack of specificity in the project document. They noted the absence of concrete activities or a structured workplan, highlighting that the document outlined broad areas of work without prescribing particular tasks. According to the implementing partners, this flexibility in identifying activities led to delays at the project's onset. They argued that accountability was compromised, as it is challenging to enforce and ensure effective follow-up without prescribed guidelines in the project document.

“Project has a lack of focus in terms of understandable pieces, and clear benchmarks. What would satisfy the overall objectives?... we do not have clear good picture of the initiatives” / “This project is a black hole in terms of accountability, as partners took a long time to flesh out their activities, and it is difficult to enforce what it is not prescribed in a project document” / “It feels ungraspable when I look at this document, how am I going to deliver?”

Project team, Implementing Partners

4. **The approach for multi-agency implementation is deemed very valid**, given the complexities inherent in the project's area of work.
5. **Human rights are effectively integrated, but gender considerations are less prominent as cross-cutting issues** within the project design and implementation. Gender issues are briefly mentioned under “Overarching policy issues including gender, human rights and environment” section, and few gender concerns seem to be taken into account during implementation, mainly in TIP issues.

EFFECTIVENESS

Extent to which the project objective and outcomes are being achieved.

The project has marked **substantial progress over nearly three years of implementation**. The following highlights some of the key achievements reported for the project:

- *Project Start-up Activities:* The initiation phase successfully established the project's Activity Governance Group (AGG), recruited staff for Implementing Partners (IPs), and finalized agreements with IPs, albeit with certain delays in 2021.
- *Stakeholder Engagement:* The project demonstrated comprehensive engagement with a diverse array of stakeholders throughout the Pacific, fostering a clear and visible understanding of the Activity's objectives.
- *Regional Workshop (January 2023):* A pivotal regional workshop brought together government representatives, worker advocates, industry stakeholders, and civil society representatives, fostering collaborative dialogue.
- *Legal and Institutional Frameworks:* The project played a key role in developing and fortifying national legal, institutional, and operational frameworks supporting labour standards on fishing vessels. Technical support extended to Pacific Island Countries (PICs) for implementing the crewing component of the FFA's Harmonised Minimum Terms and Conditions (HMTCs) and effective national coordination. Notable achievements include the formulation of national crewing policies in Fiji and the Solomon Islands, licensing conditions in the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI), and the impending implementation of Tuvalu's Crew Regulation in January 2024.
- *Research and Data Initiatives:* The project conducted mapping and situational analyses of private sector actors, labour source countries, and opportunities within trade unions. Efforts were also directed toward recognizing qualifications and establishing employment pathways for fishers.
- *Capacity Building:* Extensive capacity-building initiatives were undertaken to uphold decent working conditions, including ILO global online training opportunities.
- *Trafficking in Persons (TIP):* The project facilitated the development of a country capacity assessment tool on trafficking in persons. It contributed evidence-based training materials for media counterparts and engaged in capacity-building activities, with extra funding resource mobilized for expanded training content and additional countries.
- *Regional Initiatives:* The project supported work on a Regional Monitoring, Control, and Surveillance (MCS) Strategy, focusing on labour rights and crew employment conditions.
- *Country Prioritization:* Specific countries, including Fiji, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, RMI, Vanuatu, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu, and the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM), were prioritized with tailored approaches, yielding varied but impactful results.

The program has achieved noteworthy results, particularly given the complexities during the first year of implementation, including: delayed staff recruitment, the length of time needed to finalize and sign implementing partner agreements with all project partners, and continued COVID-19 travel restrictions across the Pacific. In general, it can be stated that

there has been good adherence to the project plans, and momentum built quickly once initial implementation delays were overcome. There are still some delays to the delivery of various outputs, where the timing and pace has been slower due to capacity issues.

The donor's flexibility and responsiveness played a pivotal role in respecting the project team's decisions, particularly regarding the openly structured results matrix, and the necessity to approve both results matrix and budget revisions.

Stakeholders have been highly engaged in the project processes, with **effective participation, collaboration, and coordination with partners**. The Regional Workshop in January 2023 served as a catalyst, fostering strong commitment and engagement while enhancing stakeholders' understanding of the project as a unique opportunity. Due to the unique challenges in ensuring decent work conditions on board fishing vessels, whole of government and whole of society approaches are required. This collaboration was reflected in the diversity of participants at the regional workshop with fisheries, labour, immigration, industry and worker representatives.

"We have learnt so much through this project, we were not aware of the risks and conditions of the crew, including issues such as trafficking in persons. We have a better understanding of what might be happening in the fishing vessels now and we truly want to do something".

Civil servant, Min. of Fisheries

Following the workshop, there is a recognized need to establish coordination spaces among stakeholders at the national level. **The project is perceived by stakeholders as a "pilot," an "eye-opener," and a "roadmap,"** indicating its pioneering and guiding role.

Implementation and delivery across the 15 PICs countries have been asymmetric, deliberately **prioritizing a few countries to achieve impactful and targeted outcomes**. This prioritization appears to be influenced more by individual IP's decisions, considering factors such as proximity, funding, and feasibility, rather than following a coordinated approach.

In order to effectively implement the program, several key priorities have been identified following stakeholders' advice.

Recommendations on programmatic priorities:

1. **Ensure National Implementation:** Building on the priorities identified during the Regional Workshop, the project needs to focus on national implementation (activities 1.2., 2.1., 2.2., 2.3., 2.4.). This involves:
 - The strategic prioritization of countries based on effective criteria, leading to the development of tailor-made approaches and workplans encompassing legislation, tools, and mechanisms. Collaboratively formulate a well-structured "country prioritization strategy" to ensure coordinated and synchronized activities among all IPs at the field level, to enhance impact, visibility, and overall effectiveness of the project.
 - The establishment of multi-stakeholder coordination platforms at the country level, essential to facilitate collaboration and coherence.

2. **Strengthen Capacity Building Efforts:** Prioritize capacity building efforts in specific areas such as Labour inspections (2.4), Trafficking in Persons (2.3), Media engagement (3.3), ensuring the incorporation of Pacific tailor-made content. Additionally, ensure the use of Training of Trainers (TOT) approaches to promote sustainability, and explore funding mechanisms to cover operational costs associated with capacity-building initiatives.
3. **Reconvert ILO's research consultancy outputs into concrete activities:** Transform the outcomes of ILO consultancies into tangible project briefs and workplans. This involves addressing aspects such as budgetary considerations, political feasibility, timely decision-making, and overall project feasibility. ILO consultancies include: mapping and situational analyses of private sector actors, mapping labour source countries, exploring options for establishing fishers' trade unions
4. **Taking into account the limited time before the project's conclusion, the following are highlighted as secondary programmatic priorities:**
 - Private Sector Engagement: Identify key drivers and strategies to secure buy-in (following the example of the Fishing Industry Association PNG). Reformulate activity (A.4.1.) to shift focus from a mere code of conduct, to providing broader training on the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, promoting a more comprehensive and sustainable approach.
 - Source Countries (A.1.3.): Explore coordination opportunities with labour source countries, engaging government actors, UN networks, and civil society organizations to foster collaboration and information exchange. Strengthening cooperation with labour source countries remains key, considering the important number of migrant workers employed on foreign-flagged fishing vessels operating in the Pacific.
 - Trade Unions (A.3.1.): Explore capacity building and institutional strengthening for trade unions, with a specific emphasis on inclusive practices for fishers.
 - Crew Awareness Raising (A.4.3): Explore innovative awareness-raising methodologies and new approaches such as community-based systems and training outside of traditional classroom settings.
 - Ratification and Implementation of C-188: Dedicate efforts to promote the ratification and effective implementation of C-188, emphasizing the significance of international standards in the protection of labour rights within the fishing industry.

Recommendations on general project implementation:

1. **Establish a clear "program identity":** Address the challenges arising from competing mandates, time constraints, and scattered activities by forging a distinct program identity. This will ensure enhanced clarity among partners, reducing confusion and enhancing collaboration.
2. **During the last year of implementation (2024), strategically "prioritize" activities (among the large costed workplan) and countries:** Effectively prioritize activities and countries, emphasizing the most impactful results and coordinating efforts across

countries. Given the interconnection of certain activities, this approach will ensure synchronized and effective management decisions.

Collaboratively formulate a well-structured “country prioritization strategy” to ensure coordinated and synchronized activities among all IPs at the field level, to enhance impact, visibility, and overall effectiveness of the project.

The AGG meeting in January 2024 should provide an ideal opportunity for a comprehensive discussion and consensus-building to jointly agree in a general program prioritization. Once this step is solved, establish a clear roadmap for project’s implementation throughout 2024 until its conclusion in December 2024.

“The project has been a great “eye opener”, but now we need legislation at the national level and ensure tangible results for the crews. The work is just starting!”

Trade Union officer

Even if some of the programmed activities are finally not fully implemented (such as eventually activities in Output 4), it is recommended to conclude this Phase I of the project without requesting a project extension, and to formulate a well-defined and transparent Phase II of the project leveraging lessons learned.

3. **Research and Data for Evidence-Based Programming:** There is a strong need to address gaps in understanding the scale and scope of poor labour conditions on fishing vessels through comprehensive research and data collection. It is crucial to place a special emphasis on the accurate identification of final beneficiaries, recognizing the importance of “narrating their stories” to ensure a correct target of activities and to be able convey the project's impact effectively. It is foreseen that an eventual Phase II of the project will need this research and data to drive evidence-based programming, enhancing the project's ability to formulate informed strategies.

Challenges and constraints (COVID-19 context). Resilience/agility to manage and monitor risks, or unexpected internal/external factors.

It is important to note that this project commenced its activities in early 2021 amid the prevailing COVID-19 travel restrictions in the broader Pacific region. These circumstances led to project delays and necessitated the postponement of the IOM Programme Manager's transfer to Honiara until March 2022. Additionally, these restrictions imposed limitations on travel and the consequent implementation of activities. As an example, the IOM Programme Manager adapted to these challenges by working remotely until her transfer to Honiara, and some of the activities were reconverted to online methodologies. A comprehensive project review was conducted during 2021, resulting in a proposed results matrix revision and budget reallocation, to ensure the delivery of project activities without the initially planned travel. This reallocation was subsequently approved by MFAT and the AGG in 2022. **Despite the challenges posed by the pandemic, the project demonstrated effective implementation.**

Additionally, the project document identified three (3) risk areas that could potentially undermine the achievement of the Activity’s outcomes, as highlighted in section: “Critical risks and risk management strategies”:

- The scale, scope and complexity of the issue requiring a broad regional, national and international multi-agency and multi-disciplinary response.
- A lack of consistent understanding and awareness of the problem of poor working conditions, labour rights violations and human trafficking on fishing vessels in the WCPO; and
- Resource and capacity limitations within relevant national agencies in PICs.

The project team effectively developed and implemented a **range of risk mitigation measures** to collectively address these risks, including: the multi-agency approach; the Regional Workshop; the establishment of the AGG; the active seeking of cooperation and efficient use of resources; the collective implementation by a variety of national agencies within PICs, including agencies with responsibilities for fisheries, labour, immigration, police and maritime safety, etc. In fact, the multi-agency approach did present a risk in relation to coordination

“Managing this project has been very challenging, with many difficulties to be overcome including COVID-19 restrictions at the beginning. However, the importance of the issue, the opportunity, the level of engagement and responsiveness of all stakeholders motivated us to propose effective solutions”.

Project team, Implementing Partner

and management of the activities across the different implementing agencies and between PICs. However, this risk has been mitigated through the early and continued involvement of the proposed IPs in the Activity decisions and implementation, and through the establishment of a clear and collaborative governance and management structure (the AGG) to support ongoing coordination and management.

Additionally, the **strong and efficient role played by the project manager** has been crucial. The project manager has served as the cornerstone, responsible for the day-to-day management, coordination, and execution of project activities and the governing bodies effective meetings. The PM role has involved not only ensuring that project tasks are carried out in a timely manner, but also fostering effective communication among the implementing partners and stakeholders. The success of the project has been intricately tied to the synergistic functioning of both the AGG and the project manager role. In conclusion, it can be asserted that **there has been a concerted effort to manage and monitor risks and unexpected changes effectively, while also adapting to external circumstances, acknowledging the inherent complexity of the project.**

EFFICIENCY

Analysis of the timeliness of delivery

The project demonstrated adaptability in response to external circumstances, yet encountered a **spectrum of challenges, both internal and external, leading to delays and implementation constraints**. These challenges included the impact of the COVID context during the startup phase, internal coordination issues, hurdles in securing IPs agreements, complexities in project design, and subsequent revisions to both project and budgetary frameworks. The project also faced challenges such as slow responses from government entities and the involvement of a diverse array of actors.

While Year 1 (2021) experienced delays, significant progress and accomplishments were achieved during Years 2 (2022) and 3 (2023). There is now an imperative to accelerate efforts in Year 4 (2024) to accomplish or advance across all activities.

The project underwent critical revisions, including the adaptation of indicators and targets based on agreements with the AGG, alongside the development of costed workplans, reflecting a strategic response to evolving circumstances. To ensure the delivery of project activities without the initially planned travel, a comprehensive review was conducted, resulting in a proposed budget reallocation. This reallocation was subsequently approved by MFAT and the AGG in 2022.

Regarding the management and decision-making structures and processes

The project document foresaw the establishment of an Activity Governance Group (AGG), involving the four implementing partners to provide high-level strategic governance and management for the Activity and to guide the ongoing delivery of activities through the life of the Activity. The establishment of this AGG was considered as essential for effective Activity delivery and to achieve real progress on the outcomes.

Currently, the Activity Governance Group (AGG) effectively meets biannually and approves collaboratively jointly formulated Costed Annual Workplans. The International Organization for Migration (IOM) serves as the leading agency, supported by a strong Project Manager overseeing coordination functions. Moreover, monthly discussions between the Project Manager and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT) are in place to provide donor updates and foster engagement. **This demonstrates that the project has established formalized management and decision-making structures and processes among stakeholders, ensuring effective coordination.**

Discussions regarding the operating model reveal that, despite efforts to foster a more cohesive joint vision for the program, there have been observations of **somewhat atomized and fragmented activities at the implementation level**. The involvement of four delivery partners undoubtedly introduces complexity and interconnected corporate ecosystems that impact the overall delivery. The project team must continue working to establish a more cohesive and streamlined program identity.

Additionally, various **considerations were raised regarding the dual role of the AGG**, which serves as both an advisory board, incorporating external partners, and a planning/reporting space with implementation functions. All stakeholders involved in the AGG concurred that Implementing Partners (IPs) need a separate platform to convene more frequently and collectively address internal implementation, planning, and reporting issues.

“The AGG is an important platform for discussion, but we would prefer to focus on high level issues that are pertinent to our countries, rather than dedicating excessive time to internal discussions of specific issues related to the IPs and the implementation of the project”.

National civil servant, AGG member

In the evaluation process, **discussions arose regarding the leading agency role**. The project document established *“IOM will take on the role as the lead implementing partner as they have less of a role in direct activity implementation than ILO or FFA and have established field offices in the region. This strong regional operation presence, and IOM’s demonstrated*

capacity to manage multi-agency projects, is considered essential to effectively lead the implementation of this Activity". Although the suitability of these criteria for choosing the leading agency is uncertain, some stakeholders have expressed that the project would fall better within the mandate of either ILO or FFA. Key considerations for future discussions:

- IOM holds a competitive advantage due to already having signed agreements with all parties, which was a complex process. The proactive engagement and visibility facilitated by the IOM project manager, coupled with the widespread presence of the IOM Country Office in Pacific countries, further strengthens its position.
- ILO faces limitations in working with countries that are not part of its Member States or lack a tripartite representation. Challenges seem to arise for ILO in implementing activities that are not approved by their tripartite groups.
- FFA, while an essential regional body, does not appear to be fully equipped to coordinate UN Agency co-implementation arrangements.

Economic use of resources (human, physical and financial).

This project is allocated a budget of NZD 5.6 million (approximately USD 3.3 million). Stakeholders have reported that the project document did not accurately budget for proper implementation, as emphasized in the project design inputs (refer to Relevance criteria). **Two budget revisions were necessary and required donor approval.** Two budget revisions were approved, the first reallocating IOM and ILO funds. The second approved budget reallocation for ILO, FFA and UNODC in July 2023.

Most of the original budget was allocated to the human resources component, while operational costs, including venue, catering, and materials, were underestimated. This imbalance has made it challenging to operationalize activities effectively. To address some of these budget constraints, IOM initiated complementary resource mobilization, securing USD 400,000 from the IOM Development Fund and AUD 50,000 from DFAT.

The budget distribution per output followed the outlined allocation, reflecting the importance assigned to each of the thematic areas, as per table below:

Output	% of total funds
Output 1 - Information, opportunities for collaboration	16%
Output 2 - Technical and operational support to PICs for MTCs	31%
Output 3 - Awareness raising and social consensus building	8%
Output 4 - Technical support and advice to fishing entities	14%
Output 5 - Activity governance and management	24%

The assessment of the financial project monitoring report indicates positive performance, particularly in terms of the **burn rate pace for project disbursements** and in alignment with the projected work plan. As of September 2023, the disbursement burn rate reached 62% of total funds transferred from IOM to IPs and expended directly by IOM (refer to the table below). However, the **project's burn rate based on real expenses** reported by IPs, stands at 38% by September 2023. FFA and UNODC, with a burn rate of 28% and a 1% respectively, will

need to undertake additional efforts to accelerate the implementation of their budgets. IPs have reported the expectation that the total allocated funds will be expended by the project's conclusion in December 2024, with no foreseen project extension request.

	Project budget		Disbursements - Sept 2023 (only for IOM "real expenses")		Real Expenses - Sept 2023	
	Total NZD	%	Total NZD	% from total funds assigned per partner	Total NZD	% from total funds assigned per partner
FFA	\$ 1.550.000	27%	742.351	48%	427.359	28%
ILO	\$ 1.400.000	25%	1.068.729	76%	569.251	41%
IOM	\$ 2.110.470	37%	1.101.064	52%	1.101.064	52%
UNODC	\$ 522.600	9%	522.600	100%	6.631	1%
1%LEVY	\$ 55.830	1%	55.830	100%	55.830	100%
TOTAL	5.638.900	100%	3.490.574	62%	2.160.135	38%

Financial procedures and procurement followed rules and standards, and stipulated agreements for IP transfers. As per agreed in the signed Agreements, IOM disbursed funds to each of the Implementing Partners; and the IPs assumed full programmatic and financial accountability for the funds disbursed to them and administered them in accordance with their own regulations and procedures. Financial reports are regularly generated and reviewed by the project manager to ensure that the project expenditures are in line with the agreed upon budget in terms of broad financial components (staff expenses, office expenses, operational expenses, and overhead costs).

Cost Efficiency: Most activities have incurred low costs, with a significant portion of the budget allocated to staff expenses. Implementing regional approaches and tools specific to the Pacific region can enhance cost efficiency and optimize results, considering cost/efficiency ratios in the Pacific for projects implemented at national level. However, it is essential to ensure effective "national implementation," recognizing that this may impose an additional burden on the project's budget due to higher Pacific costs associated with travel, daily subsistence allowances (DSA), and other related expenses.

Human Resources: The initial stages of this project faced significant challenges due to slow hiring processes across all Implementing Partners (IPs), resulting in notable delays in the implementation of activities. Given the project's strong reliance on the technical expertise of its staff, this bottleneck had cascading effects.

The project document outlined that *"the Activity will be supported by a project manager/coordinator imbedded in IOM at equivalent of 0.8 of a full-time employee and a full-time technical adviser (TA) in FFA and full-time technical adviser (TA) in ILO"*. During the project's implementation, several noteworthy observations emerged. There was a discernible need for higher-level expertise and guidance from ILO, which had implications for the quality of results, including challenges related to the rotation of international staff, the profile of current staff, and the subsequent necessity of hiring technical consultants (resulting in four consultancies across various activities). FFA, operating with a single staff member, encountered difficulties in balancing project reporting and financial management tasks with the demand for technical support. IOM leveraged additional funding from other donors to employ extra staff to bolster support for the project's activities. Moreover, the project staff's engagement in supplementary responsibilities within their respective institutions posed a potential risk to overall efficiency. Addressing these human resource challenges is crucial for the project's success and timely achievement of objectives.

Effectiveness of M&E plans, tools and systems. Quality of reporting requirements.

The project has a **correct multi-country and multi- IPs Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system**, complemented by good reporting tools and sound filing systems. This comprehensive approach ensures effective quality control functions and supports evidence-based planning. The Project Manager (PM) plays a crucial role in M&E functions, with clearly defined coordination tasks.

Reporting exercises have been efficiently conducted throughout the project, adhering to all specified donor requirements and consistently maintaining a high standard of quality. The Project Manager (PM) engages in monthly discussions with the donor, and Implementing Partners (IPs) submit their information to the PM ahead of donor meetings. Annual reporting packages are presented to the donor every March. Financial and narrative reports from IPs are submitted to IOM: FFA when they have reached disbursement threshold to receive a new tranche of funding, while ILO and UNODC send them annually, as per signed agreements. Notably, monthly progress updates for donor meetings serve as inputs for constructing annual narrative reporting exercises, along with planning exercises submitted during the January AGG's meeting, contributing collaboratively to the project's Annual Costed Workplans, a crucial component of the reporting package.

The PM has played a pivotal role in ensuring effective consolidation of information and timely delivery of reporting packages to the donor. However, there is a need for Implementing Partners to be more responsive and expedient in meeting deadlines and fulfilling reporting requirements to optimize the effectiveness of the M&E system. Notably, delayed submission of annual reporting inputs by two IPs in early 2023 resulted in the delayed submission of the 2022 Annual Report to the donor.

SUSTAINABILITY

Stakeholders have emphasized that **the processes and deliverables implemented by the project are well-positioned to extend benefits beyond its lifecycle**. Several factors contribute to the sustainability of the achieved outcomes, such as the presence of the appropriate legal framework (FFA's HMTCS), the continued presence and mandates of Implementing Partners (IPs), the significant interest, ownership and buy-in from the government. Moreover, the project's alignment with the context and relevance to the needs of partners further ensures its lasting impact.

Furthermore, there is notable evidence indicating **the successful integration of project processes and deliverables into both national and regional structures**. The project is actively enhancing capacities and structures of national and regional entities through a range of activities, including capacity-building initiatives and technical assistance

"The sustainability of the impact from this work at national level will depend heavily on Pacific Islands governments' commitment to maintaining the momentum and connections from fisheries agencies to the related agencies such as labour and immigration. Fisheries ministers have stated their commitment to this work".

Civil servant, MFAT New Zealand

extended to Ministries of Fisheries, Ministries of Labour, Trade Unions, etc. Notably, the project has been instrumental in fostering ownership at various levels, contributing to social sustainability, and securing political support for institutional sustainability, albeit not yet achieving sustained funding for financial sustainability.

Despite the project's progress in integrating into national structures and strengthening capacities at the national level, stakeholders emphasized that **there is still a gap in fully establishing the required structures, resources, and processes for the sustained continuation of the project's benefits**. The existing timeframe seems inadequate to facilitate a smooth handover and ensure government and stakeholder ownership.

Consequently, **all stakeholders concur on the imperative need for a Phase II of the project to secure full-fledged national ownership and autonomy**. The project's success in Phase I underscores the clear necessity for a Phase II to solidify and strengthen its positive outcomes.

Recognized as a fruitful pilot, Phase I has laid the groundwork for significant investment in the project's objectives. ILO reported a similar occurrence in Asia with pilot projects on labour exploitation and trafficking in the fishing sector, which resulted in a proliferation of initiatives. It should be noted that, once

“Phase I is a good starting point to get stakeholders to get together, we need to ensure national ownership and results now”.

Trade Union representative

monitoring and enforcement mechanisms at the national level are in place, there is an expectation of a broader programmatic scope of work for the protection and assistance of migrant workers on fishing vessels. However, limited capacity exists in national countries, and Phase II formulation should carefully consider this aspect.

Regarding the **availability of resources** within Implementing Partners (IPs) and/or partners for the sustained continuity of the project results, it is noteworthy that only IOM has achieved success in fundraising efforts, securing USD 400,000 from the IOM Development Fund and AUD 50,000 from DFAT. However, all other stakeholders, including government entities, UN Agencies, and FFA, express confidence in their ability to secure additional resources as activities advance, anticipating a clearer portrayal of impact, particularly after the potential commencement of Phase II.

At this stage, there is no evidence of an officially documented handover or follow-up plan, commonly known as an **exit strategy**. However, the project team anticipates developing this plan before the project's conclusion, contingent upon the confirmation or denial of Phase II.

IMPACT

While it may be premature to discuss the project's full impact, given its ongoing implementation and the nature of this Midpoint Review, notable “contributions to impact” can be identified in terms of positive short- and long-term effects, including:

- **Increased awareness and visibility:** The project has served as an “eye-opener,” shedding light on the complexity of the issue and revealing the lack of clarity in roles and responsibilities among government institutions (Fisheries vs. Labour

departments) and other partners (trade unions, UN Agencies, etc.). This has prompted discussions on expanding mandates and exploring new ways of coordination.

- **Enhanced awareness within the Labour Departments:** The project has contributed to a heightened awareness within the Labour Departments in PICs, fostering the adoption of more inclusive language in their discussions to encompass all crew members in fishing vessels.
- **Promotion of TIP issues:** The project has played a pivotal role in raising awareness of Trafficking in Persons (TIP) issues, which were reported as completely unknown to many stakeholders. For example, Tuvalu has established a national committee to review legislation, showcasing the project's impact on policy and legislative initiatives.
- **Advancements in legal frameworks:** Countries such as Fiji have made significant strides in the development and strengthening of national legal, institutional, and operational frameworks supporting labour standards on fishing vessels (A.2.1.). Fiji, as a pilot country, seems to have formalized structures, including the Fishing Trade Union and the Committee on Joint Fishing Inspection.
- **Measures to monitoring working conditions:** The project has facilitated the implementation of measures to monitor working conditions on fishing vessels (A.2.2.) in countries like Fiji and the Marshall Islands, demonstrating tangible progress.
- **Strengthened capacities through training:** The project's training efforts have resulted in strengthened capacities at the national level, empowering stakeholders with the knowledge and skills necessary to address labour issues in the fishing sector effectively.

The project's indirect impact is evident in notable events that can be linked to its influence, including:

- The elevated consideration of labour conditions on fishing vessels as a high priority during the Forum Fisheries Committee Ministerial meeting in July 2023, emphasizing the significance of addressing labour-related issues within the regional context.
- Another noteworthy development is the adoption of the *Declaration on the Placement and Protection of Migrant Fishers* by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) in May 2023. This approval reflects a broader regional commitment to ensuring the welfare and rights of migrant workers in the fishing sector, and calls on ASEAN Member States to establish agreements with countries of destination beyond ASEAN.

Stakeholders have not identified or reported **any negative effects** or changes resulting from the project, affirming its overall positive impact and constructive implementation.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following provides a summary of the key conclusions that can be drawn, based on the detailed findings presented above. Based on the findings and conclusions that have emerged from this evaluation, some key recommendations have been identified by the evaluator to

guide future programming of similar initiatives. Recommendations are not presented in priority order, but classified by evaluation criteria.

Relevance

The project's relevance is evident in its alignment with the critical importance of the fishing industry in Pacific countries, contributing billions annually to their economies. Despite the vital role of fisheries, historical neglect in addressing working conditions on fishing vessels, both for national and foreign crews, underscores the necessity of the project's objectives. There are significant challenges, such as unclear data on working conditions, vessels operating across jurisdictions, and a lack of enforcement of labour standards. The project is positioned to fill these gaps by focusing on issues like poor working conditions, labour rights violations, and human trafficking in the Pacific.

Context drivers further highlight the significance of the project, considering legal frameworks, market access concerns, and the need for a regional approach. The project's contribution to regional and national development strategies, breaking down silos and initiating dialogues among traditionally separate entities is highlighted. Its innovative approach involves a comprehensive collaboration with various stakeholders, bringing together national governments, intergovernmental institutions, UN Agencies, trade unions, and the private sector. The unprecedented collaboration between Fisheries and Labour departments stands out as a groundbreaking achievement, fostering coordinated efforts for the protection of fishing vessel crews. Overall, the project is perceived as a unique and vital opportunity that should be fully optimized.

The project design demonstrated effectiveness in addressing stakeholder needs, with extensive consultation and collaboration. However, direct representation of final beneficiaries, particularly migrant fishers, was lacking, and the absence of validation with stakeholders hindered clarity on feasibility. The project has an overly ambitious scope, commendable vertical logic in the results matrix, but a lack of clarity in indicators, work plans, and budget distribution as outlined in original project documents. Discussions on flexibility and accountability highlighted challenges in specificity, potentially impacting project efficiency. The multi-agency implementation approach is deemed valid, and while human rights integration is effective, gender considerations need increased emphasis.

- **Recommendation 1.** The design process of a project document should incorporate not only extensive consultation but also a validation of the final product with implementing partners. This validation is crucial to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the feasibility and operationalization of the proposed results matrix and budget.
- **Recommendation 2.** For future projects, formulation of an effective “Results Matrix” will facilitate project management, follow up, monitoring and evaluation purposes. To bolster accountability, foster innovative approaches, establish a concrete scope, and expedite implementation, a project document should incorporate a precise definition at the activity level. This includes a linked workplan and budget.
- **Recommendation 3.** It is advisable for the project team to adopt a more robust approach to gender issues during implementation. Despite the male-dominated

nature of the fisheries sector, a robust Gender Strategy is crucial, especially as implementation scales up.

Effectiveness

In the course of nearly three years, the project has made substantial progress, overcoming challenges and achieving significant milestones. Although certain delays occurred in 2021, the project's comprehensive stakeholder engagement and the pivotal regional workshop in January 2023 strengthened collaboration among government representatives, worker advocates, industry stakeholders, and civil society representatives. The project played a crucial role in developing and fortifying legal and institutional frameworks supporting labour standards on fishing vessels in Pacific Island Countries (PICs). The focus on research, data initiatives, and capacity building further enhanced the project's impact, addressing challenges such as Trafficking in Persons (TIP). However, the asymmetric implementation across PICs, influenced by individual IPs' decisions, indicates a need for a more coordinated approach.

Despite challenges during the first year, the project demonstrated resilience and agility, adapting to the COVID-19 context with remote work and online methodologies. The recommended programmatic priorities highlight the need for national implementation focus, strengthened capacity building, and the reconversion of ILO research consultancies into tangible activities. The secondary programmatic priorities would include private sector engagement, labour source country engagement, trade union engagement, crew awareness raising, and the ratification of C-188 to contribute to a holistic approach.

Looking ahead, establishing a clear program identity, strategic prioritization of activities and countries, and a focus on optimization of research and data products for evidence-based programming are crucial. The identified challenges and constraints, including the multi-agency and multi-disciplinary response, awareness gaps, and resource limitations, were effectively addressed through risk mitigation measures and a collaborative governance structure. The success of the project is attributed to the efficient role played by the project manager and the synergistic functioning of the AGG. As the project moves towards its conclusion, the recommendations emphasize the importance of prioritization, continued collaboration, and a well-defined Phase II to leverage lessons learned. Overall, the project has demonstrated commendable progress, adaptability, and a commitment to addressing complex issues in the fishing industry.

- **Recommendation 4, on programmatic priorities.** Please refer to page 18 for details
 - Ensure National Implementation
 - Strengthen Capacity Building Efforts
 - Reconvert ILO's research consultancies outputs into concrete activities (mapping and situational analyses of private sector actors, labour source countries, and options for establishing fishers' trade unions)
 - Secondary programmatic priorities: Private Sector Engagement (A.4.1.). Labour Source Countries (A.1.3.). Trade Unions (A.3.1.). Crew Awareness Raising (A.4.3). Ratification and Implementation of C-188.
- **Recommendation 5, on general project implementation.** Please refer to page 19 for details.
 - Establish a clear "program identity".

- During the last year of implementation (2024), strategically “prioritize” activities and countries.
- Research and Data for Evidence-Based Programming

Efficiency

In analyzing the timeliness of project delivery, it is evident that the project faced a range of challenges, both internal and external, leading to delays. External factors such as the impact of the COVID-19 context and slow responses from government entities contributed to the hurdles faced during the startup phase. Despite these challenges, significant progress was made during Years 2 and 3, prompting the need for an accelerated effort in Year 4. The project's ability to adapt to evolving circumstances and undergo critical revisions, including the reallocation of budgetary frameworks, demonstrates a strategic response to challenges encountered.

Regarding the management and decision-making structures, the establishment of the Activity Governance Group (AGG) has provided a formalized platform for high-level strategic governance and management. The involvement of four delivery partners, however, introduced complexity and potential fragmentation at the implementation level. Efforts to establish a more cohesive program identity are crucial to address this issue. Discussions on the leading agency role revealed considerations for future decisions, taking into account the strengths and limitations of each potential lead agency.

In terms of economic use of resources, the project faced budget constraints (particularly underestimating operational costs), leading to two necessary budget revisions. The project's burn rate indicates a good performance in terms of disbursements by IOM, but challenges in real expenses call for continued attention to budget management. Complementary resource mobilization activities initiated by IOM helped to alleviate some budgetary constraints.

The analysis of human resources indicates significant challenges during the initial stages, including slow hiring processes and the need for higher-level expertise from ILO. Human resource bottlenecks had cascading effects, impacting the project's efficiency and timely implementation. Addressing these challenges, particularly in optimizing the use of staff and consultants, is crucial for achieving project objectives.

In evaluating the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plans, tools, and systems, the project demonstrates a correct multi-country and multi-IP approach. Reporting exercises have been efficiently conducted, with the Project Manager playing a pivotal role in ensuring delivery of reporting packages. However, the need for Implementing Partners to be more responsive to deadlines is highlighted for further optimization of the M&E system's effectiveness.

- **Recommendation 6.** There is a recognized need to enhance implementation discussions and create formal spaces for Implementing Partners (IPs), potentially through the establishment of an Implementation Unit, as well as more frequent and formalized bilateral discussions between the Pacific Islands Forum Fisheries Agency (FFA) and the International Labour Organization (ILO).
- **Recommendation 7.** Additionally, there is a call for coordination spaces among stakeholders at the national level.

- **Recommendation 8, for an eventual Phase II.** Facilitate an open joint discussion among Implementing Partners and the donor to deliberate on the leading agency role. This discussion should aim to clarify the pros and cons of various options and arrive at the best decision collaboratively.
- **Recommendation 9, for an eventual Phase II.** Ensure that the Phase II project document provides a concrete description of activities and that the budget is accurately adjusted to facilitate correct implementation and avoid eventual budget revisions.
- **Recommendation 10.** It is highly recommended to engage in further discussions with Implementing Partners (IPs) to ensure that the prioritization exercise for 2024 aligns with programmatic priorities. This process may eventually involve conversations with MFAT for comprehensive coordination.
- **Recommendation 11, for an eventual Phase II.** Ensure appropriate staffing for the project within each Implementing Partner (IP), securing both technical and managerial expertise. Additionally, consider exploring the feasibility of having dedicated "project staff" representing all IPs at the national level in priority countries.
- **Recommendation 12.** Implementing Partners (IPs) should assume full responsibility for ensuring timely, comprehensive, and coherent reporting exercises in its various formats (monthly donor updates, AGG planning exercises, annual reporting packages). This proactive approach is essential to meet deadlines, fulfil requirements, and foster an effective and unified project vision through a collaborative approach.
- **Recommendation 13.** Strengthening group accountability is crucial, transcending individual reporting exercises conducted by each Implementing Partner (IP). The emphasis should be on collaborative efforts to collectively monitor progress for each output, evaluate implementation effectiveness, address challenges, and assess changes in activities. This concerted approach will significantly enhance overall project accountability and cohesion.

Sustainability

There is a collective sentiment that the project has strategically positioned itself to extend its benefits beyond the current lifecycle. Key factors contributing to the sustainability of achieved outcomes include a robust legal framework, manifested in FFA's HMTCs, the continued presence and mandates of Implementing Partners (IPs), strong government ownership and buy-in, and alignment with the needs of partners. Despite notable evidence of successful integration into national and regional structures, particularly through capacity-building initiatives and technical assistance, the necessary structures, resources, and processes are not yet in place for sustained continuation. The existing timeframe appears insufficient to ensure a seamless handover, prompting a unanimous call for a Phase II to secure full-fledged national ownership and autonomy.

The prospect of a broader programmatic scope for the protection and assistance of migrant workers on fishing vessels is anticipated once monitoring and enforcement mechanisms at the national level are established. However, limited capacity in national countries necessitates careful consideration in the formulation of Phase II.

The availability of resources for sustained continuity presents a mixed picture, with only IOM securing substantial funds through successful resource mobilization efforts. Nonetheless, stakeholders express confidence in their ability to secure additional resources as the project progresses, particularly after the potential commencement of Phase II. At this stage, while there is no documented exit strategy, the project team anticipates developing one before the project's conclusion, contingent upon the confirmation or denial of Phase II.

- **Recommendation 14.** To enhance sustainability, it is recommended that ongoing capacity building initiatives incorporate Training of Trainer methodologies to ensure replicability and a cascade effect. Additionally, it is recommended that training materials exhibit coherence and alignment with other concurrent training efforts, and are contextualized for the Pacific.
- **Recommendation 15.** Building on the positive outcomes and active stakeholder engagement during Phase I, and recognizing that national ownership and autonomy have not yet been fully achieved, it is recommended that MFAT explores funding options for a Phase II of the project. This exploration should involve efficient coordination with other potential donors interested in the project's focus areas, including Australia's DFAT, the EU, and the US, among others.
- **Recommendation 16.** Prior to the project's conclusion, the sustainability plan should be collaboratively discussed with all stakeholders. This plan should include a clear timetable for the transfer strategy and delineate roles and responsibilities for managing and utilizing project products.

Impact

While a comprehensive evaluation of the project's full impact is not possible until the project's conclusion, the Midpoint Review highlights significant contributions that have generated positive short- and long-term effects. Notable achievements include the project's role as an "eye-opener," bringing attention to the complexity of labour conditions on fishing vessels and prompting discussions on clarifying roles among government institutions and other partners. Enhanced awareness within Labour Departments in Pacific Island Countries (PICs) and the promotion of Trafficking in Persons (TIP) issues demonstrate the project's efficacy in influencing policy and legislative initiatives. Advancements in legal frameworks, particularly in Fiji, showcase the project's impact on formalizing structures related to enhanced trade union representation for fishers and multi-stakeholder engagement to uphold labour standards on fishing vessels, including through joint fishing inspections, contributing in the future to improved labour standards.

The project's indirect impact is evident in key events eventually influenced by its efforts, such as the elevated consideration of labour conditions during the Forum Fisheries Committee Ministerial meeting. These developments underscore the project's regional significance and broader commitment to ensuring the welfare and rights of migrant workers in the fishing sector. Importantly, there is an absence of negative effects or changes resulting from the project, affirming its overall positive impact and constructive implementation.

ANNEXES

The following are standard annexes for evaluation reports.

ANNEX 1: EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE



TOR Internal
Midpoint Review - Lat

ANNEX 2: MIDPOINT REVIEW INCEPTION REPORT



PX.0259 EV
INCEPTION REPORT fi

ANNEX 3: EVALUATION MATRIX

Key Evaluation questions	Evaluation sub-questions	Indicators	Sources of data	Data collection tools
RELEVANCE: IS THE INTERVENTION DOING THE RIGHT THING? Assessing to what extent the project's objective and intended results remain valid and pertinent either as originally planned or as subsequently modified.				
1. To what extent is this project aligned with regional and national development strategies and priorities?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is this project aligned with the country's national development strategy and priorities? 2. Are working conditions on fishing vessels and practices a concern in the country? 3. How is this project helping to advance government-led initiatives? 4. To what extent have the interventions made by the project supported, complemented, or added value to past or current interventions undertaken by IOM, FFA, ILO and UNODC in the region? (Adjusted to a sub-question from TOR) 5. To what extent have the interventions made by the project supported, complemented, or added value to past or current interventions by government, private sector, trade unions, NGOs and other UN agencies in the region? (Adjusted to a sub-question from TOR) 6. To what extent are the programme's objectives, activities, and overall approach aligned with Implementing Partners (IOM, ILO, UNODC and FFA in the Pacific) objectives, mandate, and strategies 	<p>Alignment between the project and national development policies and priorities</p> <p>Evidence of improvement of working conditions in fishing vessels in the region</p> <p>Policies and programs on regional labour standards in the region</p> <p>Alignment of programme objective and interventions with regional priorities</p> <p>Examples of contributions made by the programme towards IOM, FFA, ILO, UNODC's objectives, mandate, and strategies.</p>	<p>National policies, strategies and plans</p> <p>IP regional strategies</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>KII with key stakeholders</p>

	in the Pacific?			
2. To what extent were the needs of stakeholders and beneficiaries taken into account during project design and implementation?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the government entities participate actively in project design? Was it fully agreed with them? 2. Did other stakeholders (trade unions, private sector, associations) participate actively in project design? Was it fully agreed with them? 3. To what extent were the needs of beneficiaries (government entities, trade unions, private sector, associations) taken into account in project design? 4. Was the project well designed according to IOM project development guidelines? And relevant to those needs and priorities? 5. To what extent were project activities or implementation approaches innovative? To what extent did innovative project activities or implementation approaches allow for never-seen progress? (Adjusted to a sub-question from TOR) 	<p>Level of consultation and participation of stakeholders in the project design and implementation</p> <p>Evidence of consultation, and input of duty bearers and rights holders</p> <p>Extent to which human-rights based approach and gender mainstreaming was included in the project design.</p>	<p>Project documents, minutes of meetings, reports.</p> <p>Any assessment documentation that may exist (through the project or external)</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>KII with key stakeholders</p>
3. Do the project's expected outcomes and outputs remain valid, pertinent and appropriate either as originally planned or as subsequently modified?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Were the programme activities and outputs consistent with the intended outcomes and objective either as initially planned or as modified? 2. To what extent was the project successful in adapting to external circumstances to ensure continued relevance? (Adjusted to a sub-question from TOR) 	<p>Evidence of improvement of working conditions in fishing vessels in the region</p> <p>Policies and programs on regional labour standards in the region</p>	<p>National policies, strategies and plans</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>KII with key stakeholders</p>

EFFECTIVENESS: IS THE INTERVENTION ACHIEVING ITS OBJECTIVES?... Assessing the extent to which the project achieves its intended results.

<p>1. To what extent is the intervention achieving its objectives?</p> <p>2. Are project outputs and outcomes being achieved in accordance with stated plans?</p>	<p>1. Have the project outputs been achieved in accordance with the stated plans?...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provision of information (...) technical support to PICs to improve working conditions. - Support to PICs to monitor and enforce labour (implementation of MTCs) - Awareness raising on improving working conditions on fishing vessels. - Support to fishing entities to improve working conditions. <p>2. Which activities or planned outputs were (or were not) able to be completed? Why? [this should be asked for each of the main results]</p> <p>3. Were project activities implemented as planned?</p>	<p>Achievement of results targets, including number of outputs and outcomes achieved.</p> <p>Number of target indicators achieved as planned in the results matrix.</p> <p>Level of satisfaction with the project resources and tools (Consultants, trainings, manuals, technical assistance)</p> <p>Evidence on Results Matrix indicators at output and outcome level.</p>	<p>Project document Results Matrix and Workplan</p> <p>Updated workplans and monitoring tools</p> <p>Interim reports</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>KII with IOM staff, implementing partners, relevant members of project AGG.</p>
<p>3. What are the major factors influencing the achievement of the project's expected outcomes and outputs?</p> <p>4. To what extent was the project successful in adapting to external circumstances to ensure project outcomes?</p>	<p>1. What external factors outside of the program's control have affected the achievement or non-achievement of results?</p> <p>2. What internal factors within the program's control have affected the achievement or non-achievement of results?</p> <p>3. How did the programme management team manage these internal and external factors? Did these factors affect the project's implementation? Did they affect the project in a positive or negative way?</p> <p>4. Did these factors influence efficiency and timeliness of delivery?</p> <p>5. To what extent was the project successful in adapting to external circumstances to ensure project outcomes?</p>	<p>Presence of political, social, and economic factors outside of the program's control</p> <p>Presence of planning, implementation, and financial factors within the program's control</p> <p>Examples of how the programme management team successfully or less successfully managed these internal and external factors.</p>	<p>Project Reports</p> <p>Project stakeholders</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>KII with IOM staff, implementing partners, relevant members of project AGG and other stakeholders.</p>

EFFICIENCY: HOW WELL ARE RESOURCES BEING USED?... Assessing how well human, physical and financial resources are used to undertake activities, and how well these resources are converted into outputs.

<p>1. Is the project being implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternative means of implementation?</p> <p>2. To what extent are project activities undertaken, and outputs delivered, on time?</p> <p>3. What are the major factors that influence or influenced efficiency and timeliness of delivery?</p> <p>4. How well were or are factors influencing efficiency and timeliness mitigated?</p>	<p><i>Regarding resource efficiency</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Were the project activities planned and implemented in a cost-efficient manner? 2. Where the resources used efficiently? 3. How were resources monitored to encourage a cost-effective implementation? 4. Could different decisions have been taken in the use of resources to implement this project? <p><i>Regarding project management and timeliness</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. What were the management and decision-making structures and processes of the project? 6. To what extent are project activities undertaken, and outputs delivered, on time? 7. What are the major factors that influence or influenced efficiency and timeliness of delivery? 8. How well did the project manage effective implementation in the context of the pandemic? (Adjusted to a sub-question from TOR) <p><i>Regarding M&E</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. How is the programme being monitored? 10. Does the project have a M&E Plan? And correct tools to implement it? 	<p>Extent to which the workplan was delivered in time.</p> <p>Extent to which the results were delivered as planned.</p> <p>Overall level of cost effectiveness in comparison to related interventions.</p> <p>Perceived factors (negative, positive) influencing the efficiency.</p> <p>Efficiency of management structures of the project</p> <p>Evidence of M&E processes and tools</p>	<p>Project document and project reports</p> <p>Budget and Financial reports</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>KII with resource management staff and project manager</p>
--	--	--	---	--

SUSTAINABILITY: WILL THE BENEFITS LAST?... Assessing to what extent the project's results will be maintained for a certain period after the current project phased out.

<p>1. To what extent is the capacity of government stakeholders and beneficiaries involved in this project being strengthened?</p> <p>2. Are structures, resources and processes in place to ensure that the benefits generated by the project continue?</p> <p>3. To what extent is it expected that target groups will continue to benefit from project results?</p> <p>4. Have project results led to additional resource mobilization for IOM, FFA, ILO, UNODC or government stakeholders in the region?</p> <p>5. Are funds or a commitment available to institutionally support</p>	<p>1. What is the level of utilization of the project's results among government and other stakeholders?</p> <p>2. To what extent was the management capacity of government stakeholders strengthened?</p> <p>3. Are funds or a commitment available to institutionally support the results after closure of the project? If so, by whom?</p> <p>4. Are they committed to maintaining the benefits of the project in the long run?</p>	<p>Number of policies and/or initiatives planned and/or implemented that address working conditions in fishing vessels because of the project implementation.</p> <p>Extent to which the governments use the project's outputs (training manuals, research, etc.) to develop related initiatives and programs.</p> <p>Level of understanding and practices of government officials</p> <p>Availability of government resources to set in motion related and follow up interventions</p>	<p>Reports from Government stakeholders, project reports</p> <p>Follow up projects.</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews with project stakeholders</p>
---	--	---	---	--

the results after closure of the project? If so, by whom?				
IMPACT: WHAT DIFFERENCE DOES INTERVENTION MAKE?... Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by the project, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.				
<p>1. What change(s) are the interventions bringing at structural or individual levels (whether positive or negative, unintended or intended)?</p> <p>2. Does the impact come from project interventions, from external factors or from both?</p> <p>3. Did the project take timely measures to mitigate any unplanned negative impacts?</p>	<p>1. To what extent has the programme design and implementation promoted the achievement of results that target:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fishing entities in PICs promote and maintain safe, decent and worthwhile working conditions on fishing vessels. - Clear regional labour standards are effectively promoted, implemented, monitored and enforced at the national level. - Effective local, national, regional and international coordination and collaboration is established that promotes and protects the rights of those employed on fishing vessels. <p>2. To what extent is the programme having or is likely to have a direct impact on the lives of workers on fishing vessels?</p> <p>3. What are the positive and negative, primary, and secondary long-term effects produced by the project, directly or indirectly, intended, or unintended?</p> <p>4. What were the benefits and opportunities of taking gender into consideration? (Cross cutting GENDER)</p> <p>5. Did the intervention take timely measures to mitigate any unplanned negative impacts?</p>	<p>Level of impact linked to the project in line with the planned objective.</p> <p>Examples of intended /unintended positive/negative institutional changes.</p> <p>Examples of areas where programme impacts could have been increased and/or better captured.</p> <p>Extent to which the project team respond to unplanned negative impacts</p>	<p>Reports from stakeholders.</p> <p>Project reports</p>	<p>Document review</p> <p>Interviews with project stakeholders</p>

ANNEX 4: DATA COLLECTION TOOLS

1. QUESTIONNAIRE FOR KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS (KII)

EVALUATORS INTRODUCTION: _____ Evaluator's _____ presentation. _____ Project _____ introduction. Evaluation objectives (learning and accountability). Interview process: semi/structured interview open to comments and confidentiality.				
INTERVIEWEE PRESENTATION. Please explain your actual role and your involvement in this project.				
KII Questions	IPs (IOM, FFA, ILO, UNODC)	Gov. Entities	Others (trade unions, PS...)	Donor Project Developers
RELEVANCE: 1. To what extent is this project aligned with regional and national development strategies and priorities? 2. To what extent were the needs of stakeholders and beneficiaries considered during project design and implementation? 3. Do the project's expected outcomes and outputs remain valid, pertinent and appropriate either as originally planned or as subsequently modified? 4. To what extent was the project successful in adapting to external circumstances to ensure continued relevance?				
Is the project well aligned with the needs and priorities of your country? Which policies/initiatives does this project align with and how does it align?		x		x
What are the main concerns regarding labour standards and working conditions in fishing vessels in your country? Is it among your priorities?		x	x	
Are Fisheries a major source of income and a political concern in the country?		x		x
Was the formulation of this project a request of the governments in the region?	x	x		x
Did the project overlap with other government priorities and activities? (complementarity, duplications)		x		
Is this project helping to advance government-led initiatives? And if so, how?	x	x		
To what extent are the programme's objectives, activities, and overall approach aligned with your organization's objectives, mandate, and strategies in the Pacific?	x			x
Were all key stakeholders involved in the project design and implementation? Which stakeholders were consulted at design stage?	x			x
Where you consulted or involved in the project design and implementation?	x	x	x	x
To what extent were the needs of beneficiaries considered in project design? Did the beneficiaries participate actively in project design?	x	x	x	x
What is your general opinion about this initiative?	x	x	x	x

EFFECTIVENESS. 1. To what extent is the intervention achieving its objectives? 2. Are project outputs and outcomes being achieved in accordance with stated plans? 3. What are the major factors influencing the achievement of the project's expected outcomes and outputs? 4. To what extent was the project successful in adapting to external circumstances to ensure project outcomes?				
To what extent have the project targets been achieved? (Evaluator to share the main results to be achieved by the project)	x	x	x	x
How useful/effective are the project products? Please provide examples.	x	x	x	x
How satisfied are you with the products? Are they responsive to your needs? And contextualized to your reality?	x	x	x	x
Were there external or internal factors affecting the project? Did these factors affect the project's implementation? How were the challenges addressed?	x	x	x	x
When COVID came along, how did this impact the project?	x	x	x	x
What internal factors within the programme's control have affected the achievement or non-achievement of results?	x			
How did the programme management team manage these internal and external factors?	x	x	x	x
EFFICIENCY. 1. Is the project being implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternative means of implementation? 2. To what extent are project activities undertaken, and outputs delivered, on time? 3. What are the major factors that influence or influenced efficiency and timeliness of delivery? 4. How well were or are factors influencing efficiency and timeliness mitigated?				
What were the management and decision-making structures of the project? Were you involved in the project's implementation? Any recommendations?	x	x	x	x
Were there any challenges during the implementation of the project?	x	x		x
Where the project activities delivered as planned and on time? Were there any implementation delays? If delays, explain reasons.	x	x	x	x
Were resources allocated and spent in the best way possible? What would you have done differently?	x	x		x
Are you aware of other similar interventions been delivered more/less efficiently? Any lessons learned and best practices?	x	x	x	x
How is the programme being monitored? Does the project have a M&E Plan? And correct tools to implement it? Where did you file all project documents?... Please kindly share results from M&E tools (training pre/post-test, list and signature of participants, and evidence of activity implementation, etc)	x			
SUSTAINABILITY. 1. To what extent is the capacity of government stakeholders and beneficiaries involved in this project being strengthened? 2. Are structures, resources and processes in place to ensure that the benefits generated by the project continue? 3. To what extent is it expected that target groups will continue to benefit from project results? 4. Have project results led to additional resource mobilization for IOM, FFA, ILO, UNODC or government stakeholders in the region? 5. Are funds or a commitment available to institutionally support the results after closure of the project? If so, by whom?				
To what extent is the capacity of government stakeholders and beneficiaries involved in this project being strengthened?	x	x	x	

Which government department oversees the continuation of activities and/or use of the products? How confident is the responsible government department to manage/implement them?	x	x		
Are structures, resources and processes in place to ensure that the benefits generated by the project continue?	x	x	x	
To what extent is it expected that target groups will continue to benefit from project results? Are there any policies and/or initiatives planned and/or implemented that address the project's objectives because of the project implementation?	x	x	x	
Have project results led to additional resource mobilization for IOM, FFA, ILO, UNODC or government stakeholders in the region?	x			
Are funds or a commitment available to institutionally support the results after closure of the project? If so, by whom?	x	x		x
IMPACT. 1. What change(s) are the interventions bringing at structural or individual levels (whether positive or negative, unintended or intended)? 2. Does the impact come from project interventions, from external factors or from both? 3. Did the project take timely measures to mitigate any unplanned negative impacts?				
Have the project's results been used by your government/department/organization to inform actions and programmes? If so, which ones?	x	x	x	
To what extent is the programme having or is likely to have a direct impact on the lives of workers on fishing vessels? Or your organization?	x	x	x	x
What change(s) are the interventions bringing at structural or individual levels?	x	x	x	
Where there any unplanned negative impacts during the project implementation? If so, what actions were taken to mitigate the impacts?	x	x		
Did this initiative bring more partnerships, funding or other related projects?	x	x	x	x

ANNEX 5: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED OR CONSULTED

Donor		
Sarndra Hamilton	Sarndra.Hamilton@mfat.govt.nz	Senior Adviser, MFAT
Sarah McAvinchey	Sarah.McAvinchey@mfat.govt.nz	Lead Adviser on Fisheries, MFAT
Project Developer		
Sarah Lenel	slenel@imcsnet.org sarahmaylenel@gmail.com	Contracted by MFAT to develop the project document ("Activity Design Document"); also recently contracted by ILO
Damian Johnson	djohnson@imcsnet.org damian.t.johnson@live.com	Contracted by MFAT to develop the project document ("Activity Design Document")
Implementing Partners		
Perry Smith	perry-james.smith@ffa.int	Labour Standards Advisor, FFA
Len Rodwell	leonard.rodwell@ffa.int	Fisheries Development Advisor, FFA
Surkafa Katafono	surkafa@ilo.org	Project Coordinator, ILO
Colin Fenwick	fenwick@ilo.org	Decent Work and International Labour Standards Specialist, ILO (N.B., now in a new role)
Anna Olsen	olsena@ilo.org	International Labour Standards and Labour Law Reform Specialist, ILO
Sheik Wazeed Hussain	hussain@ilo.org	Finance Officer, ILO
Rebecca Miller	rebecca.miller@un.org	Regional Coordinator, Human Trafficking & Migrant Smuggling, UNODC
Nathalie Hanley	nhanley@iom.int	Programme Coordinator, IOM
<i>Saamu Tui</i>	<i>stui@iom.int</i>	<i>National Project Officer, IOM Tuvalu (supporting complementary IDF programming)</i>
Project Advisors (on Activity Governance Group)		
Isala Tito Isala	isala.fisheries@gmail.com	Fisheries Legal Officer, Fisheries Department, Tuvalu Ministry of Fisheries and Trade

Albert Meredith	albert.meredith@mcil.gov.ws	Assistant CEO, Industrial Relations, OSH and Employment Permits, Samoa Ministry of Commerce, Industry and Labour
Clare Tutuana	ctutuana@gmail.com	MSC & Social Accountability Officer, Fishing Industry Association PNG
Mele Amanaki	pictu2019@yahoo.com tnwc2022@gmail.com	General Secretary, Pacific Council of Trade Unions (PCTU)
Other Stakeholders		
Meli Reicebe	raicebe.meli@gmail.com	Fisheries Officer, Fiji Ministry of Fisheries (proposed by FFA)
Maritino Nemani	maritino.nemani@mepir.gov.fj	Permanent Secretary, Fiji Ministry of Employment, Productivity & Industrial Relations (proposed by ILO)
Daniel Tagivakatini	daniel.tagivakatini@mepir.gov.fj	Principal Labour Inspection Officer, Fiji Ministry of Employment, Productivity & Industrial Relations (proposed by ILO) – attended Regional Workshop
Kamlesh Kumar	kamleshtwu@yahoo.com.au	Secretary, Fiji Transport Workers Union (proposed by ILO) – attended Regional Workshop
Tony Kagovai	tkagovai@gmail.com	Secretary, Solomon Islands Council of Trade Unions (proposed by ILO) - attended Regional Workshop
Elirose Fagaqweka	Elirose.Fagaqweka@commerce.gov.sb	Senior Labour Officer, Solomon Islands Ministry of Commerce, Industry, Labour and Immigration (proposed by ILO) - attended Regional Workshop

