



International Labour Organization

iTrack

Evaluation

ILO EVALUATION

- Evaluation Title: Initiative for Labour Migration, Employment and Reintegration (LMER) in Nigeria and Ghana
- ILO TC/SYMBOL: RAF/18/12/DEU
- Type of Evaluation : Internal Mid Term Evaluation
- Countries : Nigeria and Ghana
- P&B outcome(s): Outcome 9 (2018-19) and Outcome 7 (2020-21)
- SDG(s): SDGs 8 and 10, targets 8.8 and 10.7
- Date of the evaluation: February 2020
- Name of consultant(s): Aida Awel
- ILO Administrative Office: ILO Country Office for Nigeria, Ghana, Liberia and Sierra Leone and Liaison Office for ECOWAS
- ILO Technical Backstopping Office: MIGRANT
- Other agencies involved in joint evaluation: International Organization for Migration
- Date project ends: 30 June 2020
- Donor: country and budget US\$ German US\$ 1,400,000
- Evaluation Manager: Chinyere Emeka-Anuna, Senior Programme Officer
- Evaluation budget: USD 7,470.56
- Key Words: Migrant, labour migration, employment, reintegration

This evaluation, classified as an “internal evaluation” in ILO evaluation types’ nomenclature, has followed a formalised evaluation process managed by the responsible officer (RO) of the project. The purpose of internal evaluations largely serves organizational learning and the oversight process applied by the ILO Evaluation Office to ensure independence has not been used. The report has not been professional edited.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations	4
Executive Summary.....	7
1 Introduction	18
1.1 Country Context	18
1.2 Project Background	19
1.2.1. Goal and Objectives of the Project	20
1.2.2. Project Funding Arrangement.....	20
1.2.3. Alignment	20
1.2.4. Major Milestone	23
1.2.5. Project Management Arrangements	23
1.3. Purpose, Scope and Clients of the Evaluation	24
1.3.1. Purpose and Objective of the Evaluation	24
1.3.2. Scope of the Evaluation	24
1.3.3. Clients of the Evaluation.....	25
2. Methodology of the Evaluation	26
2.1 Conceptual Framework: Evaluation Criteria	26
2.2. Methodology	28
3. Overall Findings	30
3.1. Relevance and Strategic Fit.....	30
3.2. Validity of the project design	33
3.3. Project Effectiveness	35
3.4. Efficiency of resource use	40
3.5. Impact Orientation and Sustainability	42
4. Conclusion and Recommendations.....	45
4.1. Conclusion.....	45
2.1. Recommendations.....	46
3. Lessons Learned and Good Practices	49
3.1. Lessons learned.....	49
3.2 Good practices	49

Annex 1	Terms of Reference.....	50
Annex 2	Question Matrix.....	61
Annex 3	Evaluation tools.....	64
Annex 4	Evaluation Schedule.....	69
Annex 5	List of Stakeholders met.....	73
Annex 6	Lesson Learned.....	75
Annex 7	Good Practices.....	81
Annex 8	Bibliography.....	85

List of Abbreviations

ACT/EMP	Bureau for Employers' Activities (of the ILO)
ACTRAV	Bureau for Workers' Activities (of the ILO)
AU	African Union
BDS	Business Development Service
CO	Country Office
CMS	Centre for Migration Studies
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
FE	Financial Education
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FMLE	Federal Ministry of Labour & Employment
GIS	Ghana Immigration Service
GIZ	Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
GCM	Global Compact on Migration
GoG	Government of Ghana
GoN	Government of Nigeria
GEA	Ghana Employers' Association
ILO	International Labour Organisation
ILS	International Labour Standards
IOM	International Organization for Migration
LM	Labour Migration
LMER	Labour Migration, Employment and Reintegration
MRCs	Migrant Resource Centres
MIAC	Ghanaian-German Centre for Jobs, Migration and Reintegration
MELR	Ministry of Employment & Labour Relations

MEP	Migration and Employment Promotion
MTE	Mid Term Evaluation
MW	Migrant Workers
NLMP	National Labour Migration Policy
NAP	National Action Plan
NBS	National Bureau of Statistics
NPC	National Project Coordinator
NPC	National Planning Commission
NCFRMI	National Commission for Refugees, Migrants and Internally Displaced Persons
NECA	Nigeria Employers' Consultative Association
NLC	Nigeria Labour Congress
NGCJMR	Nigerian-German Centre for Jobs, Migration and Reintegration
PAC	Programme Advisory Committee
P&B	Programme and Budget
PECs	Public Employment Centres
PSED	Programme for Sustainable Economic Development
PR	Progress Report
PRODOC	Project Document
RB	Regular Budget
RBM	Results-Based Monitoring
ROAF	Regional Office for Africa (in Abidjan)
SEDN	Sustainable Economic Development in Nigeria
SKYE	Skills for Youth Employment in Nigeria
SIYB	Start and Improve Your Business
SD	Social Dialogue
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
ToC	Theory of Change

TOR	Terms of Reference
TVET	Technical and Vocational Education Training
TUC	Trade Union Congress of Ghana
UNSDP	United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership
UNSDPF	UN Sustainable Development Partnership Framework

Executive Summary

1. Introduction

The Midterm evaluation of the project “Initiative for Labour Migration, Employment and Reintegration for Ghana and Nigeria (LMER)” was carried out by Aida Awel, ILO internal evaluator. The evaluation was managed by Chinyere Emeka-Anuna, Senior Programme Officer in ILO-CO Abuja.

2. Background and context

Nigeria is a key regional player in West Africa, Nigeria accounts for about half of West Africa’s population with approximately 202 million people and one of the largest populations of youth in the world. Ghana is considered as one of the more stable countries in West Africa with approximately 29.6 million¹ people. Nigeria joined the ILO in 1960 and has ratified 40 conventions including the 8 fundamental conventions. Ghana joined the ILO in 1957 and has ratified 51 conventions including the 8 Fundamental convention. Labour migration remains a feature of contemporary labour markets requiring effective measures at all stages of the migration process including economic reintegration of returning migrants. Nigeria adopted a National Policy on Labour Migration in 2014, which is currently under revision and Ghana just recently adopted a labour migration policy.

3. Project Background and Objective

The Initiative for Labour Migration, Employment and Reintegration in Nigeria and Ghana build on, work with existing efforts to strengthen labour migration governance, enhance employment prospects of potential or returned migrants, and support the reintegration of returnees. The overall developmental objective of the Initiative for Labour Migration, Employment and Reintegration (LMER) project is to contribute to fair and effective governance of labour migration and reintegration in Nigeria and Ghana. This development objective is pursued through two main objectives:

¹ 2018

- Building the capacity of national stakeholders in Nigeria and Ghana including Ministries of Labour, relevant public authorities and social partners to govern migration fair and effectively; and
- Capacitating existing Migrant Resource Centres in Nigeria and Public Employment Centres in Ghana to offer gender-responsive business development and management skills training to potential and return migrants.

Under the first outcome, the project aims to promote institutional capacity, policy development and implementation as well as the ratification of relevant ILO Conventions. Whilst through the second outcome the project aims at capacitating resource centres for potential and returned migrants in the areas of business skills development and access to finance. The project is being implemented in partnership with the MELR, FMLE and GIZ. The project period is from January 2019 until June 2020. The total project budget is US\$1.4 million and it is 100% funded by Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ).

4. Evaluation Objectives

The purposes of this internal mid-term evaluation is to assess the implementation of the project to date and identify factors affecting project implementation and propose revisions if required. The scope of the MTE cover all interventions of the project from 1st January 2019 to 31st January 2020, which is 13 months out of the total 18 months project period. The evaluation is expected to have a national coverage in general. In spite of this, for specific interventions where the Project has worked at State level, the evaluator met relevant State level stakeholders. The clients of the evaluation are ILO's tripartite partners and other relevant government and non-government institutions working on labour migration and reintegration in Ghana and Nigeria.

5. Evaluation Methodology

The ILO uses a conceptual framework that is consistent with Results-Based Management (RBM) and utilized the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) five evaluation criteria, namely, relevance and strategic fit, validity of the design, effectiveness, efficiency, and impact orientation and sustainability. For each of these criteria a series of evaluation questions was developed during the Inception phase and the Data Collection Tool is attached to this report as Annex 3. A combination of qualitative and quantitative data have been utilized, using a combination of tools including document reviews, semi-structured face to face individual interviews, focus group discussion as well as observations, critical reflection and triangulation of information.

6. Overall Findings

The findings of the Internal Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) below are categorized according to the five evaluation criteria eminent throughout

6.1 Relevance and strategic fit of the project

The objectives of the project are very consistent with the beneficiaries' need because it is intended to support the development, revision and implementation of the NLMP, strengthen labour migration governance, and enhance employment prospects of potential and return migrants and support the reintegration of returnees. The Project responds to the real needs of various beneficiaries and stakeholders, both individuals and institutions, such as potential migrants, returnees, Governmental institutions, mainly MELR and FMLE as the main institutional partners, but also the PECs and MRCs as implementing partners. The project objectives are closely aligned to those of the NLMP in both countries. In addition, the relevance of the LMER Project to the needs of Nigeria and Ghana is high as so many Nigerians and Ghanaians are either working as overseas labour migrants or are returning from overseas work.

The LMER project is highly relevant and consistent with the national priorities of both countries. The project is in line with the current Ghanaian national development Coordinated Programme of Economic and Social Development Policies strategic pillars and components, more specifically, youth development, employment and decent work, and population management. The project is also in line with the Nigerian Economic Recovery and Growth Plan' (ERGP), in particular, job creation, youth empowerment and improved human capital pillars, which mainstreams employment across all pillars and makes the LMER project directly relevant to the drive towards poverty eradication and reduction in unemployment rate particularly among the youth.

In support of the government efforts to address the challenge in the country the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) in Ghana and Nigeria formulated their UNSDP. The project activities contributes to the UNSDP, in particular, the diversified economic growth outcome in Nigeria and vocational education and training, employability and productivity and effective migration governance and refugee managements in Ghana. Moreover, the project contributes to the draft Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) of Ghana, specifically to Country programme priority 1: Creation of more decent and sustainable jobs, more specifically to Outcome 1.1 –

Formal and informal economy are supported to create more decent jobs and Country programme priority 3: Promoting rights at work in line with international labour standards, in particular, Outcome 3.3 - Increased protection of migrant workers (emigrants and immigrants), and Country Programme Outcome. In relation to Nigeria's Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) the project contribute to Country Programme Priority 2: Extending the Scope of Social Protection Coverage, more specifically to Outcome 2.1: Improved Labour Migration Management.

6.2 Validity of the project design

The project design was appropriate for the selected geographic area. Stakeholders considered the selected areas to be well chosen and the overall project implementation methods appropriate to the locations. The project's objective, outcome and output are clearly stated, but are considered quite ambitious as large numbers of activities were identified in the Log Frame, with 37 activities divided over 7 outputs and 2 outcomes. Especially given the limited time available for implementation, it seems overly ambitious to implement 37 activities. In addition, this large number of activities suggests a certain degree of fragmentation of support. Moreover, the indicators described in the Project Document (PRODOC) and LogFrame are not very precise because no actual numbers are given for such indicators as number of workshops, number of reports, % of workers, etc. The indicators in the LogFrame are generally gender sensitive with explicit attention to gender. However, the indicators have not adequately taken into account tripartism and social dialogue. Most stakeholders stressed the relevance of the project for the beneficiaries and for the country.

One of the major shortcomings of the design of the project was lack of consultation with constituents in the design of the project, which also created a vacuum in the involvement of constituents in the implementation and management of the project. To date, there is limited cooperation with relevant stakeholders, the constituents have only been involved in specific activities as and when the project staff deem necessary, hence there is general feeling among the constituents that there is lack of cooperation in implementation and management of the project. There is an urgent need to correct this vacuum and involve constituents and relevant partners in the project implementation.

6.3 Effectiveness

In order to achieve the two outcomes of the project, seven (7) outputs and thirty seven (37) activities were identified. The project Implementation Plan relates the outputs to their outcomes and corresponding cluster of activities. The project can be said to be effective as it is moving in

the right direction to achieve its outcome. However, the project need to speed up implementation of the activities as currently most of the activities are delayed. In order to objectively determine the amount of progress made towards achievement of each of the outcomes, the evaluation requires that indicator baselines and targets are in place together with the activities carried out since 1 January 2019. These critical measures are not available for most of the activities carried out under this project. Therefore, the approach taken is simply to assess the range of activities carried out under each output and makes a judgment on progress towards realizing the output.

Moreover, whether the project has been making sufficient progress towards its planned results is rather difficult to assess with 37 activities and in implementation only for the last 6 months. Out of the 37 listed activities for the first 13 months (2019/2020), 22% have commenced, 16% is currently on going, 54% have not yet started and only 8% were completed. The rather limited number of activities in the first year was delayed due to late commencement of the project and lack of clarity on the management structure of the project. The self-assessment in the last Progress Report (PR) of January 2020 indicates that progress is on the way with a bit of delay due to late recruitment of staff.

The project was scheduled to start 01 January 2019. However, the preparatory process took the first six (6) months during which time recruitment of all project staff was completed. The project has been making progress towards many of its planned activities, but a substantial number of activities are still to take off and other activities still need to be completed. The project needs to make substantial progress in achieving its planned long-term and medium-term outcomes by the end of the project. More comprehensive support should be provided for the ultimate beneficiaries, if the project intends to achieve its economic empowerment component objective, as it is now it is unlikely that it will achieve it unless the training is followed up by access to finance, mentoring and BDS support to enable the beneficiaries start livelihood activity.

The major results achieved till the end of February 2020 include:

1. Capacity of Migration Resource Centres (MRCs) in Nigeria, Public Employment Centres (PECs) in Ghana and Ghanaian/Nigerian-German Centres for Jobs, Migration and Reintegration built in the provision of gender-responsive business development and financial services;
2. Staff of MRCs/PECs and Ghanaian/Nigerian-German Centres certified as trainers for the Start and Improve Your Business (SIYB) Programme;

3. Staff of PECs/MRCs, Ghanaian/Nigerian-German Centres and micro-finance institutions trained on ILO Microfinance and Financial Education Work Package;
4. Assessment of financial services available to potential and return migrants Nigeria and Ghana conducted;
5. Capacity of trade union and employers organizations on effective labour migration in Nigeria enhanced;
6. Collection of labour migration data in Nigeria supported;
7. Development and revision of Labour Migration policy supported in Ghana and Nigeria respectively;
8. Enhanced evidence based policy making in the country.

Gender & Non-discrimination has received substantial attention in the design, but not much during implementation. The number of female beneficiaries in the TOT training seems to be much less than male beneficiaries. The project plans to consider the specific needs of men and women beneficiaries and capacitate the service providers accordingly, so that they can provide gender responsive support to the beneficiaries. In regards to promotion of international labour standards, the relevant ILO Conventions on migrant workers, has not been ratified by Nigeria or Ghana, but some preliminary advocacy and discussion have commenced with the relevant Ministries. In terms of tripartism and social dialogue, the project works with a series of government organisations and social partners, however this need to be improved as the engagement so far has been ad hoc.

6.4 Efficiency

The evaluation found that the resources (human resources, time, expertise, funds etc.) have been allocated and used strategically to provide the necessary support and to achieve the broader project objectives. The project initiatives generally appear to have delivered value for money, the key stakeholders interviewed including the donor, and key government organizations confirmed this. From the start of the project in January 2019 until February 2020 the expenditures had reached in total only 25% of the total project budget of US\$, 1.4 million and as can be seen below, a sequence of important activities have already taken place.

The available technical and financial resources were not fully adequate to fulfil the project plan. As indicated above, there are too many outputs and associated activities. The project staff indicated, which the evaluator also agreed in order to achieve a fully rounded and deeper impact it would have been important to have more funds and more time. Instead of focusing on seven

outputs, they could focus on 3 or 4 outputs and achieve a greater impact. Moreover, there is only one Finance/administrative support in Abuja and Ghana. This takes away time from both the NPC's to engage in more strategic work as they have to do both technical and administrative work. The resources and inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) have generally been allocated and used strategically to achieve the planned results, but some imbalances have been perceived.

6.5 Impact Orientation and Sustainability

The major project strategies for ensuring the sustainability are appropriate, these comprise human and institutional capacity building, and the move by government to achieve international standards in regard to migration and human rights through, developing/revising NLMP, bilateral agreements and ratification of convention. At least, four of the seven output of the project focus directly on human and institutional capacity building. Both outcomes are sustainable as it is in line with the NLMP and day to day activity of the MRCs and PECs, the government will ensure its sustainability, however more in-depth work need to be done by the project.

Generally, the results of *Outcome 1* are quite sustainable, because most of them are embedded in the structures and policies of the Ministry. Regarding the revision and development of the NLMP in Nigeria and Ghana respectively, it is very sustainable provided all of the proposed steps are completed, such as the revision and adoption of the policy for Nigeria, which may not happen within the life span of the project given the limited time left and the launch of the NLMP in Ghana. In addition, this outcome focuses on capacity building, which is sustainable as it focuses on human and institutional development. The results of *Outcome 2* also show a clear sustainable character as it focuses on improving knowledge and enhancing capacity.

Ownership of the project has been relatively low due to lack of consultation during design and lack of engagement during implementation of relevant stakeholders including Constituents. However given that the project objectives fit well with national priorities, this can be easily improved through more engagement of stakeholders in project implementation and management.

7. Conclusions

It can be concluded that the project is going in the right direction, however the time line is too tight to achieve the set objectives.

The project was regarded as highly relevant as the project is consistent with the priorities of Ghana and Nigeria's development strategy. The project has been making progress towards some of its planned activities, but a substantial number of activities are still to take off and that other activities still need to be completed. There has been a delay, the project needs to make substantial progress in achieving its planned outcome. While the project's overall goals and objectives are clearly stated, it is felt that it is overly ambitious, there is too many activities within the very limited timeline and budget. In addition, as there was lack of consultation among relevant stakeholders during project design and implementation, there is a need to go back to the drawing board in partnership with relevant stakeholders and prioritize the outputs based on the limited time and resource available as well as constituents' priorities. Moreover, there is a need to involve constituents in the implementation and management of the project, as their involvement to date has been very limited. The financial delivery and activities implementation of the project has been very low so far, so there is a need to speed up delivery. There is a need to strengthen the project team as there is too many activities to deliver on, and there is a need to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the project management structure. The evaluation concluded that the budget was comparatively small to achieve deep impact across the many lofty targets. There is a critical need to provide comprehensive support to the ultimate beneficiaries to ensure impact. The evaluator found that the project strategy will ensure sustainability as it is embedded on human and institutional capacity building.

8. Recommendations

- 1) Maintain the overall current project design as it is still valid and relevant for the two countries, but mobilize more resources to move towards providing a more comprehensive support to the beneficiaries (returnees) and extending the support to the remote areas in the country.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO, GIZ & Constituents	High	Medium term	High

Validity

- 2) It is recommended that the Constituents should be actively involved in prioritizing outputs taking into account what is realistically achievable taking into consideration the project timeframe and resources available.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO, GIZ & Constituents	High	Short term	Low

- 3) The Bi-annual progress reports being submitted to GIZ, should also be submitted to the Constituents.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO	High	Short term	Low

Effectiveness

- 4) Revise the M&E plan to include targets for outputs and indicators with baselines and targets for outcomes baselines

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO	Medium	Medium term	No resource required

- 5) Ensure that the MRCs and PECs provide gender specific support to potential migrants and returnees.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO, GIZ & Constituents	High	Long term	High

- 6) Provide continuous expanded support for the beneficiaries of the SIYB training, including access to finance, mentoring, business development service, market linkage, coaching and additional training if possible.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO, GIZ & Constituents	High	Short term	Medium

Efficiency

- 7) Strengthen the project team and the project management by employing a finance assistant and driver in each country, Ghana and Nigeria

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO & GIZ	High	Short term	No resource required

- 8) Provide clarity on the roles and responsibilities of the personnel of the project and technical backstopping support. Clarity of project management internally is required.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO	High	Short term	No resource required

- 9) Develop expenditure plan to prioritize the various activities that still need to be undertaken in the second half of the Project, including an action plan to speed up the level of delivery.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO	High	Short term	Resource available

Impact and Sustainability

- 10) Reach out more actively to the constituents including employers' and workers' organisations and relevant partners such as IOM in the implementation and management of the project. For example, one venue to involve the constituents is through establishing project steering Committee to ensure ownership and sustainability.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO & Constituents	High	Short term	Low

9. Lesson Learned and Good Practices

9.1. Lesson Learned

- LL1: The number of outputs and activities identified in the Project Document must be proportionate to the human and financial resources available and timeline in order to ensure timely delivery of the project outputs towards its outcomes achievement.
- LL2: Enabling the potential migrants and returnees to start livelihood activity requires support in various strategic areas simultaneously and in a long-term perspective.
- LL3: The effectiveness of the TOT for methodologies such as SIYB and FE requires to consider in the project that the trainees can have the opportunity to cascade the training to ultimate beneficiaries and that these last group can apply what they have learned in their livelihood.

9.2. Good practices

- GP1: The setting up of Coordination mechanism among labour migration projects within the ILO Country Office in Abuja is an important step towards enhancing oversight, coordination, synergy, and complementarity, as well as to avoid overlaps.
- GP2: Embedding the project implementation within existing local institutions. One of the two component of the project is to strengthen the capacity of the MRC's and PECs to offer

services for potential migrants and returnees. Even though these institutions have limited capacities, it is worth investing in their capacities, as it will ensure sustainability even after the project phase out. The project embedded all implementation within existing structures and focused on strengthening their capacity to support potential migrants and returnees.

1 Introduction

The Midterm evaluation of the project “Initiative for Labour Migration, Employment and Reintegration for Ghana and Nigeria (LMER)” was carried out by Aida Awel, ILO internal evaluator. The evaluation was managed by Chinyere Emeka-Anuna, Senior Programme Officer in ILO-CO Abuja. This Evaluation Report is in line with the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Mid-Term Evaluation of the project “Initiative for Labour Migration, Employment and Reintegration for Ghana and Nigeria (LMER)” attached as Annex 1. The report first articulates the country context and background of the LMER project, followed by the mid-term evaluation purpose, scope and clients. The methodology employed for this evaluation will be described in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 will provide the analysis organized by the evaluation criteria and addressing the evaluation questions. Conclusions and Recommendations will be the focus of Chapter 4, and Chapter 5 presents Lessons Learned and Good Practices.

1.1. Country Context

Nigeria is a key regional player in West Africa. It accounts for about half of West Africa’s population with approximately 202 million people, one of the largest populations of youth in the world. It is Africa’s biggest oil exporter, with the largest natural gas reserves on the continent. While Nigeria has made some progress in socio-economic terms in recent years, its human capital development remains weak due to under-investment. The country ranked 152 of 157 countries in the World Bank’s 2018 Human Capital Index. The lack of job opportunities is at the core of the high poverty levels, of regional inequality, and of social and political unrest in the country.

Ghana is considered as one of the more stable countries in West Africa with a population of 29.6 million people. Ghana is the world’s second largest cocoa producer behind Ivory Coast, and Africa’s biggest gold miner after South Africa. It is one of the continent’s fastest growing economies, it has made major progress in the attainment and consolidation of growth. Significant progress has been made in poverty reduction. Although Ghana’s growth has been fairly robust, the source of growth has always been biased in favour of extractive and capital intensive services sector which do not have direct poverty reducing effect. Ghana ranked 142 of 189 countries in the World Bank’s 2018 Human Capital Index. Unemployment remains one of the major challenges in the country.

Nigeria joined the ILO in 1960 and has ratified 40 conventions including the 8 Fundamental Conventions. Out of 40 Conventions ratified by Nigeria, only 26 are in force, 9 Conventions

have been denounced and 5 instruments abrogated. Ghana joined the ILO in 1957 and has ratified 51 conventions including the 8 Fundamental convention. Out of 51 Conventions ratified by Ghana, only 37 are in force, 10 Conventions have been denounced and 4 instruments abrogated.

Labour migration remains a feature of contemporary labour markets, requiring effective measures at all stages of the migration process including economic reintegration of returning migrants. In view of the potential benefits labour migration offers to both origin and destination countries, it is increasingly prioritized by national and international agendas, which is highlighted by both the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration. The Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) has adopted a number of migration related instruments including the Free Movement of Persons' Protocols and is developing a regional migration policy. Nigeria and Ghana have a Migration Policy, Nigeria further adopted a National Policy on Labour Migration in 2014 and Ghana just adopted a labour migration policy by the Cabinet.

1.2. Project Background

The Initiative for Labour Migration, Employment and Reintegration in Nigeria and Ghana (LMER) build on existing efforts to strengthen labour migration governance, enhance employment prospects of potential or return migrants, and support the reintegration of returnees. There is a need for national policies to promote good governance and the protection of migrant workers and their families in order to maximize the developmental impact of labour migration.

Nigeria is both a source and destination country. Migrants from the ECOWAS region, mostly from Benin, Ghana and Mali, use Nigeria as a destination country. Nigeria is also a source country for people migrating mostly to the UK, USA. Recent trends show Nigeria as the largest migrant sending country from West Africa to the GCC countries² and unsafe migration to Europe through Libya is also a growing migration trend³.

Ghana is a source, transit and destination country. Ghana is destination for migrants from the ECOWAS region mostly from Togo, Mali, Nigeria and Burkina Faso, and it is also a source

² http://www.ituc-africa.org/IMG/pdf/ituc-africa_study-africa_labour_migration_to_the_gcc_states.pdf

³ <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000372459>

country mostly to ECOWAS region, the US, the UK, Italy, Germany and Canada, with most recent trends shows increase to the Middle East.⁴

1.2.1. Goal and Objectives of the Project

The ***overall developmental objective*** of the LMER project is to contribute to fair and effective governance of labour migration and reintegration in Nigeria and Ghana. This development objective is pursued through two specific objectives:

- 1) Protection of potential and returning migrants in Nigeria and Ghana through fair and effective labour migration governance frameworks and through capacitation of national stakeholders to maximize the development impact of labour migration throughout the migration.
- 2) Build the capacity of Migrant Resource Centres in Nigeria and Public Employment Centres in Ghana to offer services that enhances employment and income generating opportunities of potential and return migrants as well as support the reintegration of returnees in a sustainable manner.

Under the first objective, the project aims to promote institutional capacity, policy development and implementation as well as the ratification of relevant ILO Conventions. Whilst through the second one the project aims at capacitating resource centres for potential and returned migrants in the areas of business skills development and access to finance. The project is being implemented in partnership with the MELR, FMLE and GIZ. The project period is from January 2019 until June 2020.

1.2.2. Project Funding Arrangement

The project is funded by Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) and the full budget has already disbursed.

1.2.3. Alignment

This project is aligned to the program currently being implemented by GIZ, in collaboration with the International Organization for Migration (IOM) missions in Ghana and Nigeria, on Ghanaian-German Centre for Jobs, Migration and Reintegration (MIAC) and the Nigerian-German Centre for Jobs, Migration and Reintegration (NGC). The project have enhanced the capacity of both the MIAC and NGC on Financial Education and SIYB, which in return will

⁴ http://www.ituc-africa.org/IMG/pdf/ituc-africa_study-africa_labour_migration_to_the_gcc_states.pdf

enrich the capacity of returnees as they have direct access to the returnees and they provide guidance to the returnees based on the skills they have acquired through this project.

The project focuses on a close operational collaboration between ILO interventions and the operations of the centres in Ghana and Nigeria. In addition, BMZ also commissioned GIZ to complement PMD's interventions by measures carried out by bilateral projects of German development cooperation in the areas of "Sustainable Economic Development" and "Technical Vocational Education and Training". However such cooperation are found to be limited and need to be enhanced. These are, in Ghana: The Programme for Sustainable Economic Development (PSED) especially its Migration and Employment Promotion (MEP) component. In Nigeria: The Programme "Sustainable Economic Development in Nigeria" (SEDIN) and the Technical and Vocational Education Training (TVET) project "Skills for Youth Employment in Nigeria" (SKYE). How the LMER project synergizes with these projects currently seem non-existent. In terms of ILO's partnership with GIZ, this project is guided by GIZ's overall goal and framework on labour migration. Cooperation between IOM and ILO also seems limited and there is a need for stronger coordination and collaboration, in order to avoid duplication, and pool resources together to achieve impact.

This project contributes to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals Target 10.7 "Facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies" and Target 8.8 to "Protect labour rights and promote safe and secure working environments of all workers, including migrant workers, particularly women migrants, and those in precarious employment". The project is also aligned to ILO's regional and global work on Labour Migration, contributing to Outcome 9 of the ILO's Programme and Budget for 2018-19 on fair and effective international labour migration and mobility and Output 7.5 of the Programme and Budget for 2020-21, on Increased capacity of constituents to develop fair and effective labour migration frameworks, institutions and services to protect migrant workers. This project is also in line with the Labour Migration Portfolio of the ILO Country Office through the Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP), in Nigeria, contributing to Country Programme Priority 2: Extending the Scope of Social Protection Coverage, more specifically to Outcome 2.1: Improved Labour Migration Management, and ILO Country Programme Outcome NGA 904 Improved labour migration governance in Nigeria.. In Ghana, it contributes to the DWCP , Country programme priority 1: Creation of more decent and sustainable jobs, in particular, to Outcome 1.1 – Formal and informal economy are supported to create more decent jobs and Country programme priority 3: Promoting rights at work in line with international labour standards, in particular, Outcome

3.3 - Increased protection of migrant workers (emigrants and immigrants), and ILO Country Programme Outcome GHA 904: Improved labour migration governance in Ghana.

In addition, the project responds to Nigeria's Economic Recovery and Growth Plan in the areas of job creation and youth empowerment and improved human capital. It further contributes to the implementation of the Employment Policy, Migration Policy and LM Policy. It also supports Nigeria's UN Sustainable Development Partnership Framework (UNSDPF) with a focus on diversified economic growth (Outcome 7) and population dynamics (Outcome 8). In Ghana, the project contributes to the Coordinated Programme of Economic and Social Development Policies including in the areas of youth development, employment and decent work, and population management. It further contributes to other Government initiative in Ghana such as the capacity building plan of MELR, Ghana beyond Aid, Planting for food and job. It also contributes to Outcomes 2 and 7 of the United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership (UNSDP), in particular Outputs 2.4 on vocational education and training, employability and productivity and 7.3 on effective migration governance and refugee management. The project mostly work with the labour Ministry in both countries, when necessary however, they collaborate with other relevant Government and non-government institutions in both countries. The project does not have a well-established coordination mechanism in both countries, the coordination have been ad hoc and as required.

In Ghana, the project mainly work with the Ministry of Employment and Labour Relations (MELR) including its Labour Office and Public Employment Centres (PECs). Depending on the specific activities under implementation the project also work beyond the traditional ILO constituents such as Ghana Immigration Service (GIS) and. Centre for Migration Studies. The engagement so far with the Trade Union Congress of Ghana (TUC), and Ghana Employers' Association (GEA) has been rather limited. The project have good collaboration with GIZ, and Ghanaian-German Centre for Jobs, Migration and Reintegration (MIAC) as indicated above. The ILO also closely collaborates with International Organization for Migration (IOM) in policy engagement. The recent support to the Government of Ghana in the Bilateral Labour Agreement (BLA) with Qatar and LMP is a good testimony of such partnership.

In Nigeria, the project mainly work with the Federal Ministry of Labour and Employment (FMLE), especially the Migrant Resource Centres (MRCs). As required and depending on specific project activities the project also collaborate with National Commission for Refugees, Migrants and Internally Displaced Persons (NCFRMI), National Planning Commission, and National Bureau of Statistics (NBS). The coordination with Nigeria Labour Congress (NLC),

Trade Union Congress (TUC), and Nigeria Employers' Consultative Association (NECA), has been limited and mostly focused on capacity building. The project further collaborates with Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit ('GIZ'), Nigerian-German Centre for Jobs, Migration and Reintegration (MIAC) and IOM as indicated under alignment above.

Within the ILO Country Office (CO) the project has been part of a forum with another labour migration project. This is important to ensure overall guidance, coordination, synergy, monitoring as well as to avoid overlap in the subject. The other project is the ECOWAS project "Support to Free Movement of Persons and Migration in West Africa (2013-2020)"⁵.

1.2.4. Major Milestone

Even though the project was supposed to commence on 1st January 2019, recruitment took longer than expected and the project actually commenced on 1st July 2019. However, during the 6 month some activities was implemented by the ILO Abuja CO. Since the commencement of the project in Ghana, the project have built the capacity of relevant stakeholders on SIYB and Financial education. Moreover, the project has contributed significantly to the development of the Labour migration Policy in Ghana. On the other hand, in Nigeria, the project have built the capacity of Employers and workers organization on labour migration, strengthened data on migration, built the capacity of relevant stakeholders on SIYB and Financial education and developed a policy brief.

1.2.5. Project Management Arrangements

The Director of the ILO Abuja CO is responsible for the overall implementation of the project. The project is managed by National Programme Coordinators (NPCs) based in the project offices in Accra and Abuja CO and they formally report to the Director of the ILO Abuja CO, in practice to ILO Abuja CO the Migration and Employment Technical Officer. The NPCs are in charge of programme implementation, supervising staff, allocating programme budgets, preparing progress reports and maintaining programme relations with institutional partners. They are also responsible for elaborating the final programme document, gathering supporting information and developing preliminary work plans. A full-time Finance & Administrative Assistant based in the ILO Abuja CO supports the NPCs.

The project implementation was envisaged to be guided by an existing Project Steering Committee established by GIZ. However, in practice this never took place. To date, no periodic

⁵ Being implemented in close partnership with IOM and ICMPD, which is mostly focused on policy development at the ECOWAS Regional level

monitoring of progress and coordination with key stakeholders has taken place. It was further envisaged to have a donor management mechanism, where GIZ and ILO meet on monthly basis, again this is not taking place regularly, there has been 2 meetings in Ghana and 4 meetings in Nigeria so far. In addition to in-person meetings, calls have been held in both Ghana and Nigeria between the ILO and GIZ.

Regarding ILO supports, the Migration and Employment Technical Officer in ILO Abuja CO technically backstops the project. The Decent Work Team (DWT) in Dakar, the Regional Office for Africa (ROAF) in Abidjan and the International Labour Migration Branch (MIGRANT) at ILO headquarters in Geneva provide technical and policy level support to the project on various aspects.

1.3. Purpose, Scope and Clients of the Evaluation

1.3.1. Purpose and Objective of the Evaluation

The main purposes of this internal mid-term evaluation are to:

- ◆ Assess the implementation of the project to date, identifying factors affecting project implementation. If necessary, propose revisions to the expected level of achievement of the objectives and corrective actions the project could take.
- ◆ Analyze the implementation strategies of the project with regard to their potential effectiveness in achieving the project outcomes and impacts; including unexpected results.
- ◆ Review the strategies for sustainability.
- ◆ Identify the contributions of the project to the National Development Plans, the SDGs, the UN development frameworks, the ILO objectives and its synergy with other projects and programs.
- ◆ Identify lessons learned and potential good practices for the key stakeholders.
- ◆ Provide strategic recommendations for the different key stakeholders to improve implementation of the project activities and attainment of project objectives

1.3.2. Scope of the Evaluation

The MTE will cover all interventions that have been implemented from 1st January 2019 to 31 January 2020, which is more than the halfway and closer to the end of the 18-month project. The evaluation is expected to have a national coverage in general. In spite of this, for specific interventions where the Project has worked at subnational level, the evaluator met relevant stakeholders at that level. The evaluation integrated gender equality and non-discrimination,

ILS, tripartism and social dialogue and just transition towards environmental sustainability as a crosscutting concern through integrating questions in the data collection tool.

1.3.3. Clients of the Evaluation

The primary clients in Nigeria are Federal Ministry of Labour and Employment (FMLE), National Commission for Refugees, Migrants and Internally Displaced Persons (NCFRMI), Nigeria Labour Congress (NLC); Trade Union Congress of Nigeria (TUC); Nigeria Employers' Consultative Association (NECA), Migrant Resource Centres (MRCs) and Nigerian-German Centre for Jobs, Migration and Reintegration.

The primary clients in Ghana on the other hand are Ministry of Employment and Labour Relations (MELR), Ghana Immigration Service (GIS), Ghana Employers' Association (GEA), Trade Union Congress of Ghana (TUC) Public Employment Centres (PECs) and Ghanaian-German Centre for Jobs, Migration and Reintegration.

The primary clients for both countries include GIZ, IOM, ILO (Project Team, Country Office Abuja, DWT-Dakar, ROAF and MIGRANT-HQ. The Secondary clients for both countries include other key stakeholders and migrants themselves.

2. Methodology of the Evaluation

2.1 Conceptual Framework: Evaluation Criteria

The present Mid Term Evaluation (MTE) will be based upon the ILO's evaluation policy and procedures. The ILO adheres to the United Nations system's evaluation norms and standards as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards. It has also adheres to ethical standards and codes of conduct, when gathering of information in order to protect those involved in the evaluation process. The ILO uses a conceptual framework that is consistent with Results-Based Management (RBM) and addresses the following five Evaluation Criteria as specified in the ToR (Annex 1):

- 1) Relevance and strategic fit of the project
- 2) Validity of the project design
- 3) Project Effectiveness
- 4) Efficiency resource use
- 5) Impact orientation and sustainability of project achievements/results

The following questions related to the criteria were addressed:

Relevance and Strategic fit:

- What are the major challenges of migration in Ghana/Nigeria and how is the project supporting you in overcoming this challenge?
- Can you explain the relevance and coherence of project activities to the related government's strategy, policies and plans; UNSDF; SDGs? Can you mention examples of integration?
- Does the project address the felt needs of men and women beneficiaries?
- To what extent does the LMER project complement and fit with other on-going Government initiatives/programmes /projects in the country?

Validity of design

- What is your general assessment on the program objectives and design: strengths and weaknesses, possible gaps, constraints, drawbacks, etc.?
- Was the project design realistic? What is your assessment with regard to the participation of your institution in the diagnosis and project design?

- How appropriate and useful are the indicators described in the project document in assessing the project's progress?
- Were any lessons learned from previous pilot projects considered in the design and implementation of the project?

Effectiveness

- To what extent has the project achieved its objective in terms of capacity building for your institution; economic empowerment of returnee's communities; policy framework; data and knowledge about migration?
- Which have been the main contributing and challenging factors towards project's success in attaining its targets?
- What, if any, unintended results of the project have been identified or perceived?
- To what extent is your organization been involved in projects implementation?
- Have the available technical and financial resources been adequate to fulfil the project plans?
- Does the management and governance arrangement of the project contributed to facilitate the project implementation? How do you see the co-ordination structures?

Efficiency

- How efficiently have resources (human resources, time, expertise, funds etc.) been allocated and used to provide the necessary support and to achieve the broader project objectives?
- Have they been delivered in a timely manner? If not, what were the factors that have hindered timely delivery of outputs? Any measures that have been put in place?

Impact orientation and sustainability

- To what extent is there evidence of positive changes in the life of the ultimate men and women project beneficiaries?
- Are project outcomes sustainable and can you identify steps that have been taken to enhance it?
- To what extent has the project strengthened the capacities of the government structures?
- Was there ownership, prospects of continuation of project activities by the Government, commitments, and leverage of funding? What are the main constraints in this regard?

Further elaboration of the questions can be found in the Data collection worksheet attached as annex 3, which specifies by evaluation criteria and questions the sources of data, as well the techniques applied for the data collection.

2.2. Methodology

The evaluation used both qualitative and quantitative methodology. The evaluation was able to draw on data collected mostly from written documents (including financial report), and data gathered through interviews, focus group discussion and observation. When possible all data gathered was crosschecked.

The evaluation entailed three phases. The *initial phase* was focused on building the foundation, which includes a desk review of relevant documents (Annex 8). This phase further included discussions with the evaluation manager in the drafting and finalizing of the Inception report. The *second phase* comprised a field mission to Accra followed by Abuja and Lagos to consult with the relevant partners including ministries, tripartite partners, the donor, and other relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries (please refer to program of Field Visit as Annex 4). The project covers seven locations (Abuja, Lagos and Edo State in Nigeria and Accra, Kumasi, Takoradi, and Tema in Ghana). Only Abuja, Lagos and Accra were visited due to time and resources available. Regarding the selected stakeholders in each visited location, the criteria selected was to choose the most actively involved in the project.

In Accra meetings were held at ILO office with the project staff. In Abuja at ILO Country office meetings were held with the Director OIC, the project team, the Finance department staff, and the Migration and Employment Technical Officer. This was followed up with meeting with all relevant stakeholders in Accra and later in Lagos MRC in a one day trip to Lagos MRC.

At the end of field work two stakeholders' workshops were organized, one in Accra and one in Abuja to present the preliminary findings and recommendations for comments. The *final phase* consisted of writing the draft evaluation report, which was shared with all relevant stakeholders, and their comments were considered by the evaluator in finalizing the report.

2.2.1. Limitations

The project involves not only a large number of stakeholders and partners, but also a number of project locations, which apart from Abuja and Accra include Kumasi, Takoradi, and Tema in Ghana and Lagos and Edo States in Nigeria. In view of the limited time available for the mission not all of these stakeholders could be interviewed and project sites visited. However, effort was made to interview as many stakeholders as possible and the most relevant

stakeholders were all interviewed. It was noted by the Evaluator that the experiences described by the later interviewees with regard to those interviewed earlier was becoming similar, this seems to indicate that the saturation effect was probably taking place and no new data or information was likely to emerge from new interviews. Moreover, in regards to the location 3 out of 7 were visited which can give a fair representation. Lastly, the desk review was thorough and comprehensive and covered the whole project adequately.

2.2.2. Description and rationale for stakeholder participation

The reasons Abuja, Lagos and Accra was selected were: 1) these are migrant prone locations ; 2) capacity building activities were undertaken in Lagos and Accra with the MRC and Accra with the PECs; 3) the GIZ, Nigerian-German Employment, Migration and Reintegration, and the GIZ, Ghanaian-German Employment, Migration and Reintegration, which works with local job seekers, potential migrants and returnees were located in Lagos and Accra respectively; and 4) The Abuja and Lagos MRC and Accra PEC were also selected because of logistical reasons, given the limitation of time available for the evaluation this was also important issue to consider.

3. Overall Findings

This section provides in-depth discussion of the findings under each of the evaluation criteria. These criteria have been examined using the Evaluation Questions developed during inception phase (Annex 2).

3.1. Relevance and Strategic Fit

The relevance and strategic fit was evaluated based on secondary source, such as the SDGs, ILO Programme and Budget, AU Migration Policy, National Development Strategies, National Migration Policies, National Labour Migration Policies (NLMP), UN Sustainable Development Partnership Framework (UNSDPF) and Decent Work Country Programs (DWCP). In addition, this was confirmed through interview with relevant partners, ILO project staff in Abuja and Accra and ILO technical staff in Abuja as well as FGD with beneficiaries and field observations.

There is a general consensus among the stakeholders about the high relevance and strategic fit of the project. The desk review and interview conducted by the evaluator confirms this positive correlation. Stakeholders consistently stressed the importance and timeliness of the project given the challenges that Nigeria and Ghana faces with respect to migration and employment.

The objectives of the project are very consistent with the beneficiaries' need because it intended to support the implementation of the NLMP, strengthen labour migration governance, and enhance employment prospects of potential and return migrants and support the reintegration of returnees. The project responds to the real needs of various beneficiaries and stakeholders, both individuals and institutions, such as potential migrants, returnees, Governmental institutions, mainly MELR and FMLE as the main institutional partners but also the PECs and MRCs as implementing partners. The project objectives are closely aligned to those of the NLMP. The LMER project, through promoting fair and effective labour migration governance frameworks, responds to Sustainable Development Goals Target 10.7 "Facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies" and target 8.8 on Protect labour rights and promote safe and secure working environments of all workers, including migrant workers, particularly women migrants, and those in precarious employment.

The project has been contributing to the ILO Global Agenda on Migration under Outcome 9 of the ILO's Programme and Budget for 2018-19, Fair and effective international LM and mobility and in particular indicator 9.1 on fair LM policies, legislation, bilateral or multilateral

agreements, the protection of migrant workers and the functioning of labour markets and Outcome 7 of the current ILO's Programme and Budget (2020-21), adequate and effective protection at work for all, in particular, Output 7.5 Increased capacity of constituents to develop fair and effective labour migration frameworks, institutions and services to protect migrant workers. The project further contributes to Nigeria and Ghana implementing the Global compact on migration. The project is also in line with GIZ migration policy, specifically the Global Agenda on Migration and Development. The Global Agenda stresses the importance of better organizing regular migration and fostering well-managed mobility, eradicating irregular migration, addressing the root of migration through employment and promoting reintegration. The project is also in line with AU Free Movement Protocol, Agenda 2063 and initiatives by the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), who have adopted a number of migration related instruments including the Free Movement of Persons' Protocols and is in the process of developing a regional migration policy.

In pursuit of its accelerated economic growth, Nigeria formulated, and has been vigorously implementing, its 'Economic Recovery and Growth Plan' (ERGP). Some of the relevant pillars in the ERGP are job creation, youth empowerment and improved human capital, which this project directly responds to. The LMER project focuses on policy development and capacity building of institution such as MRCs, who provides direct support for potential migrants most whom are young men and women s and provides support to returnees through training to enhance employability and in self-employment. The project further responds to the implementation of the Nigerian Employment Policy, Migration Policy and LM Policy. It is also in line with Nigeria's UN Sustainable Development Partnership Framework (UNSDPF) with a focus on diversified economic growth (Outcome 7) and population dynamics (Outcome 8). In relation to Nigeria's Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) the project contribute to Country Programme Priority 2: Extending the Scope of Social Protection Coverage, more specifically to Outcome 2.1: Improved Labour Migration Management, and Country Priority Outcome NAG 904 Improved labour migration governance in Nigeria.

For Ghana, the project is in line with several pillars of the Coordinated Programme of Economic and Social Development Policies strategic pillars and components, such as youth development, employment and decent work, and population management. It also contributes to Outcomes 2 and 7 of the United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership (UNSDP), in particular Outputs 2.4 on vocational education and training, employability and productivity and 7.3 on effective migration governance and refugee management. It is also aligned with other

Government and Development actors initiative in the country such as the GIZ Programme Migration for Development”(PMD), Capacity building plan of MELR, Ghana Beyond Aid, Planting for food and job. This project also supports the Government in the implementation of the Migration policy as well as the newly adopted Labour Migration Policy, which the project contributes to the development. Moreover, it contributes to Ghana draft Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP), the project contributes to Country programme priority 1: Creation of more decent and sustainable jobs, more specifically to Outcome 1.1 – Formal and informal economy are supported to create more decent jobs and Country programme priority 3: Promoting rights at work in line with international labour standards, in particular, Outcome 3.3 - Increased protection of migrant workers (emigrants and immigrants), and Country Programme Outcome GH 904: Improved labour migration governance in Ghana.

The ILO CO is supporting both governments in improving labour migration governance in both countries through a coordinated effort. This project is the only project at national level in this area, but coordinates with a regional project ECOWAS “Support to Free Movement of Persons and Migration in West Africa (2013-2020) that work on labour migration. For example, the two projects jointly organized a training on labour migration. The project fit well with other ILO initiatives on decent work and related aspects within the country and internationally. For example, the project fit well on the work the CO is doing on enterprise development, and youth employment. In addition, to maximise project synergies within the CO Abuja, as well as with some units in ILO headquarters and other countries, the project partnered with relevant department in ILO HQ on enterprise development through providing training on Start and Improve your business (SIYB) and Financial Education for relevant stakeholders and returnees, who then engaged in starting and improving their own business. The work done by the project on integrating a module of essential questions on international migration for inclusion in Nigerian household surveys to improve statistics on migration in Nigeria was supported by the Statistics specialist based in ILO Decent Work Team in Dakar. The project also collaborated with ILO’s Bureau for Workers’ Activities (ACTRAV) and ILO’s Bureau for Employers’ Activities (ACTEMP) specialists in Abuja and Dakar respectively, to provide training for employers and workers organization in Nigeria on labour migration. However, there could have been more coordination with other government and agencies programmes in areas such as job creation in the country. Such coordination could, for example, have been useful to support the reintegration of returnees.

3.2. Validity of the project design

The project design validity was assessed based on primary and secondary sources, such as the project document, log frame, implementation plan, monitoring & evaluation plan and progress reports. This was further triangulated through interview with relevant partners, ILO project staff in Abuja and Accra and FGD with beneficiaries. The project design was appropriate for the selected geographic areas. Stakeholders considered the selected areas to be well chosen and the overall project implementation methods appropriate to the locations. The overall design was broad and with decentralised actions, which allowed for local adaptation, for example the training on SIYB, even though it was broad and comprehensive, the relevant stakeholders at the MRC and PES was adopting it specifically to their need, as they were in no position to provide the whole SIYB for the returnees as they do not have the capacity.. The fact that the government has expressed requests to enlarge coverage to other region, (if additional resources had been available) is a testimony about the validity of the project design.

The project's objectives, outcomes and outputs are clearly stated, but are considered quite ambitious, with 37 activities divided over 7 outputs and 2 outcomes. Especially given the limited time available for implementation, it seems overly ambitious to implement 37 activities. In addition, this large number of activities suggests a certain degree of fragmentation of the support. There is insufficient coherence, clarity and logic of the actual intervention logic framework structure and its indicators. The logical framework does not need to be changed fundamentally but the project need to revise the logframe to provide clarity in coherence and logical flow through revisiting the flow through bottom up approach, by looking at how the activities and the output help achieve the set outcome and indicators. Some of the activities seem unclear as to how it contribute to achieve the output or outcome. The indicators described in the Project Document (PRODOC) and LogFrame are not very precise because no baseline and targets are set for the indicators. The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan need to be more focused, coherent, accurate and logical taking into account the timeline and budget as well as by setting target and clarity as to how the activities contribute to achieving the output and outcome.

At this stage, there is a need to modify the design of the project itself, taking to account the resources and time available. It is important to ensure its alignment with the constituent's priority as well as the newly adopted NLMP of Ghana and the NLMP of Nigeria being revised. In the absence of defined baselines and targets for outcomes it is challenged to

determine the degree of progress made through project implementation towards the achievement of project

Some aspects of the project design were overly ambitious and thus not realistic. The revision of policy is not directly within the control of a development project. While the project intention is to contribute to the development and advocate diligently for adoption, it is unrealistic to expect the adoption of the policy within such short term project and plan the development of action plan, sensitization of the policy etc. In addition, the project timeline and budget was comparatively small to achieve deep impact across the many targets. While the project can achieve some of its expected results before the end of the project, some elements of the project need to benefit from more in-depth efforts, for example, Migrant Resource Centres in Nigeria and Public Employment Centres in Ghana offer services to enhance employment and income generating opportunities of potential and return migrants and support the reintegration of returnees in a sustainable manner. This is especially the case for capacity strengthening which, although well appreciated and well implemented, could have benefitted from more extensive focus for intensified impact. Several stakeholders noted that, given the available budget and timeline, it is impossible for them to cascade such training to the ultimate beneficiaries.

One of the major shortcomings of the design of the project was lack of consultation with constituents on it, which also created a vacuum in the involvement of constituents in the implementation and management of the project. To date, there is limited cooperation with relevant stakeholders. The constituents have only been involved in specific activities when the project staff deem necessary. Hence, there is general feeling among the constituents that there is lack of cooperation in implementation and management of the project.

In regards to the management structure, in the PRODOC stated that this project would benefit from an already established Project Steering Committee led by the GIZ, however this did not take off. Hence, there is an urgent need to create Project Steering Committee to guide and drive the implementation and management of the project. Given that a project like this involves stakeholders beyond the traditional tripartite partners, it is important to establish a project steering committee that incorporates all project partners to ensure ownership and sustainability. A number of meetings were organized between the ILO and GIZ, given the life span of the project, as an alternative, such meetings could also be broadened to include all relevant partners and serve as project steering committee instead of establishing a new one.

In addition, internally within the ILO, there is a need to create a clarity on the roles and responsibilities of the project staff and the technical backstopping official. Though it is clearly

stated in the PRODOC that the NPCs are responsible for the project implementation and report directly to the ILO CO Director, in reality, the technical backstopping officer seems to be responsible for project implementation and management. So the project staff reports to him. This needs to be clarified going forward.

Gender has been considered in the analysis of needs and the settings of targets (50 % of project beneficiaries should be women). However, the project could have gone further in analysing the impact of its activities from a gender perspective.

3.3. Project Effectiveness

The project effectiveness was evaluated based on primary and secondary sources, such as project progress report and through interview with relevant partners, ILO project staff in Abuja and Accra and FGD with beneficiaries as well as observation.

We present below an analysis of effectiveness by outcome.

Outcome 1: Potential and returning migrants in Nigeria and Ghana are protected through fair and effective labour migration governance frameworks.

Even there are no outcome indicators, it should be noted that the project is making good progress in achieving this outcome through supporting the Ghanaian government in finalizing the recently adopted NLMP and by supporting the Nigerian Government in revising the existing NLMP. The Ghanaian NLMP was adopted in January 2020²), while the Nigerian revision was just commencing at the time of the evaluation. Moreover, in Nigeria the insertion of migration module on the Household Survey is also a noteworthy progress towards achieving this outcome.

Output 1.1: National capacities on labour migration and reintegration strengthened through targeted training

The evaluation concluded that institutional and capacity building strengthening efforts were successful in the area of labour migration, SIYB and Financial education. Institution and capacity strengthening were conducted using several methods. Capacity strengthening was done mostly through providing training of trainers (ToT) on SIYB and FE. For the SIYB TOT 14 (12 men, and 2 women) participants were drawn from the MRCs, PECs, GIZ and MELR. For the FE TOT 12 (10 men, and 2 women) participants were drawn from the MRCs, PECs, GIZ, and Financial Institutions and various workshops on labour migration. Participants in the capacity strengthening efforts were very pleased with the content and methods used in these various trainings. The content was said to be relevant and well targeted to address the gaps and

issues. Continued capacity strengthening is needed, particularly extending it to other MRCs and PECs offices as well as the Ministries and Social partners that have not yet been covered and ensuring that other staff acquire the same level of expertise as those who had been trained. In addition, migration being dynamic, the context may change recurrently, so it will always be necessary to update and adjust capacities strengthening in accordance with changing realities.

Capacity of workers and employers organization was strengthened on Labour migration in Nigeria. The ILO in partnership with the ITUC and NLC provided training for 25 workers federations' representatives on migration and related issue. The ILO in partnership with NECA supported capacity building of employers, through training held in Lagos on migration to 24 persons. Social partners were appreciative of the capacity building provided to them. However if resources allow, they felt that there is a need to upscale such training to ensure more affiliates can benefit from such trainings.

The evaluation found that the project has achieved good progress under this output, through capacity building and policy development, impetus given to further action in improving labour migration governance.

Output 1.2: Capacity of governments to ensure the human and labour rights of migrant workers enhanced, including through support to ratification of relevant ILO Conventions

The implementation of this output is lagging behind, some preliminary discussion and advocacy work have commenced, but not much have been done yet.

Output 1.3: The design, revision or implementation of labour migration policies and action plans is supported through tripartite consultations

Government officials pointed out on the critical technical support provided by the project in the development of the newly adopted labour migration policy of Ghana and are in the process of reviewing the NLMP of Nigeria.

The ILO further supported the Ghanaian Government in concluding bilateral labour agreement with the Government of Qatar, aimed at strengthening relations between sending and receiving countries in the protection of migrant workers.

Overall, the evaluation found that appropriate steps have commenced to strengthen the Government in revising or implementation of LM policies, however there is a need to

strengthen the support and use the momentum, as there is clear commitment from the Government in both countries.

Output 1.4: The collection of disaggregated labour migration statistics is improved

The project conducted a review on the supply and demand of financial services for potential migrant workers and returnees in Ghana and Nigeria, to help inform the development of legal and policy frameworks. This research was able to show that poverty is not the only pushing factor for emigration, it was rather the mind-set of potential migrants. Evaluation interviewees, especially experts and the Government, noted that such studies are very important. Adding to the knowledge base is seen as essential to ensuring that all planning is appropriate and well targeted. The project supported the development of two policy briefs, namely, “Financial services for potential migrant workers and returnees in Nigeria” and “Potential skills development for migrants and returnees in Nigeria”.

The project has also commenced working on two policy briefs in Ghana. One on Fair recruitment, with the aim of promoting fair recruitment practice in Ghana. Another one on financial service for migrant workers, including potential migrants and returnees, with the aim to improve access to finance for the target group.

The project was able to achieve significant progress under this output especially in Nigeria, because the project was able to incorporate the ILO Labour Migration Module into the recently conducted Household Survey in Nigeria. However since the result has not been out or shared with the project yet, the evaluator was not able to review the document. In Ghana a research on migration costs have commenced. The project seems to have made positive stride under this output.

Outcome 2: Migrant Resource Centres in Nigeria and Public Employment Centres in Ghana offer services to enhance employment and income generating opportunities of potential and return migrants and support the reintegration of returnees in a sustainable manner.

The project is making significant advancement towards achieving this outcome

Through FGD with ultimate beneficiaries the evaluator found that some of the beneficiaries of the training programmes were able to establish their own businesses and some were able to improve their existing business. However, there is a need for close follow up and additional support especially in regards to access to finance and BDS support for these beneficiaries to fully engage in successful and sustainable businesses.

Due to this project, there are now six SIYB certified trainers in Ghana. Four PECs in Kumasi, Takoradi, Tema and Accra are providing counselling services for potential migrants and returnees on entrepreneurship using the knowledge they have acquired through the SIYB training. Similarly, there are now seven SIYB certified trainers in Nigeria. Three MRCs in Abuja, Lagos and Benin State are providing counselling services for potential migrants and returnees on entrepreneurship using the knowledge they have acquired through the SIYB training.

Output 2.1: Capacity of MRCs in Nigeria and PECs in Ghana to deliver gender responsive business development and management skills training to potential and returning migrants strengthened

The ILO, in partnership with FMLE and MELR, organised a national Training of Trainers (TOT) on SIYB. A total of 14 (12 men, and 2 women) participants drawn from the MRCs, PECs, GIZ and MELR, took part in the two weeks TOT workshop. Based on the training manual provided at the TOT, and with the financial and technical support of ILO, the trainers provided training on SIYB for 62 (39 men and 23 women) potential migrants and returnees in Ghana and 70 (34 men and 36 women) in Nigeria.

In Ghana four PECs in Kumasi, Takoradi, Tema and Accra are providing counselling services for potential migrants and returnees on financial education using the knowledge they have acquired through the FE training. Similarly, three MRCs in Abuja, Lagos and Benin State are providing counselling services for potential migrants and returnees on financial education using the knowledge they have acquired through the FE training. There is no gender sensitive or gender responsive product developed specifically for returnees and potential migrants yet. There is no gender specific or gender responsive support being provided particularly for men or women returnees and potential migrants, it is the same kind of support being provided to all beneficiaries.

Output 2.2: Financial capabilities of potential/returning migrants strengthened and access to gender-sensitive financial products improved

The ILO, in partnership with FMLE and MELR, organized a national Training of Trainers (TOT) on Financial Education (FE) jointly for Ghana and Nigeria. A total of 12 participants (10 men, and 2 women) drawn from the MRCs, PECs, GIZ, and Financial Institutions, took part in the one week TOT workshop. Based on the training manual provided at the TOT, and with the financial and technical support of the ILO, at the time of the evaluation, the trained facilitators in Nigeria were preparing to roll-out the FE training to beneficiaries.

More comprehensive support should be provided for the ultimate beneficiaries, if the project intends to achieve its economic empowerment component objective, as it is now, it is unlikely that all beneficiaries will be economically active unless the training is followed up by access to finance, mentoring and BDS support to enable the beneficiaries start livelihood activity. The project have concluded the first part of this output, which is training, however need to work on the other component, which is improve access to gender sensitive financial product.

Output 2.3: Learning partnership between implementation partners and ILO established to build knowledge on promoting employment and income earning opportunities and supporting reintegration in a sustainable manner

This output has not commenced, none of the activities have been implemented yet.

The mainstreaming of crosscutting issues, differs as follows:

Gender & Non-discrimination: it received substantial attention in the design, but not much during implementation. The number of female beneficiaries in the training seems to be much less than male beneficiaries. This can partly be explained by the fact that the Government assigns more male officials to benefit from these training than women. The project plans to consider the specific needs of men and women beneficiaries in the economic reintegration of returnees and potential migrants by taking into account the sociocultural gender differences and capacitate the service providers accordingly, so that they can provide gender responsive support to the beneficiaries. So far, the capacity building effort has mainly focused on the skills aspect of SIYB and FE. Going forward, there should be a bit more focus on gender issues, especially through advocacy and ensuring that 50% of the beneficiaries are women. Moreover, there should be solid recommendation on gender mainstreaming in the revision of NLMP in Nigeria.

Promotion of international labour standards: The ratification of relevant ILO Conventions on migrant workers, by Nigeria or Ghana, is under discussion with the relevant Ministry. The advocacy for ratification is also one of the delivery of this project under output 1.2.

Tripartism and social dialogue: The project works with a series of government organisations and social partners, however there is need to improve the engagement, so far the engagement has been limited. There is a need for a structured engagement with the constituents. The project should establish a Project Steering Committee in both countries, which comprise of tripartite partners, other relevant stakeholders and the Donor, to guide the project and provide policy guidance and strategy.

Finally, based on the achievements discussed above, the project needs to make substantial progress in achieving its planned medium-term and long-term outcomes by the end of the project. However, in the coming weeks there is a need for the project to sit together with the constituents and see how to re-focus the project taking into account constituents priorities as well as the timeline and financial resources available. Given that there was lack of consultation in the design stage, such consultations is critical to get the buy-in of the constituents and ensure ownership and sustainability.

Generally, it can be concluded that the project has been making progress towards some of its planned activities, but a substantial number of activities are still to take off and that other activities still need to be completed. , The project will require intensified efforts in capacity building and institutional strengthening across the country in order to improve labour migration governance in the country. Most of the PECs and MRCs have limited capacity in regards to human, financial and technical to address migration. The project needs to further advocate to the government at the highest level on the importance of improving LM Governance in the country.

While it was not initially intended, the project has gone beyond the borders of Ghana in working towards improving labour migration Governance. The ILO provided technical support to the Ghanaian Government, in negotiating and concluding bilateral agreements with Qatar Government. Even though unintended this support contribute towards achieving the project overall objective, which is to improve labour migration governance.

3.4. Efficiency of resource use

Efficiency of the resource used was assed based on primary and secondary sources, such as project financial report, progress report, and the PRODOC and triangulated through interviews with the relevant partners and ILO project staff in Abuja and Accra. The total budget is USD 1.4 Million fully funded by GIZ. The evaluation found that the resources (human resources, time, expertise, funds etc.) have been allocated and used strategically to provide the necessary support and to achieve the broader project objectives. The project initiatives generally appear to have delivered value for money and this was confirmed by the key stakeholders interviewed including the donor and key government organisations, for example, through collaboration with the other ILO project, they cost shared the regional fair recruitment report for Ghana and Nigeria.

From the start of the project in January 2019 until February 2020 the expenditures had reached in total only 25% of the total project budget of US\$, 1.4 million and as can be seen in the above, a sequence of important activities have already taken place.

Moreover, there is only one Finance/administrative support in Abuja and Ghana this takes away time from both the NPC's to engage in more strategic work because they are caught up in doing both technical and administrative work. The resources and inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) have generally been allocated and used strategically to achieve the planned results, but some imbalances have been perceived, for example, limited resources have been allocated for activities the require more resources, while more resource have been allocated for activity that require limited resources.

Some of the activities have been delivered in a timely manner, while others have been lagging behind and others have not yet started. For example, the work on the ratification of the convention and knowledge has not been implemented other than preliminary discussion and advocacy, with 0% of the budget used by February 2020 while the project end date is June 2020. This is mainly attributed to the late start of the project. The financial overview and spending per activity could not be analysed further as the financial report available was not based on outcome based workplan. The budget was generally spent according to proposed budget lines in the project document. The evaluator considers that the interventions were certainly worthwhile, given the feedback received from stakeholders. However, it should be noted, that some work could not be carried out as fully desired due to lack of planning and availability of resources. For example, cascading the SIYB and FE training to ultimate beneficiaries was difficult because it is costly and it was not envisaged at the design stage. Hence, unless the government can mobilize resources to cascade the training to the ultimate beneficiaries, it will stop by the already trained beneficiaries.

Efficiency of resource use, including the time of project staff, was affected by the ILO financial disbursement processes. The project staff had to spend an inordinate amount of time trying to understand and meet the requirements of the complex financial approval systems due to the staff being new and not having adequate understanding of the ILO financial processes. The project personnel's should have been trained and well acquainted with the ILO Financial rules and processes at the time of appointment to ensure efficiency. The financial disbursement challenges are not unique to this project, however 2 out of 3 project staff being new to the ILO and appointed only 6 months before the evaluation, it clearly revelled challenges on project delivery.

The project received adequate technical and political support from the ILO CO Abuja and specialists in the field (Dakar, Abuja), ITC-ILO as well as the relevant technical units in headquarters. The Country Director is very supportive and provides the required support as needed. ILO officials and project staff indicated that the donor's flexibility to accept changes in the project because of the contextual realities was very important. The specialists in Abuja and Dakar continue to provide technical support to the project as required, for example, the support in improving data in Nigeria was supported by the specialist in Dakar. The project partnered with ITC-ILO and was in the process of organizing training on labour migration for partners at the time of the evaluation. The GIZ in turn confirmed that the working relationship had been good, open and regular from both sides. An M&E plan was in place and project management monitored performance but it is activity-based. Lack of outputs and outcomes targets and milestones made it difficult to see the results and to understand what was expected to be achieved in 13 months. Progress reporting was adequate and in agreement with the rules that both the ILO and the GIZ set for such reporting.

Actual expenditures have been rather limited in 2019, while expecting to pick up in 2020. As a result, in the second half of the project 75% of the budget still needs to be spent; there are of course already secured commitments made for 5% of the total budget. Nevertheless, sustained efforts and proper planning are required to be able to spend all of the three quarters including commitments within the second half of the project.

3.5. Impact Orientation and Sustainability

Impact orientation and sustainability were evaluated mainly through relying on secondary sources such as national development strategy, UNSDP, the project document, project reports and crosschecked through interviews with relevant partners, ILO project staff in Accra and Abuja as well as FGD with project beneficiaries. The major project strategies for ensuring the sustainability are appropriate, these comprise of human and institutional capacity building, and the move by government to achieve international standards in regard to migration and human rights through, developing/revising NLMP, bilateral agreements and ratification of convention.

At least, four of the seven outputs of the project focus directly on human and institutional capacity building, namely:

- Output 1.1: National capacities on labour migration and reintegration strengthened through targeted training.

- Output 1.2: Capacity of governments to ensure the human and labour rights of migrant workers enhanced, including through support to ratification of relevant ILO Conventions.
- Output 2.1: Capacity of MRCs in Nigeria and PECs in Ghana to deliver gender responsive business development and management skills training to potential and returning migrants strengthened.
- Output 2.2: Financial capabilities of potential/returning migrants strengthened and access to gender-sensitive financial products improved

To this end, the project has organized Training of Trainers workshop on SIYB and FE for technical experts. Participants were represented from FMLE, MELR, MRC, PRC and GIZ. The evaluation observed that similar training will continue to be given with focus on the different locations in Ghana and Nigeria. There was also capacity building of social partners in Nigeria and such training will also be provided for Ghanaian social partners.

The project has also taken steps in organizing a training on Labour Migration Statistics in Nigeria and another one on Labour Migration jointly for Nigeria and Ghana, which is expected to take place in February 2020 and March 2020 respectively.

Moreover, the project has improved Operational Framework for regular cooperative action between Ghana and Qatar. Although the process is still at the formative stage, the conclusion of bilateral agreements between Ghana and Qatar will go a long way in the protection of migrant workers in destination countries.

There has been direct initial signs of impact on returnees and potential migrants, out of the 135 project SIYB and FE beneficiaries, some of them have started income generating activities as self-employed and/or wage employment and are leading a decent life.

Overall, it seems that both outcomes achievements could continue to be applicable beyond the life of the project as these are in line with the NLMP and day to day activity of the MRCs and PECs. However more in-depth work need to be done by the project. Generally, the results of *Outcome 1* are embedded in the structures and policies of the Ministries. Regarding the revision and development of the NLMP in Nigeria and Ghana respectively, improvement on labour migration governance can be achieved, provided all of the proposed steps are completed. In Nigeria the revision and adoption of the policy may not happen within the life span of the project given the limited time left. In Ghana the launch of the NLMP in Ghana is too recent. In addition, this first outcome focuses on capacity building which is the ground for sustainability

both on human and institutional development dimensions of it. The results of *Outcome 2* also show a clear sustainable character as it focuses on improving knowledge and enhancing capacity. However, ownership of the project has been relatively low due to lack of consultation during design and lack of engagement during implementation of relevant stakeholders. However given that the project objectives fit well with national priorities, this can be easily be improved through more engagement of stakeholders in project implementation and management. Partners need to be provided with opportunities to play a role in guiding the direction of the project through project advisory committees (PAC).

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

4.1. Conclusion

It can be concluded that the project is going in the right direction, however due to the delay in implementation, the timeline is too tight to achieve the set objectives.

The conclusions below are presented according to the five Evaluation Criteria distinguished throughout this report.

Relevance and strategic fit

1. The project is highly relevant. It is consistent with the priorities of Ghana and Nigeria's development strategy. The project is also very much in line with the SDG, UNSDP, ILO P & B, DWCP and GIZ migration policy. The objectives of the project are very consistent with the beneficiaries' needs, because the project intended to support the protection of the migrant workers while overseas, and create employment opportunities upon their return, which is very much in line with the NLMPs and national strategies of employment creation of both countries.
2. While the project's overall goal and objectives are clearly stated, these can be overly ambitious and there are too many activities within the very limited timeline and budget.
3. In addition, as there was lack of consultation among relevant stakeholders (especially ILO constituencies) during project design and limited involvement of them during implementation and in project management. There is a need to go back to the drawing board in partnership with relevant stakeholders and prioritize the outputs based on the limited time and resource available as well as constituents' priorities.
4. While gender and ILS issues have received substantial attention, tripartism and social dialogue were not addressed.

Effectiveness

1. The project has been making progress towards some of its planned activities, but a substantial number of activities are still to take off and that other activities still need to be completed. There has been a delay, the project needs to make substantial progress in achieving its planned outcome.
2. Constituent's engagement in the design and implementation of the project has been limited, there is a need for the project to sit together with the constituents and see how

to re-focus the project taking into account constituents priorities as well as the timeline and financial resources available.

3. The project require intensified efforts in capacity building and institutional strengthening across the country in order to improve labour migration governance in the country.
4. Most of the PECs and MRCs have limited capacity in regards to human, financial and technical to address migration.
5. The project needs to further advocate to the government at the highest level on the importance of improving LM Governance in the country.

Efficiency

1. The project initiatives generally appear to have been delivered as per planned budget.
2. Spending had initially been very low, the project need to pick up the pace to ensure delivery within the limited time left.
3. The project appear to be too ambitious, the budget was comparatively small to achieve the many lofty expected results.
4. Reporting has been quite transparent during the first year.
5. The project submit bi-annual progress reports to GIZ, this should also be extended to Constituents.
6. Staffing had been limited given the timeline and density of the project.

Impact orientation and Sustainability

1. The project outcomes can be sustainable because are embedded on the national legal frameworks and in developing human and institutional capacities. Human and institutional capacity building have been a major focus area in the delivery of this project.
2. The evaluation found that most of these interventions have made significant impact on the target beneficiaries, namely the Government, social partners, potential migrants and returnees and ensure sustainability. However there is a lack of ownership by the partners, which need to be improved in the second half of the project.

4.2. Recommendations

The recommendations will be presented in this section according to the five Evaluation Criteria distinguished throughout this report.

Relevance

- 1) Maintain the overall current project design as it is still valid and relevant for the two countries, but mobilize more resources to move towards providing a more comprehensive support to the beneficiaries (returnees) and extending the support to the remote areas in the country.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO, GIZ & Constituents	High	Medium term	High

Validity

- 2) It is recommended that the Constituents should be actively involved in prioritizing outputs taking into account what is realistically achievable taking into consideration the project timeframe and resources available.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO, GIZ & Constituents	High	Short term	Low

- 3) The Bi-annual progress reports being submitted to GIZ, should also be submitted to the Constituents.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO	High	Short term	Low

Effectiveness

- 4) Revise the M&E plan to include targets for outputs and indicators with baselines and targets for outcomes baselines

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO	Medium	Medium term	No resource required

- 5) Ensure that the MRCs and PECs provide gender specific support to potential migrants and returnees.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO, GIZ & Constituents	High	Long term	High

- 6) Provide continuous expanded support for the beneficiaries of the SIYB training, including access to finance, mentoring, business development service, market linkage, coaching and additional training if possible.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO, GIZ & Constituents	High	Short term	Medium

Efficiency

- 7) Strengthen the project team and the project management by employing a finance assistant and driver in each country, Ghana and Nigeria

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO & GIZ	High	Short term	No resource required

- 8) Provide clarity on the roles and responsibilities of the personnel of the project and technical backstopping support. Clarity of project management internally is required.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO	High	Short term	No resource required

- 9) Develop expenditure plan to prioritize the various activities that still need to be undertaken in the second half of the Project, including an action plan to speed up the level of delivery.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO	High	Short term	Resource available

Impact and Sustainability

- 10) Reach out more actively to the constituents including employers' and workers' organisations and relevant partners such as IOM in the implementation and management of the project. For example, one venue to involve the constituents is through establishing project steering Committee to ensure ownership and sustainability.

Responsible Unit	Priority	Time Implication	Resource Implication
ILO & Constituents	High	Short term	Low

3. Lessons Learned and Good Practices

This chapter compiles three lessons learned (LL) and two good practices (GP), namely:

3.1. Lessons learned

- LL1: The number of outputs and activities identified in the Project Document must be proportionate to the human and financial resources available and timeline in order to ensure timely delivery of the project outputs towards its outcomes achievement.
- LL2: Enabling the potential migrants and returnees to start livelihood activity requires support in various strategic areas simultaneously and in a long-term perspective.
- LL3: The effectiveness of the TOT for methodologies such as SIYB and FE requires to consider in the project that the trainees can have the opportunity to cascade the training to ultimate beneficiaries and that these last group can apply what they have learned in their livelihood.

Good practices

- GP1: The setting up of Coordination mechanism among labour migration projects within the ILO Country Office in Abuja is an important step towards enhancing oversight, coordination, synergy, and complementarity, as well as to avoid overlaps.
- GP2: Embedding the project implementation within existing local institutions. One of the two component of the project is to strengthen the capacity of the MRC's and PECs to offer services for potential migrants and returnees. Even though these institutions have limited capacities, it is worth investing in their capacities, as it will ensure sustainability even after the project phase out. The project embedded all implementation within existing structures and focused on strengthening their capacity to support potential migrants and returnees.

These Lessons Learned and Good Practices will be further discussed in detail in annexes 6 and 7.

Annex 1: Terms of Reference for Mid-Term Evaluation

Project Title	Initiative for Labour Migration Employment and Reintegration (LMER) in Nigeria and Ghana.
Implementer	ILO CO for Nigeria, Ghana, Liberia and Sierra Leone
Partners	Federal Ministry of Labour and Employment (FMLE); Ministry for Employment and Labour Relations (MELR).
Backstopping Units	MIGRANT
Donor	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH (GIZ).
Budget	EUR 1,230,690
Duration	January 2019 – June 2020
Type of Evaluation	Internal
Timing of Evaluation	Midterm

I. Project Description

The International Labour Organization (ILO) is implementing the Initiative for Labour Migration Employment and Reintegration (LMER) in Nigeria and Ghana that is funded by the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH (GIZ).

The project identifies labour migration as an important feature of contemporary labour markets globally and was designed to contribute to strengthening labour migration governance and enhancing capacities of relevant actors in the two target countries.

Labour migration, as a critical development dynamic for promoting sustainable development and in view of the potential benefits it offers to both origin and destination countries, is increasingly prioritized by national and international policy agendas as highlighted by both the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration.

The project outcomes are:

1. Potential and returning migrants in Nigeria and Ghana are protected through fair and effective labour migration governance frameworks.
2. Migrant Resource Centres in Nigeria and Public Employment Centres in Ghana offer services to enhance employment and income generating opportunities of potential and return migrants and support the reintegration of returnees in a sustainable manner.

Under the first outcome, the project aims to promote institutional capacity, policy development and implementation as well as the ratification of relevant ILO Conventions.

The second outcome aims to capacitate resource centres for potential and returning migrants in the areas of business skills development and access to finance. In this are staff of resource centres in Nigeria and Ghana have already been certified as trainers in the ILO Start and Improve Your Business (SIYB) programme and access to finance for potential and returning migrants has been assessed. In November 2019, a training-of-trainers on financial education will be organized.

The initiative is implemented in recognition of other existing and ongoing programmes/initiatives being supported by both the ILO and GIZ.

The project major results up to December 2019, as reported by the project, are:

The major results achieved as at December 2019 include:

9. Capacity of Migration Resource Centres (MRCs) in Nigeria, Public Employment Centres (PECs) in Ghana and Ghanaian/Nigerian-German Centres for Jobs, Migration and Reintegration built in the provision of gender-responsive business development and financial services;
10. Staff of MRCs/PECs and Ghanaian/Nigerian-German Centres certified as trainers for the Start and Improve Your Business (SIYB) Programme;
11. Staff of PECs/MRCs, Ghanaian/Nigerian-German Centres and micro-finance institutions trained on ILO Microfinance and Financial Education Work Package;
12. Assessment of financial services available to potential and return migrants Nigeria and Ghana conducted;

13. Capacity of trade union organizations on effective labour migration in Nigeria enhanced;
14. Collection of labour migration data in Nigeria supported.

2. Project alignment with the DWCP, P&B, CPO & SDG

The project contributes to Outcome 9 of the ILO's Programme and Budget for 2018-19 on fair and effective international labour migration and mobility and in particular indicator 9.1 on fair labour migration policies, legislation, bilateral or multilateral agreements, protection of migrant workers and the functioning of labour markets. It will also link to Global Product 256 on labour migration governance.

In Nigeria, it contributes to ILO Country Programme Outcome NGA 904 on rights-based labour migration, and Outcome 9.2.1 of the Decent Work Country Programme on improved labour migration management.

In Ghana, the initiative contributes to the Decent Work Country Programme in particular through Outcomes 1.1 on youth employment and 1.3 on income-generating opportunities and job security and GHA 904.

The project contributes to the achievement of SDG 8 in both countries – Nigeria and Ghana.

3. PROJECT MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENT

The project team reports to the Director, ILO Country Office covering Nigeria, Ghana, Sierra Leone and Liberia. The team comprises the following staff:

- National Project Coordinator, Nigeria
- National Project Coordinator, Ghana
- Finance and Administrative Assistant, Nigeria

In August 2019, a first progress report was submitted to the donor.

4. x. Evaluation background

ILO considers evaluation as an integral part of the implementation of technical cooperation activities. This project will go through one internal and one independent evaluations. Both evaluations will be managed by ILO/EVAL ILO officer certified as evaluation managers. The first one will be implemented for a trained internal evaluator and the second one by an independent evaluator.

The evaluation in ILO is for the purpose of accountability, learning, planning and building knowledge. It should be conducted in the context of criteria and approaches for international development assistance as established by: the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standard; and the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System.

This evaluation will follow the ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation; and the ILO EVAL Policy Guidelines Checklist 3 "Preparing the inception report"; Checklist 4 "Validating methodologies"; and Checklist 5 "Preparing the evaluation report".

The evaluation will follow the OECD-DAC framework and principles for evaluation. For all practical purposes, this ToR and ILO Evaluation policies and guidelines define the overall scope

of this evaluation. Recommendations, emerging from the evaluation, should be strongly linked to the findings of the evaluation and should provide clear guidance to stakeholders on how they can address them.

5. PURPOSE OF THE MIDTERM EVALUATION

The purpose of midterm evaluation for the ILO project is to:

- i) Assess the implementation of the project to date, identifying factors affecting project implementation (positively and negatively). If necessary, propose revisions to the expected level of achievement of the objectives and corrective actions the project could take;
- ii) Analyse the implementation strategies of the project with regard to their potential effectiveness in achieving the project outcomes and impacts; including unexpected results.
- iii) Review the strategies for sustainability
- iv) Identify the contributions of the project to the National Development Plans, the SDGs, the UN development frameworks, the ILO objectives and its synergy with other projects and programs;
- v) Identify lessons learned and potential good practices for the key stakeholders.
- vi) Provide strategic recommendations for the different key stakeholders to improve implementation of the project activities and attainment of project objectives

The midterm evaluation findings will take into consideration the project duration, existing resources, and political and environmental conditions through an analysis that will assess the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats during the project implementation period.

6. EVALUATION SCOPE AND QUESTIONS

The evaluation should address the overall ILO evaluation concerns such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact as defined in the ILO Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation, 2017:

www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/--eval/documents/publication/wcms_571339.pdf

The review will address the following ILO evaluation concerns;

- Relevance and strategic fit of the project;
- Validity of the project design;
- Project effectiveness;
- Efficiency of resource use;
- Sustainability of project achievements/results;
- Impact orientation;

Throughout the different criteria the cross-cutting themes: Gender equality and non-discrimination, ILS, tripartism and social dialogue and just transition towards environmental sustainability.

Specifically, the midterm evaluation will answer the following evaluation questions:

The evaluator shall examine the following key issues:

1. Relevance and strategic fit:
 - Is the project relevant to the government's strategy, policy and plan in the area of promoting effective labour migration governance, as well as other relevant regional and global commitments such as relevant SDG targets and indicators, countries UNDAFs/UNSDCFs and ILOs strategic Objectives?
 - Is the project relevant to the felt needs of the beneficiaries?
 - How does the project complement and fit into other key ongoing programmes and projects in the country related to the project subjects?
2. Validity of design
 - Does the project have an implicit or explicit theory of Change? How has it been understood by the project team and other key stakeholders
 - Does the design take into account monitoring needs that might help in showing the project's contributions to relevant SDGs targets and indicators?
 - Has the design clearly defined outcomes, outputs and performance indicators and targets (plus baselines for the outcome level)?
 - Did the project design include an integrated and appropriate strategy for sustainability?
 - Was the implementation approach valid and realistic? Has the project adequately taken into account external positive and negative factors (risks and assumptions)?
 - Has the project addressed the cross-cutting themes in the project document?
3. Project effectiveness
 - To what extent has each of the expected objectives and their related outputs have been achieved according to the work plan or are likely to be achieved and why?
 - Has the project successfully built or strengthened an enabling environment (systems, policies, people's attitudes, etc.) that supported achievements of desired outcomes?
 - What have been the main contributing and challenging factors towards project's success in attaining its targets?
 - What, if any, unintended positive and negative results of the project have been identified or perceived?
4. Efficiency of resource use
 - Have resources (financial, human, technical support, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the project outputs/outcomes?
 - Were the project's activities/operations in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the project team and work plans? If not, what are the factors that hinder timely delivery and what are the counter measures taken to address these issues?
 - Were the disbursements and project expenditures in line with expected budgetary plans? If not, what were the bottlenecks encountered? Were they being used efficiently?
5. Effectiveness of management arrangements
 - Are the available technical and financial resources adequate to fulfil the project plans? If not, what other kind of resources may be required?

- Is the management and governance arrangement of the project adequate? Is there a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities by all parties involved?
 - How effectively has the project management and relevant stakeholders monitored project performance and results?
 - Is a monitoring & evaluation system in place and how effective is it? Is relevant information systematically collected and collated? Is the data disaggregated by sex (and by other relevant characteristics, such as people with disabilities and other disadvantaged groups the project might have identified)?
 - Has the project created positive relationship and cooperation with relevant national, regional and local level government authorities and other relevant stakeholders to implement the project?
 - Is the project receiving adequate administrative, technical and - if needed - policy support from the ILO COs and specialists in the field (ROAF) and the responsible technical unit (MIGRANT) in headquarters?
6. Impact orientation and sustainability
- What influence has the project had on the development of policies and practices at national level?
 - Which project-supported tools have been institutionalized by partners and/or replicated or external organizations?
 - To what extent is the project likely to bring lasting changes in norms and policies on the project subject?
 - Has the project implemented an exit strategy to allow continuation of relevant results?
 - To which extent are the results of the intervention likely to have a long term, sustainable positive contribution to the SDG and relevant targets? (explicitly or implicitly)

7. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

The mid-term evaluation will comply with evaluation norms and standards and follow ethical safeguards, all as specified in ILO's evaluation procedures. The ILO adheres to the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) evaluation norms and standards as well as to the OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards. The evaluation is an independent evaluation and the final methodology and evaluation questions will be determined by the consultant in consultation with the Evaluation Manager.

The evaluation will apply multiple approaches including qualitative and participatory approach, engaging with key stakeholders of the project during the design, field work, validation and reporting stages. To collect the data for analysis, the evaluation will make use of the techniques listed below (but not limit to). The data from these sources will be triangulated to increase the validity and rigor of the evaluation findings.

Desk review of project design and strategy documents, activity documents, communications and research and publications.

Key informant interviews with project staff, relevant ILO specialists, tripartite constituents, civil society organizations and other stakeholders and partners

Focus group discussions with beneficiaries (women and men)

Presentation of the preliminary findings to stakeholders at a workshop in Abuja (if possible with use of skype for participation of stakeholders in Ghana). The workshop will be technically organized by the evaluator and logistically by the project.

1. MAIN DELIVERABLES

- 1) An inception report (not more than 20 pages excluding the annexes) - upon the review of available documents and an initial discussion with the project management (EVAL Guidelines –Checklist 3). The inception report will:
 - Describe the conceptual framework that will be used to undertake the evaluation;
 - Elaborate the methodology proposed in the TOR with changes as required;
 - Set out in some detail the data required to answer the evaluation questions, data sources by specific evaluation questions, data collection methods, sampling and selection criteria of respondents for interviews
 - Detail the work plan for the evaluation, indicating the phases in the evaluation, their key deliverables and milestones;
 - Set out the list of key stakeholders to be interviewed and the tools to be used for interviews and discussions.
 - Set out outline for the final evaluation report
- 2) The ILO will organize a half day meeting to present the preliminary findings of the evaluation after data collection is completed. The evaluator will develop a PowerPoint presentation and work with the evaluation manager to set the agenda for the half-day meeting. The presentation should provide a brief review of key results for each evaluation criteria
- 3) First draft of Evaluation Report (Checklist 5 to be used). The Evaluation Manager holds the responsibility of approving this draft. The draft review report will be shared with all relevant stakeholders and a request for comments will be asked within a specified time (not more than 14 working days).
- 4) Final evaluation report incorporating comments received of ILO and other key stakeholders. The report should be no longer than 30 pages excluding annexes with executive summary (as per ILO standard format for evaluation summary). The quality of the report will be assessed against the EVAL checklist 5 and 6. Any identified lessons learnt and good practices will also need to have standard annex templates as per EVAL

guidelines. The report should also include as an annex section on output and outcome level results against indicators and targets of each project.

The draft and final versions of the evaluation report in English (maximum 40 pages plus annexes) will be developed under the following structure (Checklist 5 and 6):

1. Cover page with key project data as per ILO template.
2. Table of contents
3. Acronyms
4. Executive Summary
5. Background of the project and its intervention logic
6. Purpose, scope and clients of evaluation
7. Methodology, evaluation questions and limitations
8. Review of implementation
9. Presentation of findings
10. Conclusions and Recommendations (including to whom they are addressed, priority level, resources implication and timing)
11. Lessons Learnt and potential good practices
12. Annexes (TOR, list of people interviewed, Schedule of the field work, list of Documents reviewed, other relevant information).

8. DURATION OF ASSIGNMENT

The Assignment is expected to commence on 20th January 2020 and end on 18th February 2020, within which 20 working days shall be allotted as workdays for the Evaluator.

9. MID TERM EVALUATION WORK PLAN

Deliverable	Responsibility	No of Working Days	Dates
Desk review of documents by the consultant and Submission of Inception report to ILO	Evaluator	5 days	27 – 31 Jan
Field work in Accra, Lagos and Abuja Validation workshop in Abuja	Evaluator	10 days	3 rd - 14 th Feb
Development of the draft report	Evaluator	5 days	17 – 21 Feb
Sharing the draft report to stakeholders for comments	Evaluation manager		24 Feb – 6 March

Consolidated comments on the draft report, sent to the evaluator	Evaluation manager		9 March
Development of the final evaluation report addressing the comments	Evaluator	2 days	10 - 13 March
Submission of the revised report to ROAF SMEO	Evaluation manager		16 March
Final approval	ROAF SMEO		17 – 18 March
Total evaluator working days		22 days	

10. Management arrangements, work plan & time frame

The evaluator will report to the evaluation manager, Ms Chinyere Emeka-Anuna with whom she should discuss any technical and methodological matters. The evaluation manager will supervise the evaluator.

The evaluation will be carried out with full logistical support of the project staff in Abuja, Lagos and Accra with the administrative support of the ILO Office in Abuja.

All draft and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided to the evaluation manager in electronic version compatible with Word for Windows.

The first draft of the report will be circulated to all partners for a two weeks review. Comments from stakeholders will be presented to the evaluator by the evaluation manager for its integration into the final reports as appropriate or to document why a comment has not been included,

Evaluator responsibilities

The evaluation will be conducted by an internal evaluator selected by the Regional SMEO for Africa based on a short list composed of those certified and linked with the subject and not working directly with project.

Responsibilities

Responsibilities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desk review of programme documents • Briefing with ILO/ Evaluation Manager • Development of the evaluation instrument as a part of the Inception report • Telephone interviews with ILO and development partners • Undertake interviews with stakeholders and key informants • Undertake field visits in projects areas

- Facilitate the stakeholders workshop
- Draft evaluation report
- Final evaluation report

11. RESOURCES

Estimated resource requirements at this point:

- Evaluator: travel to Nigeria and Ghana including flights and DSA days
- Local transportation in both countries
- Stakeholders' workshop

ANNEX 1: RELEVANT POLICIES AND GUIDELINES

ILO Policy Guidelines for evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 3rd ed.

http://www.ilo.ch/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS_571339/lang--en/index.htm

Code of conduct form (To be signed by the evaluators)

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206205/lang--en/index.htm

Checklist No. 3: Writing the inception report

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165972/lang--en/index.htm

Checklist 5: preparing the evaluation report

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165967/lang--en/index.htm

Checklist 6: rating the quality of evaluation report

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165968/lang--en/index.htm

Template for lessons learnt and Emerging Good Practices

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206158/lang--en/index.htm

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_206159/lang--en/index.htm

Guidance note 7: Stakeholders participation in the ILO evaluation

https://www.ilo.org/global/docs/WCMS_165982/lang--en/index.htm

Guidance note 4: Integrating gender equality in the monitoring and evaluation of projects

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_165986/lang--en/index.htm

Template for evaluation title page

http://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationguidance/WCMS_166357/lang--en/index.htm

Template for evaluation summary

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

Monitoring and Evaluation Standards (DFAT)

<http://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Documents/monitoring-evaluation-standards.pdf>

UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation

<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/548>

Annex 2: Question matrix

Evaluation Criteria and Questions	Sources of Data	Stakeholder Interviews	Specific Methods
A. Relevance and strategic fit			
1. To what extent are the objectives of the project consistent with the beneficiaries' requirements, relevant to country needs and global commitment?	Government Policies & Strategies, DWCPs, PRODOC	Project Team, MELR/ FMLE, Social Partners, Donor, CO Abuja, GIZ, MRC/PEC- Partners	Document review; Interviews; FGD; Field visit
2. To what extent does the project complement and fit with other on-going GIZ initiatives and other programmes and projects in the country as well as other relevant migration initiatives?	Donor Programmes, Government Policies & Strategies, PRODOC, Progress Report (PR)	Same as above	Same as above
B. Validity of the project design			
3. To what extent are the project design (objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities) and its underlining theory of change logical and coherent?	PRODOC, PR, log frame, M & E plan	Same as above	Same as above
4. How appropriate and useful are the indicators described in the project document in assessing the project's progress? Are indicators gender sensitive and taken into account tripartism and social dialogue?	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
5. Were any lessons learned from previous projects in the area?	PRODOC	Same as above	Same as above
6. Were the outputs achievable or overly ambitious?	PRODOC, PR, Log Frame	Same as above	Same as above
C. Effectiveness (including effectiveness of management arrangement)			
7. To what extent has the project been making sufficient progress towards its planned results?	DWCPs, PRODOC, PRs, Log Frame	Project Team, MELR/ FMLE, Social partners, Donor, CO Abuja, GIZ, MRC/PEC- Partners	Document review; Interviews; FGD; Field visits
8. Will the project be likely to achieve its planned long-term and medium-term outcomes by the end of the project?	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above

9. Were there any non-planned effects and were these good or bad?	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
10. What have been the main contributing and challenging factors towards project's success in attaining its targets?	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
11. To what extent have stakeholders, particularly workers' and employers' organizations been involved in projects implementation?	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
12. The extent to which gender mainstreaming has been addressed in the design and implementation of the project?	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
13. Is the project receiving adequate administrative, technical and - if needed - policy support from the ILO COs and specialists in the field (ROAF) and the responsible technical unit (MIGRANT) in headquarters	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
14. To what extent do the project management capacities and arrangements put in place support the achievement of the planned results?	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
15. In how far does this also apply to the other cross-cutting issues of non-discrimination, promotion of international labour standards, and tripartite processes?	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
D. Efficiency			
16. How well have resources and inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) been allocated or used strategically to achieve the planned results?	PRODOC, PR, Financial Reports to GIZ, Log Frame	Project Team, MELR/ FMLE, Social partners, Donor, CO Abuja, GIZ, MRC/PEC- Partners	Document review; Interviews; FGD; Field visits
17. Have they been delivered in a timely manner? If not, what were the factors that have hindered timely delivery of outputs? Any measures that have been put in place?	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
18. To what extent have the project resources been leveraged with other related interventions to maximize impact, if any?	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
19. Was the budget spent according to the proposed budget lines?	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
20. Was the rate of spending acceptable and according to plan?	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above

E. Impact orientation and Sustainability				
21. To what extent are the planned results of the project likely to be durable and can be maintained or even scaled up and replicated by other partners after the project phase out?	PR, PRODOC, relevant partners documents, Government Policies & Strategies	Project Team, MELR/ FMLE, Tripartite stakeholders, Donor, CO Abuja, GIZ, MRC/PEC- Partners	Document review; Interviews; FGD; Field visits	
22. How effective has the project been in establishing national/local ownership?	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	
23. To what extent has the project strengthened the capacities of the government structures?	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	
24. Has the project increased or decreased dependency on outside intervention?	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	
25. To what extent there is evidence of positive changes in the life of the ultimate project beneficiaries?	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	
26. To what extent is the impact sustainable over the longer term?	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	<i>Same as above</i>	

Annex 3: Evaluation Tools

INTERVIEW GUIDE –PROJECT STAFF and PECs

Introductory questions:

Name:

Position of the interviewed person:

Provide Brief on the project and the purpose of the interview.

- Reports read: *“This project is expected to build on GIZ and IOM’s work in strengthening labour migration governance, enhance employment prospects of potential or return migrants and support the reintegration of returnees”*. Please, explain the scope of the initiative and the specific role of this project within the broader work of PEC and GIZ-GCC.
- How was the process of design? Joint design with National Institutions? ILO protocols applied?
- Theory of change developed? (Not found among the documents)
- Explain assessment, diagnosis, mapping, baseline studies conducted. Were they useful inputs for the purpose of decision making? Were they participatory? Are they being used for monitoring and impact assessment? If you have not conducted baseline, how did you get the information?
- Involvement of Stakeholders and Target Groups, Government, social partners, donor, ultimate beneficiaries in the project design?
- How is the project aligned to existing strategies, programs...? PRODOC refers to Links to Programme and Budget (P&B), Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP). The UNSDF being aligned to the Ghana development strategy. Please explain
- Examples of applications of previously developed tools, methodologies, approaches, etc. such as Start & Improve Your Business (SIYB)
- Explain / describe the criteria applied for selection of communities and target groups.
- Flexibility to adapt to unexpected or changing circumstances. Mechanisms used to adapt to new circumstances.
- The design itself: was logical and coherent? Are the 2 results the right choice? Were gender issues, ILS, tripartism and social dialogue duly considered? The same for sustainability?
- Is the expected result realistic?

- Has the budget been adequate and enough to implement the program of activities?
- What could be improved concerning the design process?

Implementation capacity /management arrangements:

- Can you assess the delivery process of these activities, performance, achievement of targets, etc.? Examples of success and or failures, underachievement, etc. Reasons/Explanations for one and the other.
- The Progress Report refers to delay in recruitment of staff and delays in project implementation, has this been progressively overcome, if not how do you think this can be overcome. Please, expand
- Assess commitment and ownership by local stakeholders
- Examples of complementation, use of comparative advantages and synergies between ILO, GIZ and IOM programmes Can you refer to some examples of complementation and synergies between the different Programmes
- Management of resources: resources have been available on time and disbursed on time?
- Assess the governance structure: Steering Committee and TWG. Coordination mechanisms with service providers.
- Is the project receiving adequate administrative, technical and - if needed - policy support from the ILO COs and specialists in the field (ROAF) and the responsible technical unit (MIGRANT) in headquarters?

Direct Achievements:

- Discuss achievements in each of the 2 results: capacity building of relevant actors and PEC's and policy development substantiated with examples.
- Strengths and weaknesses
- Target vs. achievement. Please elaborate

Sustainability:

- Assess the process for documenting and disseminating models of intervention, best practices, and lessons learned, etc? Any example of this?
- Assess the design of the sustainability strategy for the projects, and assess the progress of the strategy.
- Tools applied to identify and manage the sustainability factors

- Determine the potential to sustain the gains of the project beyond its life and what measures are needed to ensure this. Examples. What is going to happen with all the training effort, which has been made?
- Identify potential good practices and inputs for models of intervention with returnees. Outputs susceptible of expansion or scale-up
- Factors of Sustainability.

INTERVIEW GUIDE - Government Officials, Social partners, IOM and Donor

Introductory questions:

Name:

Position of the interviewed person:

Brief on the project

Experience/knowledge of ILO project and involvement in the program:

Relevance and Strategic fit:

- Can you explain the relevance and coherence of project activities to the related government's strategy, policies and plans; the DWCP of Ghana; UNSDF; SDGs? Can you mention examples of integration?
- Does the project address the felt needs of men and women beneficiaries?
- To what extent does the project complement and fit with other on-going GIZ initiatives and other programmes and projects in the country as well as other relevant migration initiatives?

Validity of design

- What is your general assessment on the program objectives and design: strengths and weaknesses, possible gaps, constraints, drawbacks, etc.?
- Has the design clearly defined outcomes, outputs and performance indicators with quantitative and/or qualitative baselines and targets?
- Was the project design realistic? What is your assessment with regard to the participation of your institution in the diagnosis and project design?
- How appropriate and useful are the indicators described in the project document in assessing the project's progress? Are indicators gender sensitive and taken into account tripartism and social dialogue?

- Were any lessons learned from previous pilot projects considered in the design and implementation of the project?

Project effectiveness

- To what extent has the project achieved its objective in terms of capacity building for your institution; economic empowerment of returnee's communities; policy framework; data and knowledge about migration?
- Has this been done through the planned outputs or new ones have been included, why and how effective these have been?
- Which have been the main contributing and challenging factors towards project's success in attaining its targets?
- What, if any, unintended results of the project have been identified or perceived?
- To what extent is your organization organization been involved in projects implementation?

Efficiency

- How efficiently have resources (human resources, time, expertise, funds etc.) been allocated and used to provide the necessary support and to achieve the broader project objectives?
- To what extent are the disbursements and project expenditures in line with expected budgetary plans?
- Have they been delivered in a timely manner? If not, what were the factors that have hindered timely delivery of outputs? Any measures that have been put in place?

Effectiveness of management arrangements

- Have the available technical and financial resources been adequate to fulfil the project plans?
- Does the management and governance arrangement of the project contributed to facilitate the project implementation? How do you see the co-ordination structures?
- Has the project created good relationship and cooperation with relevant national, and local level government authorities and other relevant stakeholders, including the donor to achieve project results?
- Were there problems during implementation and what are they? How do you evaluate the performance of the partnership?

- To what extent do the project management capacities and arrangements put in place support the achievement of the planned results?

Impact orientation and sustainability

- To what extent there is evidence of positive changes in the life of the ultimate men and women project beneficiaries?
- Are project outcomes sustainable and can you identify steps that have been taken to enhance it?
- To what extent has the project strengthened the capacities of the government structures?
- Was there ownership, prospects of continuation of project activities by other programs, commitments, and leverage of funding? What are the main constraints in this regard?

GUIDE FOR FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION WITH BENEFICIARIES

- Presentations
- Try to establish the extent of their participation / involvement in the project activities. Check if they can identify the activities of the project
- Describe how they became involved in the project. Channels they were approached or how they got the information about the services provided by the project.
- Describe the things they liked and did not like about the project activities: organization, quality of the services, timing, what has been different about the project
- Did they miss anything?
- Good things that happened to them after they became involved in the project activities. Examples of benefits they obtained in different areas: self-esteem, knowledge, social links, livelihoods, economic etc. Describe the situation before and after.
- Describe present situation. What kind of assistance is still needed?
- Aspirations for the future.
- Try to assess if the beneficiaries, especially women, are able to identify gender specific actions conducted by the project.

Annex 4: Evaluation schedule

Ghana, 3 – 7 February 2020

Name	Institution	Position	Time	Place and Contact
Sunday 3/2/20		Arrival		
Monday 3/2/20				
Mrs Akua Ofori-Asumadu	ILO	NPM	9:00-10:00am	ILO Project Office
Mrs Sylvia Lopez-Ekrah	UNDP	UN RC	10:30-11:30am	RCO –
Lunch			12:00-1:00pm	
Mr. Kizito Balans/ Mrs Emma Ofori-Agyemang/Mr Horen Quashiga	MELR	Chief Director/Director PPME/ Assistant Director PPME and SIYB training beneficiary	1:30-2:00pm	Chief Directors Office MELR-
Mr Benjamin Woestern	GIZ GGC	GCC, MELR	3:00-4:00pm	GCC Office (Cleanlight)
Tuesday 4/2/20				
Marigold Domfey Cleanlight Kabutey	GGC GIZ	Migration Officers GIZ	11:30am-12:00am	GGC
Lunch			12:00-12:30pm	
Mr Eugene Korletey	Labour Department	Chief Labour Officer	1:00 -1:45 am	Labour Department
Wednesday 5/2/20				
Mr Boachi Yiadom	PEC	Greater Accra Regional Employment Officer	9:30-10:30am	Greater Accra Regional Employment Office
Peter Antwi/Horen Quashigha	MELR	Assistant Director PPME, Beneficiaries	11:00-12:00pm	MELR Office Horen:

Lunch			12:00-1:00pm	
Mr J. Amuah/Kingsley Laar	GEA	Deputy Chief Executive	1:30-2:30am	GEA Office -
Thursday 6/2/20				
FGD Participants:	SIYB: Robert Donkor - 0244421842 Patricia Larbi - 0241233799 Kingsley Asiedu - 0244171688 Isaac Amankwaa – Eunice Akosua Biney - Nii Adjei Adjei-Boye Marigold Domfeh Cleanlight Kabutey Peter Antwi Horen Quashigha	Beneficiaries	9:30am -12:00 pm	Conference Room, MELR/GG C Joint Interviews Horen
	FE: Rita Afriyie Asante- Bernard Anyan - Oduro Boachie - Clean light Kabutey - Marfo MELR -	Beneficiaries	12:00pm-2:00pm	
Friday 7/2/20		Departure	10:pm	KIA, Accra
Dr. Achakoma/Ms Mary Karimu	GTUC	Migration Officer	10:00 – 10:45am	TUC Building
Akua Ofori-Asumadu/MELR Staff	MELR		11:30 – 12:30pm	Conference Room, MELR

Nigeria, 10 – 14 February 2020

Name	Institution	Position	Time	Place and Contact	Status
Monday 10/2/20					
Mr. David Dorkenoo	ILO	Officer – in Charge (OIC)	8:00am – 8:30am	ILO Abuja CO- Office	Confirmed
Chinyere Emeka-anuna Dino Corell	ILO	Evaluation Manager National Project Coordinator Employment and Migration Specialist	8:30-10:00	ILO Abuja CO- Office	Confirmed

Augustine Erameh Joshua Ebibi,		Project Finance/ Administration Assistant			
Veronica Ogbonnaya	National Population Commission	- Chief Vital Registration/migration Focal Point	10:30 – 1:00	No. 1, Masaka Close, Off, Olusegun Obasanjo	Confirmed
Adenike Ajala	National Employers Consultative Association (NECA)	Deputy Director	2:00 – 4:00	NECA Office, Edo State Liaison Office, Plot 75 Ralph Shodeinde Street, CBD.	Confirmed
Enite Young Odebala	The Sublime Hub	Managing Partner	4:00 – 5:00	8, Madiana Close, Wuse II Ground Floor Unit 4	Confirmed
Olusegun Ogidan	External Collaborator, Access to finance	Managing Director/CEO Global Knowledge Group	9:00 – 10:00am	No 54B Abidjan Street, Wuse Zone 3, Abuja, FCT	Confirmed
Eustace James	Nigerian Labour Congress (NLC)	Migration Focal Officer	10:00 – 12:00	Labour House	Confirmed
Tolulope Olaiya	GIZ	National Project Coordinator	12:30 – 1:30	Asokoro, Abuja	Confirmed
Lunch					1:30:pm - 2:30pm
Charles Nwanelo	National Commission for Refugees, Migrants and Internally Displaced Persons (NCFRMI)	Asst Director Migration Department	2:00-3:00pm	Federal Secretariat	Confirmed
Dr. Sunday Onazi Emmanuel Igbinosun	Federal Ministry of Labour and Employment (FMLE)	Chief Labour Officer TA to the Hon. Minister	3:30pm – 5:00pm	Federal Secretariat	
Wednesday 12/2/20 (Arrival in Lagos 10:15 am)					

					Confirmed
Noruwa Edokpolor	External Collaborator, SIYB				
Mimi Badejo Bayo Adenusi	Migrant Resource Centre, Lagos	Deputy Director Chief Labour Officer	1:00-3:00pm	Ikoyi	Confirmed
Sandra Vermuijten	GIZ		TBC	Lagos State	
Thursday 13/2/20					
Consolidation of MTE Preliminary findings					
Aida Awel Chi-Chi Emeka-Anuna	ILO	Evaluator Project Team Evaluation Manager	9:00am-5:00pm		Confirmed
Friday 14/2/20					
Focus Group Discussion (FGD) -Okeke Anya -Emeka Obiezu Steve Ogidan Victor Aihawu Michael Nwogbo Tersoo Zamber	External Collaborators Centre for Youth Initiative and Development (CYID) NCFRMI Editor, Migration Desk FMLE	 Executive Director Migration Officer Federal Radio Cooperation of Nigeria Labour Migration Desk Officer	9:00 – 11:30	UN House	Confirmed
Chinyere Emeka-anuna Dino Corell Augustine Eramah Joshua Ebbi,	ILO	LMER Project Team Project Evaluation Manager	11:30 – 1:00	UN House	Debriefing

Annex 5: List of Stakeholders Met

Ghana

Name	Institution	Position
Mrs Akua Ofori-Asumadu	ILO	LMER Project National Project Manager (NPM)
Mrs Sylvia Lopez-Ekrah	RCO and IOM	a.i. UN RC and IOM Country Representative
Mrs Emma Ofori-Agyemang Mr Horen Quashiga	Director PPME Assistant Director PPME and SIYB training beneficiary	MELR
Mr Benjamin Woestern	GIZ GGC	GCC, MELR
Marigold Domfey Clean-light Kabutey	Migration Officers GIZ	GCC GIZ
Mr Eugene Korletey	Chief Labour Officer	Labour Department
Mr Boachi Yiadom	Greater Accra Regional Employment Officer	PEC
Peter Antwi/Horen Quashigha	Assistant Director PPME, Beneficiaries	MELR
Mr J. Amuah/Kingsley Laar	Deputy Chief Executive	GEA
Robert Donkor Patricia Larbi Kingsley Asiedu Isaac Amankwaa Eunice Akosua Biney Nii Adjei Adjei-Boye Marigold Domfeh Cleanlight Kabutey Peter Antwi Horen Quashigha	SIYB Training Beneficiaries from MELR, PECs, GIZ and returnees	
Rita Afriyie Asante Bernard Anyan Oduro Boachie Clean light Kabutey Marfo	FE training Beneficiaries from PECs, GIZ, and Financial Institution	
Dr. Achakoma/Ms Mary Karimu	Migration Officer	GTUC
Akua Ofori-Asumadu	ILO	Project Coordinator

Nigeria

Name	Institution	Position
Mr. David Dorkenoo	ILO	Officer – in Charge (OIC)
Chinyere Emeka-anuna Dino Corell	ILO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation Manager - National Project Coordinator

Augustine Erameh Joshua Ebbi		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Employment and Migration Specialist - Project Finance/ Administration Assistant
Veronica Ogbonnaya Mathew T.S	National Population Commission Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assistant Director, Vital Registration/migration Focal Point - Director, Vital Registration/migration Focal Point
Adenike Ajala	National Employers Consultative Association (NECA)	Deputy Director
Olusegun Ogidan	External Collaborator, Access to finance	Managing Director/CEO Global Knowledge Group
Eustace James	Nigerian Labour Congress (NLC)	Migration Focal Officer
Tolulope Olaiya	GIZ	National Project Coordinator
Dr. Sunday Onazi Emmanuel Igbinosun	Federal Ministry of Labour and Employment (FMLE)	Chief Labour Officer and Head, Int'l LM Desk Deputy Director , TA to the Hon. Minister
Noruwa Edokpolor	External Collaborator, SIYB	
Bayo Adenusi	Migrant Resource Centre, Lagos	Chief Labour Officer
Chinyere Emeka-anuna Dino Corell Augustine Erameh Joshua Ebbi,	ILO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation Manager - National Project Coordinator - Employment and Migration Specialist - Project Finance/ Administration Assistant

Annex 6: Lesson Learned

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Initiative for Labour Migration, Employment and Reintegration (LMER) in Nigeria and Ghana

Project TC/SYMBOL: RAF/18/12/DEU

Name of Evaluator: Aida Awel

Date: 14/05/2020

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

LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	The number of outputs and activities identified in the Project Document must be proportionate to the input of project staff, timeline and available financial resource in order to ensure timely delivery of the project objectives.
Context and any related preconditions	The project have identified 2 outcomes, 7 Outputs and 37 Activities to be implemented within 18 months with USD 1.4 million. The evaluation found it to be overly ambitious in proportion to the limited financial, time and staff inputs.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	ILO Country Office in Abuja, GIZ, HQ Geneva
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	The lack of adequate project staff and fragmentation of activities have implication in project delivery. As it is can be seen from the MTE, the financial utilization is around 25% even though 13 months out of the 18 months project period has gone.
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	It will be possible to achieve the objectives by making the project more focused and hire additional staff to ensure that delivery will be up to speed and the project achieve its intended objectives.

**ILO Administrative Issues
(staff, resources, design,
implementation)**

ILO in cooperation with GIZ can decide to employ an additional staff and the project team in partnership with GIZ and ILO constituents need to revise the project to make it more focused and feasible to achieve within the limited time left and available resources.

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Initiative for Labour Migration, Employment and Reintegration (LMER) in Nigeria and Ghana

Project TC/SYMBOL: RAF/18/12/DEU

Name of Evaluator: Aida Awel

Date: 14/05/2020

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

LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	Enabling the potential migrants and returnees to start livelihood activity requires wide-ranging and longer-term support.
Context and any related preconditions	The provision of SIYB and Financial education training without provision for access to finance, business development support, market linkage, and mentoring was felt to be inadequate to have impact on the livelihood of the beneficiaries. In particular, beneficiaries who plans to start new business. Training on its own had more impact on beneficiaries who already had existing businesses. Creating a livelihood opportunity entails longer term and comprehensive support.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	ILO CO Abuja, ILO HQ (MIGRANT, SME, SOCIAL FINANCE), Constituents and beneficiaries.
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	Potential migrants or Returnees being supported by such programmes usually represent vulnerable group with limited or no financial capital or business experience. Resources are scarce and the business environment, offers limited possibilities. Such a challenging environment can be scary for such vulnerable group to embark on businesses unless they are well supported. As one of the beneficiaries said unless he is supported further to access financial resources, he was ready to re-migrate, as training on its own did not open up any opportunity for him. In such context, some beneficiaries and partners believe that the project is too ambitious to expect beneficiaries to start livelihood activity after receiving SIYB and Financial education training. Hence it is critical to provide comprehensive long-term support in order to achieve impact.

Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	<p>It is critical to link the project intervention with other existing programs in the area of micro-finance, job creation, SME support, etc. including with the program being implemented by GIZ and the government on job creation. Such linkage or referral mechanism might open opportunities for the beneficiaries to benefit from comprehensive support.</p>
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	<p>ILO staff at designing project and programme should think creatively of long term, comprehensive and robust support as well as linkage with existing programmes, as enterprise development entails much more than training.</p>

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Initiative for Labour Migration, Employment and Reintegration (LMER) in Nigeria and Ghana

Project TC/SYMBOL: RAF/18/12/DEU

Name of Evaluator: Aida Awel

Date: 14/05/2020

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

LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	The effectiveness and impact of the TOT for both SIYB and FE depends on the trainees having the opportunity to cascade the training to ultimate beneficiaries and the effectiveness and impact of the training provided for the ultimate beneficiaries depends on the trainees applying what they have learned to improve their livelihood.
Context and any related preconditions	The TOT both for SIYB and FE was appreciated by the trainees. However all trainees indicated the limitation on the impact of the training in the ultimate beneficiaries, because there was financial limitation to cascade the training to ultimate beneficiaries who will apply it in their day to day work. The trainees was mostly civil servants, GIZ staff and Financial institution staff who is not engaged in business, so they will only use limited part of the training probably to advise and guide beneficiaries, but cannot cascade the training further for the ultimate beneficiaries unless they are supported further by the project staff. Moreover, up to the time of the MTE no access to finance was facilitated to the beneficiaries, which limited them to start or improve their business.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	Project staff, ILO CO Abuja and GIZ.
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	Lack of budgeting by the project for SIYB and FE training to be cascaded down to potential migrants or returnees, have limited the cascading of the training to the ultimate beneficiaries at the time of the MTE. In addition, lack of adequately considering facilitating access to finance to the ultimate beneficiaries have also limited the beneficiaries to start livelihood opportunities. Facilitating linkage with existing programmes were not well thought.

Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	This can be easily corrected through linkage with existing programmes and advocacy for the government to mainstream SIYB and FE through their TVET programmes or within the MRCs and PECs, so that Government can budget for it within their existing provisions.
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	Project staff can quickly map out existing programmes and create linkages with such institutions to facilitate support for the beneficiaries. ILO CO Abuja should advocate with the government of Nigeria and Ghana to mainstream SIYB and FE within the MRCs, PECs or TVETs programs.

Annex 7: Good Practices

ILO Emerging Good Practice Template

Project Title: Initiative for Labour Migration, Employment and Reintegration (LMER) in Nigeria and Ghana

Project TC/SYMBOL: RAF/18/12/DEU

Name of Evaluator: Aida Awel

Date: 14/05/2020

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

GP Element	Text
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	The conception of coordination mechanism among labour migration projects within the ILO Country Office in Abuja is an important step towards enhancing oversight, coordination, and synergy as well as avoiding duplication.
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	There is another project (Support to Free Movement of Persons and Migration in West Africa (2013-2020)), within country office Abuja that works at the Regional level. The two projects work closely and meet on regular basis to strategies on possible areas of cooperation between the two projects.
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	The existing structure permits the projects to maintain close coordination among the existing projects and enhance coordination with partners at national and regional level.
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	<p>The two projects supported jointly the regional fair recruitment report (Ghana/Nigeria studies).</p> <p>The two projects were in the process of organizing Labour Migration training in partnership with ITC-ILO at the time of the MTE.</p>
Potential for replication and by whom	It can be replicated in ILO offices, where there are more than one project working in the area of labour migration. ILO CO Director or Regional Migration Specialist can perform the coordinating role and bring all the projects together.

Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	Linked to ILO's Strategic Plan 2018–21, "Strengthening effective and efficient use of ILO resources".
Other documents or relevant comments	Fair recruitment report, concept note of the training organized by the two projects, the minutes of the coordination meeting

ILO Emerging Good Practice Template

Project Title: Initiative for Labour Migration, Employment and Reintegration (LMER) in Nigeria and Ghana

Project TC/SYMBOL: RAF/18/12/DEU

Name of Evaluator: Aida Awel

Date: 14/05/2020

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

GP Element	Text
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	Embedding the project implementation within existing local institutions. One of the two component of the project is to strengthen the capacity of the MRC's and PECs to offer services for potential migrants and returnees. Even though these institutions have limited capacities, it is worth investing in their capacities, as it will ensure sustainability even after the project phase out. The project embedded all implementation within existing structures and focused on strengthening their capacity to support potential migrants and returnees.
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	Given the limited timeline and resources available, it is worth assessing the ability of these institutions to implement the remaining project activities and achieve the set objectives. If possible, it would have been helpful if the capacity assessment were done in the inception face so that it can inform project implementation.
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	Even in instances where local institutions have limited capacities, pursuing to build their capacity will have a long term impact and sustainability, because once such service is embedded in their system, these institutions will continue to provide the service to potential migrants and returnees beyond the project life span.
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	The MRCs and the PECs capacity has been strengthened on SIYB and FE and are providing guidance to potential migrants and returnees using the tools they have acquired through trainings.
Potential for replication and by whom	The ILO and other development actors should replicate such practice. ILO CO Abuja can share their experience.

Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	ILO Programme and Budget 2020-2021, Outcome 1: Strong tripartite constituents and influential and inclusive social dialogue
Other documents or relevant comments	Training Reports.

Annex 8: Bibliography

1. ILO (2018). DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION PROJECT DOCUMENT (PRODOC). Initiative for Labour Migration Employment and Reintegration (LMER) in Nigeria and Ghana.
2. 2019 project workplan
3. Logframe
4. Ghana's Coordinated Programme of Economic and Social Development Policies strategic pillars and components
5. Nigerian Economic Recovery and Growth Plan' (ERGP)
6. National Migration Policy of Ghana and Nigeria
7. National Labour Migration Policy of Nigeria (2014)
8. National Labour Migration Policy of Ghana (2020)
9. United Nations Sustainable Development Partnership (UNSDP) of Ghana
10. UN Sustainable Development Partnership Framework (UNSDPF) of Nigeria
11. Nigeria and Ghana DWCP
12. Periodic progress report to Donors
13. Training and Meeting Reports
14. Monthly report on key indicators
15. Communication strategy
16. Mission reports
17. Research products including policy brief
18. Mission reports
19. Concept notes and Term of References,
20. Other relevant documents and publications.