



International
Labour
Organization

► Evaluation Office



i-eval Discovery



Migrant Advocacy for Rights

THA/23/01/USA

Type of Evaluation: Project

Evaluation timing: Mid-term

Evaluation nature: Internal

Project countries: Thailand

P&B Outcome(s): 600060 - Outcome 6: Protection at work for all

SDG(s): SDG 8 – Target 8.8, SDG 10 – Target 10.7

Date when the evaluation was completed by the evaluator: 26 December 2025

ILO Administrative Office: DWT/CO-Bangkok

ILO Technical Office(s): MIGRANT

Joint evaluation agencies: n/a

Project duration: 27 September 2023–29 September 2026

Donor and budget: Donor: U.S. Government, USD 1,200,000

Name of consultant(s): n/a

Name of Evaluation Manager: Rebecca Napier-Moore, Technical Officer

Evaluation Office oversight: Pamornrat Pringsulaka, Regional Evaluation Specialist

Evaluation budget: USD 0

Key Words: labour migration, Thailand, agriculture, manufacturing

Table of contents

Table of contents	2
► Executive summary	3
► 1. Background and project description	9
1.1 Context	9
1.2 Project background	9
1.3 Purpose of the project	9
► 2. Evaluation background	10
2.1 Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation	10
2.2 Evaluation criteria and questions	10
2.3 Approach and methodology	11
2.4 Limitations and potential sources of bias	12
► 3. Findings	13
3.1 Relevance	13
3.2 Coherence	17
3.3 Effectiveness	19
3.4 Efficiency	24
3.5 Impact	25
3.6 Sustainability	27
► 4. Conclusions, recommendations and action to be taken	29
4.1 Conclusions	29
4.2 Recommendations and action to be taken	30
► 5. Lessons learned and good practices	31
5.1 Select lessons learned	31
5.2 Emergent good practice	32
► Annex 1: Evaluation TOR	34
► Annex 2: Evaluation questions, per stakeholder	40
► Annex 3: Project Implementation Tracking Table (PITT)	43

► Executive summary

Background

The Migrant Advocacy for Rights (MARs) project aims at improving migrants' rights realization in informal agriculture and manufacturing in Thailand through migrant organizing and advocacy for full coverage in labor law and social protection, improved labor migration governance, and enforcement of rights-protective laws. MARs project works to formalize migrant labour in agriculture and manufacturing sectors in Thailand, through supporting consultative law and policy reform processes, enforcement of labour and migration laws and policies, and migrant worker knowledge and engagement in social dialogue. The project works to ensure labour exploitation and unfair trade is addressed and thus not part of international supply chains (including US/donor), among others through strengthening the labour inspectorate as well as complaints and wage protection mechanisms in the targeted sectors. The project sustainably contributes to Thailand's national aims to reduce irregular and undocumented migrant labour, improve labour practices and build the capacities of national institutions and social partners. The project runs from 27 September 2023 to 29 September 2026.

This project is centered in Thailand as the largest destination country for migrants in the ASEAN region. Participant groups are Cambodian, Lao and Myanmar migrant workers of working age in informal agriculture and manufacturing. The project focusses broadly on three areas of Thailand with high numbers of migrant workers: Greater Bangkok, Tak province (including the Tak SEZ), and the Eastern Special Development Zone of Chachoengsao, Chonburi and Rayong provinces. All three are sites of manufacturing, and the latter two are sites with agriculture.

Present situation of the project

The project is funded by the US Government from September 2023 until September 2026. In the project's most recent October 2025 Quarterly Progress Report, the project was reported as being on-course to achieve many of the outcomes of the project, though some may not be achieved due to an effective six-month implementation disruption from the US Stop-Work Order in the first half of 2025, on top of an extended nine-month inception period before the first Project Advisory Committee meeting could be held. Thus the project implementation has been limited to a 21 of 36-month project period.

Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

As per the Project Award Document, and in line with ILO's evaluation policy, the MARs project planned for a mid-term internal self-evaluation and a final independent evaluation. The mid-term evaluation identifies lessons learned and good practices from project implementation slightly after the mid-point, and generates recommendations on how to strengthen implementation and enhance project performance. It identifies and analyzes expected and unexpected results by examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors and causality using appropriate OECD/DAC criteria including relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. **The mid-term evaluation assesses the continued relevance of interventions and progress made towards achieving planned objectives, and provides an opportunity for in-depth reflection on the strategy and assumptions guiding the project.**

After a delay due to the Stop-Work Order mentioned above, the internal self-evaluation (originally planned for early 2025/1.5 years after the project started) started around two years after the project started. Full implementation started again after the Stop-Work Order in June/July 2025, thus a decision was taken to implement for one quarter so that the mid-term evaluation could capture at least a few months of renewed efforts. Thus, evaluation data was collected during the October-December 2025 period.

While the evaluation might also be of interest to development partners and policymakers, the main clients of the evaluation are: ILO's tripartite-plus stakeholders, migrant workers in Thailand, ILO staff directly working on the project.

Methodology

The evaluation is primarily qualitative in nature but incorporates quantitative summative target values tracked and reported by the project. It engaged tripartite-plus stakeholders. Further and essentially, per donor request and ILO's guidance on participatory approaches, the evaluation included migrant workers who have participated in project-supported migrant groups, trainings or national policy discussions.

According to the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), internal evaluation is defined as, "Evaluation of a development intervention conducted by a unit and/or individuals reporting to the management of the donor, partner, or implementing organization." According to the ILO Evaluation Policy Guidelines, they can have a high level of usefulness because those who identify good practices are in a position to implement them. Thus, as an internal self-evaluation, this has been planned and led by the international Technical Officer with support from the National Project Officer and the ILO-ROAP Evaluation Officer, and with review by Lars Johansen, Nilim Baruah, Anna Engblom, Jittima Srisuknam and Ussama Kaewpradap. Some migrant focus groups were conducted by implementing partners, also enabling them to capture feedback and learn about their own implementation directly from beneficiaries.

A total of **51 individuals participated in the evaluation**, including representatives from 8 of the project's tripartite-plus stakeholder and partner organizations, 3 ILO staff, and 40 migrant workers. Stakeholders and ILO staff filled out a survey, and migrant workers participated in five focus groups, one led by ILO in Bangkok and four led by implementing partners. Survey data was collected, anonymized and organized in an excel, which can be shared upon request.

Findings

Overall, the project has had achievements in supporting stronger migrant workers organizations and workers organizations and bringing workers to the table for policy discussions related to labour migration governance and policy related to seasonal agriculture. It has been flexible to maintain relevance by responding to originally unforeseen areas such as social dialogue, collective bargaining, and displaced workers. Dedicated attention is needed in the remaining part of the project to achieving work under Objective 3 related to policy implementation, through support to the Thai labour inspectorate and possibly through research on wage protection (depending on MOL's preference for research focus). The project aligns with national priorities in the DWCP and supporting international frameworks.

MARs has had particularly noted impact for migrant workers themselves, as the primary beneficiary, but also has been able to build stakeholders knowledge and consultation needs. More is needed in the coming months to finalize briefs and research, which -in addition to worker and employer input to policy- can provide an evidence base for grounded and informed policy reform.

Primarily due to the USEO stop-work order, as well as some other delays, the project has needed to reduce one activity and may not meet all originally set indicator targets. It is, however, largely on track to meet its objectives. Due to existing challenges linked to organizing migrant workers in these sectors, unions have primarily been able to organize only in migrant worker groups. Union membership for migrants has been more challenging, as migrant workers largely are not working in workplaces with existing unions. Since they cannot form their own unions as per the national laws, if there is not one already in their workplace, then less formal migrant worker groups are their only option, rather than union membership.

"We felt good because we have never accessed information before on labour rights and social security. We want more projects because we are just now aware we have labour rights, so we want to have increased capacity to make more demands and change." – Migrant workers group, FGD summary reported at IA Partners Meeting

Relevance

Finding 1: The project focus on migrant worker organizing and services has primarily met needs of migrant workers, worker organizations and CSOs, while the project's policy and social dialogue work has been relevant as well to government and employers.

Finding 2: The project aligns with the Decent Work Country Programme and national priorities of the Ministry of Labour and social partners, supporting decent work outcomes on the ground and informed policy inputs.

Finding 3: MARs has listened to varied stakeholders' voicing their needs and has responded, for instance meeting the Mae Sot DLPW's request to train employers on social dialogue and collective bargaining. The project has also given initial support to displaced persons, a group of non-Thai workers with new access to work in the MARs project sectors agriculture and manufacturing.

Finding 4: ILO and the project's convening power of bipartite or tripartite actors remains key to relevance, bridging socio-political gaps between workers and government, or workers and employers.

Coherence

Finding 5: The project has catalyzed and added to ILO's efforts on organizing and social dialogue at the enterprise level.

Finding 6: There is also a niche the project has started to fill by bringing together workers' organizations and associations around seasonal agriculture, important for ongoing related policy reform.

Finding 7: The project is increasing coherence through joint collaboration with other ILO projects on labour migration and manufacturing, and sharing knowledge and information with UN agencies and other partners.

Finding 8: The project is increasing knowledge about worker organizations among other stakeholders, and more tripartite-plus conversations with migrant involvement are needed on various labour and migration topics.

Effectiveness

Finding 9: The project is on-track to achieve most of its planned objectives, outputs and indicator targets.

Finding 10: The project has used a phased approach first prioritizing outcomes 1 and 2, and rounded project success depends on implementation of outcome 3 in the remainder of the project.

Finding 11: While the project has been effective in forming migrant worker groups, there have been fewer avenues to unionizing than originally envisioned, partly because migrants are not employed in workplaces with existing unions (and are legally restricted from forming them). Migrant workers are, however, overcoming this in some Mae Sot factories through collective bargaining in the absence of any registered worker organizations in the border province.

Finding 12: Implementing partners and migrant workers face challenges related to worker organizing and training in terms of the workers' long hours, as well as loss of pay or threats from some employers if they participate.

Finding 13: Policy dialogues (related to labour migration governance, working conditions in seasonal agriculture, and social security for seasonal agriculture) have been targeted to include migrant workers.

Key Findings- Efficiency

Finding 14: The project has had a relatively short time to implement, and had time-based challenges related to USEO stop-work order and delays in the initial PAC meeting.

Finding 15: Project activities must run at full pace in 2026 for efficiency criteria related to time and spending to be met.

Finding 16: Value for money has come from high-impact, low-cost interventions, as well as joint resources with other projects contributing to larger meetings attracting higher level attention.

Key Findings- Impact

Finding 17: Stakeholders, including migrant workers, assess that there are positive evident short-term impacts, particularly related to the following:

- ▶ capacity building of migrant workers' knowledge of rights as well as ways to solve problems, including negotiating with employers and discussing practical solutions with local politicians;
- ▶ stakeholders' increased understanding of migrant worker realities leading to "better protection of migrant workers and more effective policy dialogue";
- ▶ migrant worker group formation and organizing;
- ▶ national security; and
- ▶ stronger cross-border union collaboration.

Finding 18: MARs is not working in isolation or starting from scratch, but working with partners and other ILO projects which have been doing - and can build on - similar previous or complementary work.

Finding 19: Respondents see ways to further improve impact by:

- ▶ expanding workers' rights education;
- ▶ increasing opportunities to dialogue with employers;
- ▶ creating spaces for worker groups to network with each other;
- ▶ a joint partner campaign on C87 and C98, fair wages and social security;
- ▶ collaborating further and helping migrants engage with government; and
- ▶ involving the central bank and national development institutes for assessments of migration vis-à-vis economic growth.

Key Findings- Sustainability

Finding 20: National policy reform processes have been supported and may contribute to durable changes. Migrant workers would like to know the outcome of the policy discussions to which they inputted.

Finding 21: Migrant worker organizing, group building, social dialogue and support services have contributed to a built-up, longer-lasting empowerment of migrant workers.

Finding 22: Sustainability may also result from dedicated work with and strengthening of Thai workers' organizations. Respondents called for continued support to the trade union movement, migrant worker groups and the principles of freedom of association.

Finding 23: Sustained impact needs more time for this or similar projects and further financial resources.

Finding 24: Due to the evolving challenges linked to labour migration, work at a systemic level is still needed to address core needs related to labour and migration governance. An extended project phase or other investments would help capacitate stakeholders to address these. Stakeholder priorities for continued policy work include the following: Ratification of ILO Conventions 87 and 98, wage protection, social security access, documents untied from specific employers, enforcement of policies in small factories.

Recommendations

1. Continue and expand migrant worker knowledge building, group formation and inter-group discussion, social dialogue support and legal aid.
2. Continue using ILO's convening power to organizing bi- and tri-partite discussions, especially bringing employers and a broader set of relevant government actors to the table.
3. Ensure further discussion and tripartite-plus validation of research.
4. More work needs to be done with employers in border areas, continuing discussions on social dialogue, but also decent work and awareness of the Thai labour law.

5. Increase support to the trade union movement, migrant worker groups and the principles of freedom of association.
6. Project activities must run at full pace in 2026 for efficiency criteria related to time and spending to be met, as well as for Objective 3 to be fulfilled.
7. Work to improve the effectiveness and implementation of the national complaints mechanism, wage protection and social protection access. This relates to MARs Objective 3.
8. Consider a joint partner campaign on ILO Conventions 87 and 98, as well as fair wages and social security.
9. Consider involving the central bank and national development institutes for assessments of labour migration vis-à-vis economic growth.
10. An extended project phase or other similar investments would help capacitate stakeholders to continue efforts in addressing systemic change and would enable more longer-term change in migrants' lives. Consider expanding the scope more to large factories.
11. Stakeholder priorities for further policy work include the following: Ratification of ILO Conventions 87 and 98, wage protection, social security access, documents untied from specific employers, enforcement of policies in small factories. Work at a systemic level is still needed to address core needs related to labour and migration governance.
12. Following outcomes of current policy reform processes, feed back to migrant workers who contributed to policy dialogues. They request to know if their inputs have contributed to change.

Select lessons learned

- ▶ **Employer strengthening:** Given this project has had a focus on worker strengthening, it has therefore had relatively less focus on employers. Workers asked for more employer dialogue. The project team and ILO specialists noted on the MARs November 2025 mission to Mae Sot on the Thai-Myanmar border that, in addition to social dialogue between workers and employers, more discussion on ILS, social dialogue and/or ESG principles is also needed with employers as a singular group.
- ▶ **Attention to Mae Sot border province:** The project has given new attention to the Mae Sot area with Specialists and the Deputy Country Director engaging in workshops with workers and employers. Given working conditions there are comparatively poor, further attention is needed in that province specifically. Partners appreciated ILO staff direct presence and time dedication, in addition to funding support.
- ▶ **Flexibility to shifting labour migration context:** Unforeseen political and cross-border developments can substantially affect migrant workers' networks and advocacy spaces. The Cambodia-Thailand border situation that emerged during implementation was not anticipated at the design stage and constrained one partner's activities in particular, as Cambodians were main beneficiaries. On the other hand, it also opened space for the same partner to take up some outreach to displaced workers who were hired to replace some of the Cambodians in agriculture. This experience reinforces the importance of flexibility and adaptive implementation in dynamic migration contexts.

Emergent good practices

- ▶ **Social dialogue and collective bargaining agreements:** While the project has been effective in forming and supporting migrant worker groups, there are few opportunities for migrant workers to join unions. In Mae Sot and broader in Tak province, there are no private sector unions. Migrant workers are, however, overcoming this in some larger Mae Sot factories through collective bargaining. Under Thai law governing collective bargaining agreements, signatures are needed

from 15 per cent of the workforce at an enterprise. MARs partners (ITUC-Thai Council and CSOs) and the ILO (including the Country Office and workers and social dialogue specialists) are supporting this through legal aid and training of workers, and -with the request of the provincial government- through training of employers. Worker organization partners are also supporting collective bargaining in the Greater Bangkok area in a factory with both Thai and migrant workers. MARs has given support to three completed collective bargaining agreements (CBAs), and there is further support ongoing to workers negotiating other CBAs.

- ▶ **Connecting agriculture workers groups:** There are no other registered agriculture private sector workers organizations. This makes it difficult to hold tripartite dialogue about conditions in the sector. Over the course of the MARs project, MARs set out to build and support migrant worker groups in agriculture through implementing partners, but also to find out what other groups or workers' associations might exist in the sector. This became increasingly important as the MOL reform process of the Ministerial Regulation progressed. MARs held an initial informal call with worker groups so MARs and the groups could all introduce each other. MARs then organized a "Workshop to Build Solidarity for Effective Laws and Protection for Workers in Agriculture" on 8 October 2025. This was an opportunity for the groups to meet in person, but also to meet and dialogue with MOL ILPD officials and the Working Group academic who are leading the collection of data to input into the reform process decisions. ILPD and the academic will continue to host four or five more dialogues in different parts of the country in 2026, and they noted at the Workshop that they will draw on the connections to worker groups they met at the Workshop to ensure a large number of workers in each region are able to attend and give inputs to the review survey queries. Both migrant workers and worker organization representatives recommend more spaces be created for groups to meet each other and dialogue, appreciating the newly made connections and also noting the time, logistics and financial resources needed to convene.
- ▶ **Decent work for displaced workers:** An emergent area of work related to MARs agriculture and manufacturing sectors has been displaced persons' access to the Thai labour market as of 1 October 2025. The project has drawn on the ILO's technical expertise, and partners to engage with displaced persons and the stakeholders who are invested in success of the new scheme. An initial Cabinet Resolution (CR) on 26 August 2025 issued the decision with ministry Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) issued subsequently. The government notified the UN that reviews of the policies would be held initially every three months. The review inputs are coordinated by another UN agency (UNHCR), and the ILO is collaborating closely with the UN Thematic Working Group on the Cabinet Resolution on the Right to Work for Displaced Persons. This has included technical contribution related to international labour standards and Thai labour law, with particular attention to hiring and recruitment. Specific technical input has related to job fairs, written standard contracts, and social security enrolment, as well as discussing MOL's intention that recruiters are not part of the current policy. The project contributed to two policy discussions with multiple government ministries in 2025. On the MARs November 2025 mission to Mae Sot, the project organized for ITUC-Thai Council leaders to meet displaced person leadership to be able to coordinate on any case management or labour issues in future. Coherently, the ILO TRIANGLE programme is supporting legal aid of these new workers, while MARs worker organization partners plan to include outreach to this group, among other non-nationals in agriculture and manufacturing, in destination provinces.

► 1. Background and project description

1.1 Context

Thailand is the main country of destination for migrant workers in Southeast Asia, with around 3.5 million documented migrant workers from Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic (Lao PDR) and Myanmar, in addition to a large number of undocumented migrant workers. Many migrants have positive migration experiences, yet situations of rights abuses abound. Feeding into major global supply chains, informal agriculture and manufacturing can have decent work deficits. Migrants in the informal economy are largely excluded from labour and social protection and have very few opportunities to join workers organizations, bargain collectively and advocate for their rights. Those working informally particularly face low wages, passport confiscation, injuries due to unsafe workplaces, and excessive hours.

Responding to these challenges, and within the broader context of the ILO Decent Work Country Programme in Thailand, the ILO is implementing the Migrant Advocacy for Rights (MARs). Since the project started in September 2023, increased numbers of migrants from Myanmar have arrived, particularly after forced conscription commenced in April 2024. And in July and August 2025, a large number of Cambodians returned home, following border hostilities, leaving labour market demands especially in provinces nearer the Cambodian border but also in other areas. These dynamic changes in workforce and migration patterns have caused uncertainties for ILO tripartite partners and for migrant workers. At the same time during the first half of the project, a significant migration policy and agriculture related labour and social protection policy have been under review.

1.2 Project background

The Migrant Advocacy for Rights (MARs) project aims at improving migrants' rights realization in informal agriculture and manufacturing in Thailand through migrant organizing and advocacy for full coverage in labor law and social protection, improved labor migration governance, and enforcement of rights-protective laws. MARs project works to formalize migrant labour in agriculture and manufacturing sectors in Thailand, through supporting consultative law and policy reform processes, enforcement of labour and migration laws and policies, and migrant worker knowledge and engagement in social dialogue. The project works to ensure exploitation is addressed and thus not part of international supply chains (including US/donor), among others through strengthening the labour inspectorate as well as complaints and wage protection mechanisms in the targeted sectors. The project runs from 27 September 2023 to 29 September 2026.

This project is centered in Thailand as the largest destination country for migrants in the region. Participant groups are Cambodian, Lao and Myanmar migrant workers of working age in informal agriculture and manufacturing. The project focusses broadly on three areas of Thailand with high numbers of migrant workers: Greater Bangkok, Tak province (including the Tak SEZ), and the Eastern Special Development Zone of Chachoengsao, Chonburi and Rayong provinces. All three are sites of manufacturing, and the latter two are sites with agriculture.

1.3 Purpose of the project

Responding to these challenges, the program "Migrant Advocacy for Rights" has a **goal** to improve rights realization of migrant workers in the informal agriculture and manufacturing sectors in, and beyond, special economic zones. Towards this goal, the program will implement a set of **activities** including support to migrant workers' organizing to advocate for rights in their workplaces and in law; support to consultative law and policy reform processes in Thailand and migration corridors; and participatory strengthening of labour inspectorates, access to complaints mechanisms and wage regulation enforcement. The project will contribute to the following summarized **outcomes**: 1a) Workers are aware of their rights to organize and do so; 1b) Labour and social protection law and policy reforms increasingly formalize informal sectors; 2) Thailand has more effective admission policies and practices in place and coordinates with Cambodia and Lao PDR, toward safe migration and fair recruitment; 3) Workers and civil society organizations advocate for diligent enforcement of labour law within migrant workplaces,

including in SEZs. Ultimately, the project will contribute to **impacts** of worker empowerment, sustainable legal reform, improved freedom to organize, safe and fair migration, decent work and access to justice. With first-hand migrant input, evidence-based changes in law and practice have the potential to change the lives of millions of migrant workers now and in the future via migration reforms, labour reforms and enforcement. This project's **approach** is one of migrant worker organizing and advocacy, backed by provision of ILO's rights-based technical advice on legal reform.

► 2. Evaluation background

2.1 Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

As per the Project Award Document, and in line with ILO's evaluation policy, the MARs project planned for a mid-term internal self-evaluation and a final independent evaluation. Per donor request and ILO's guidance on participatory approaches, the evaluation included participation of migrant workers. The Evaluation TOR is found in Annex 1.

The mid-term evaluation identifies lessons learned and good practices from project implementation slightly after the mid-point, and generates recommendations on how to strengthen implementation and enhance project performance. The mid-term evaluation identifies and analyzes expected and unexpected results by examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors and causality using appropriate OECD/DAC criteria including relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. Tripartite plus partners of MARs were surveyed on those topics as related to the project's activities and outcomes on labour migration in agriculture and manufacturing in Thailand.

After a delay due to the Stop-Work Order mentioned above, the internal self-evaluation (originally planned for early 2025/1.5 years after the project started) started around two years after the project started. Full implementation started again after the Stop-Work Order in June/July 2025, thus a decision was taken to implement for one quarter so that the mid-term evaluation could capture at least a few months of renewed efforts. Thus, evaluation data was collected during the October-December 2025 period.

The mid-term evaluation aims to assess the continued relevance of interventions and progress made towards achieving planned objectives. Importantly, the mid-term evaluation offers an opportunity to make modifications to project strategy, partnerships and activities to ensure that the objectives are achieved. This evaluation provides an opportunity for in-depth reflection on the strategy and assumptions guiding the project.

The main clients of the evaluation are:

- ILO's tripartite-plus stakeholders, including government officials, worker and employer organizations, and civil society organizations
- Migrant workers in Thailand, particularly in agriculture and manufacturing and those who have participated in project activities
- ILO staff directly working on the project, in CO-BKK and in ROAP

The evaluation might also be of interest to development partners and policymakers.

2.2 Evaluation criteria and questions

The evaluation will be conducted according to the criteria and approaches as defined in the ILO Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation¹, namely: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact. Per the project document, and as per the scope section above, the evaluation will

¹ Available at: https://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS_571339/lang--en/index.htm

look at expected and unexpected results by examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors and causality.

The following questions guided the evaluation.

Table 1: Key evaluation questions and related evaluation criteria

ILO Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions
1. Relevance	1.1. Is the project relevant to beneficiary (migrant workers and tripartite-plus stakeholders) needs? Are there changes that could be made in the last year to make it more relevant?
2. Coherence	2.1. Does the project remain compatible with other interventions in the country, sectors (agriculture and manufacturing), and ILO? Are there recommendations for better collaboration among tripartite-plus partners or others?
3. Effectiveness	3.1. To what extent has the project achieved - and is expected to achieve - its objectives, and its results? 3.2. Are there any challenges to implementation faced by the project staff or partners that can be addressed in the last year?
4. Efficiency	4.1. Is the project delivering results in an economic and timely way, taking into account the US stop-work order in early 2025?
5. Impact	5.1. To what extent have there been - and do you foresee - positive changes in the lives of migrant workers, and on policies and practices? What could increase impact?
6. Sustainability	6.1. To what extent are the results of the intervention likely to have a long term, sustainable positive contribution?

2.3 Approach and methodology

According to the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), internal evaluation is defined as, “Evaluation of a development intervention conducted by a unit and/or individuals reporting to the management of the donor, partner, or implementing organization.” According to the ILO Evaluation Policy Guidelines, internal evaluation is conducted when a project has a modest budget and is of a short duration. Per ILO Guidance Note 2.2: Self and Internal Evaluations, these type of evaluations are suited to project improvement and organizational learning. These can be done quickly because staff are already familiar with the context, and then influence the end of the project’s implementation. They can have a high level of usefulness because those who identify good practices are in a position to implement them. Thus, as an internal self-evaluation, this has been planned and led by the international Technical Officer with support from the National Project Officer, guidance from the ILO-ROAP Evaluation Officer, and with review by Lars Johansen, Nilim Baruah, Anna Engblom, Jittima Srisuknam and Ussama Kaewpradap. Some migrant focus groups were conducted by implementing partners, also enabling them to capture feedback and learn about their own implementation directly from beneficiaries.

The evaluation is primarily qualitative in nature but incorporates quantitative summative target values tracked and reported by the project. It engaged tripartite-plus stakeholders. Further and essentially, per donor request and ILO’s guidance on participatory approaches, the evaluation **included migrant workers who have participated in project-supported migrant groups, trainings or national policy discussions.**

A total of **51 individuals participated in the evaluation**, including representatives from 8 of the project’s tripartite-plus stakeholder and partner organizations, 3 ILO staff, and 40 migrant workers. Stakeholders

and ILO staff filled out a survey, and migrant workers participated in five focus groups, one led by ILO in Bangkok and four led by implementing partners.

The evaluation methodology included:

- ▶ **Document analysis:** The following documents were reviewed: ILO CPO report for Thailand, partner progress reports, PAC meeting summaries, and project tracking of activities and indicator progress.
- ▶ **Survey of stakeholders and ILO staff:** A dedicated discussion was planned to be held at the MARs Project Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting on 27 October 2025, with participation from tripartite-plus stakeholders and ILO staff. However, time ran short and the PAC participants agreed to answer survey questions after the meeting. Survey data was collected and organized in an excel, which can be shared upon request. Data is anonymized, and no names or organizations are given. Thus for instance government responses could be from any ministry attending the PAC meeting, ranging from the Ministry of Labour to the National Security Council. A total of 11 responses were collected from 8 stakeholder organizations and 3 ILO staff, including 2 Decent Work Country Team Specialists and 1 member of an adjacent labour migration project. The survey questions are in Annex 2.
- ▶ **Focus Group Discussions (FGD) with migrant workers:** ILO staff held a FGD with migrant workers at the MARs agriculture policy workshop on 8 October 2025, and four implementing partners also held FGDs with migrant workers during October. Partners' FGD data was shared to the project in writing or at the Implementing Partners Meeting before the PAC on 27 October 2025. Anonymized data was organized in an excel, which can be shared upon request. Migrant workers were assured of confidentiality, notified that they are being interviewed for project learning purposes, and only participated after verbal informed consent. The original target was to interview two migrant workers from each of five partners, covering all targeted provinces, and including six workers from manufacturing and four from agriculture (ten in total). As below, this number was exceeded and 40 migrant workers participated in focus groups. Questions for migrant workers are in Annex 2.

Table of participants:

Type of evaluation participant	Total number
Migrant Workers	40
Government	3
Employers' Organizations	1
Workers' Organizations	2
CSOs	2
ILO Officials	3
Total	51

Following the completion of data collection, the data from the desk review, survey, and FGDs was analysed, and an initial draft of the report submitted to CO-BKK, MIGRANT colleagues and the development partner/donor for feedback. A second draft of the report was produced based on the initial feedback and the draft shared with all the stakeholders who had participated in the evaluation. Following feedback on the second draft, and feedback from the presentation of results, the report was finalized and submitted to the ILO Evaluation Office.

2.4 Limitations and potential sources of bias

The following limitations of the evaluation were identified during its implementation.

- ▶ An internal evaluation, as above mentioned, has benefits of direct insight from implementers and quick use of findings, but lacks an external and objective view on the project implementation. This is to be balanced with an external, independent final evaluation at the end of the project.

- ▶ No data was submitted from staff of two workers organizations and one CSO who are part of the project, though two of them held FGDs with migrant workers, so there is some direct feedback on those streams of work.
- ▶ As a quick and light evaluation, this was not fully comprehensive of every aspect of the project, and ILO staff did not travel to destinations to collect data. However, through partners a wide range of migrants participated in four different locations through Thailand.
- ▶ Participants gave feedback at worker group meetings, an agriculture policy workshop or directly after the second Project Advisory Committee meeting, thus responses have a bias towards focus on the topics of discussion and methods at those events, and omitting reflection, for instance, on legal aid, as workers receiving legal aid were not part of focus groups.
- ▶ Given its timing later in the project, there will be less time to implement learnings, however, since the ILO staff and implementing partner staff conducted FGDs and collected data ourselves, we have been able to listen deeply to the feedback starting from October and begin to make programmatic decisions based on the learnings even before the evaluation is finalized.

▶ 3. Findings

3.1 Relevance

Key Findings- Relevance

Finding 1: The project focus on migrant worker organizing and services has primarily met needs of migrant workers, worker organizations and CSOs, while the project's policy and social dialogue work has been relevant as well to government and employers.

Finding 2: The project aligns with the Decent Work Country Programme and national priorities of the Ministry of Labour and social partners, supporting decent work outcomes on the ground and informed policy inputs.

Finding 3: MARs has listened to varied stakeholders' voicing their needs and has responded, for instance meeting the Mae Sot DLPW's request to train employers on social dialogue and collective bargaining. The project has also given initial support to displaced persons, a group of non-Thai workers with new access to work in the MARs project sectors agriculture and manufacturing.

Finding 4: ILO and the project's convening power of bipartite or tripartite actors remains key to relevance, bridging socio-political gaps between workers and government, or workers and employers.

Evaluation Questions

- ▶ Is the project relevant to beneficiary (migrant workers and tripartite-plus stakeholders) needs? Are there changes that could be made in the last year to make it more relevant?

The evaluation found the MARs project to be relevant to the needs of stakeholders as below, and stakeholders have given recommendations for furthering relevance during the final months of the project.

Relevance by stakeholder group

- Migrant Workers

Migrant workers in informal agriculture and manufacturing have limited ability to negotiate and many have little knowledge of their rights, much less access to mechanisms of redress and remedy when needed. The project has first focused on building knowledge and supporting migrant worker groups. As in the below quotes, migrant workers find it useful and recommend continued and increased efforts on knowledge building and worker group formation and in expanded locations. Partners provided knowledge on labour and migration to a total of 2,590 migrant workers by end-September 2025. Three migrant worker groups

have been formed including one with Cambodian members in the Eastern region of Thailand. Given recent events on the border, a group to support Cambodians is timely and needed.

“The project has a lot of benefits for migrant workers. I have been in Thailand for many years. I thought it was normal that migrant workers get exploited. But after learning about labour rights, I aware that migrant workers are protected under the laws. I am now confident to give consultation to fellow migrant workers. I gain knowledge from joining the project activities... But I am aware that there are still a lot of migrant workers who could not have a chance like we have. I would like the project to extend the location and reach to more migrant workers.” – Myanmar migrant woman

The above types of empowerment are key for migrants to voice their needs in their workplaces and in policy making. Migrant workers also need platforms in which to speak to and meet employers and government. ILO’s convening power has enabled some MARs-supported policy discussions (on labour migration policy, and on working conditions in agriculture), and migrants in FGDs called for more of this and more actors in the discussions, as in the below quote from a worker at a MARs agriculture policy workshop with government and worker participants.

“I would like to have employers at MARs meetings also, to discuss solutions together... This meeting is good because we share experiences with workers from different subsectors and provinces. Also I would like more ILO projects and meetings in agriculture, and to expand our existing [migrant workers group] from Chantaburi to Trat.” – Cambodia migrant leader, at MARs agriculture policy workshop

The project has also ensured relevance by drawing on ILO’s technical expertise and partners to engage with displaced persons who are newly allowed to work in Thailand as of 1 October 2025, and related policy discussions led by another UN agency. These workers are primarily in project sectors: agriculture and manufacturing, and one project worker organization partner will include these workers in upcoming outreach. One ILO staff survey respondent noted, “The project has jumped on opportunities (e.g. [displaced persons]’ right to work) to break new ground for the ILO as a whole and bringing tangible benefits to migrant women and men.”

Access to justice is a considerable need for migrant workers, given their vulnerability to exploitation and abuses. MARs implementing partners have supported migrant workers to be able to access justice and receive money awarded, with 36 legal aid cases including 103 migrant workers and 30,788USD awarded as of end September 2025. Partners also provided legal counselling for collective bargaining for 633 workers at 3 workplaces, with two successful CBAs and one ongoing. Further, migrant workers were supported to engage in social dialogue resulting in negotiated reduction of recruitment fees and costs from 14,000 THB to 11,200 THB for each of 200 workers (a total of 16,611USD saved for the workers). Continued work is needed on legal aid and social dialogue support, as well as on systematically improving the effectiveness of the national complaints mechanism as the quote below from an ILO staff member notes.

“The only suggestions I would give [are]: 1. Tripartite social dialogue... and 2. Support tripartite review of Thailand’s labour disputes resolution (policy and practices), involving national tripartite partners plus migrants and CSOs/lawyers who deal with labour cases of the migrants. (Our mission revealed that issues that migrants face in the factories rarely receive satisfactory resolution due to deficiencies in Thai Dispute resolution mechanisms.)” – ILO staff, following Mae Sot workshops on social dialogue

- Government

Discussions with government officials at Project Advisory Committee (PAC) meetings and in meetings on specific technical areas (research, employment in Mae Sot, agriculture policy reform, labour inspection) have continued to help steer the project toward meeting government needs. Government officials responding to the evaluation survey noted that MARs briefs and research help the government understand the realities of work in the project sectors, as well as have information on reasons why irregular migration continues to be a challenge. Government officials in the survey were broadly positive of the project and encouraged further discussion and validation of research briefs to jointly finalize and ensure accuracy and feedback from all sectors.

"For the government, having the policy briefs would help the government improve its policies to better align with the needs of migrant workers." – Government official, survey response

"[The project is relevant to our needs] such as [understanding] reasons why migrant workers are unwilling to comply with legal requirements for the registration." – Government official, survey response

The project has also been able to pivot with specific government requests, such as:

- 1) In November 2024, during the field visit of MARs, ILO Bureau for Workers' Activities (ACTRAV) and the International Trade Union Confederation- Thai Council (ITUC-TC) to the Department of Labour Protection and Welfare (DLPW) in Mae Sot, officials highlighted challenges in the employment situation and expressed the need for targeted capacity building support from the ILO for employers to engage more effectively in social dialogue as a way to strengthen labour relations and improve workplace cooperation. At the same time, one of the project partners in Mae Sot is supporting workers to understand law related to collective bargaining. For collective bargaining to be sustainable and mutually beneficial, it is important that both employers and workers have the knowledge, skills, and tools to participate constructively in social dialogue processes. Without this balance, efforts to promote fair and effective collective bargaining may not achieve their intended outcomes. Thus, following this request, MARs returned to Mae Sot in November 2025 and held social dialogue and collective bargaining workshops with employers, and also additionally with workers focusing not only on social dialogue but also organizing.
- 2) At the project's "Workshop for Building Solidarity for Effective Laws and Protection for Workers in Agriculture" in October 2025, the Ministry of Labour Informal Labour and Protection Department (ILPD) requested that the workshop's afternoon of discussion on policy recommendations be changed so that agriculture worker participants and workers' organizations would specifically discuss per the government's formal policy review survey format. This was duly accommodated, with five ILPD representatives taking over to lead discussions at flip charts and formally collect workers' opinions on the government's proposed policy changes for working conditions in seasonal agriculture work.

- Employers' organizations

The project has worked with employers in two events thus far: 1) supporting the Employers' Confederation of Thailand (ECOT) to discuss with their agriculture sector members about extension of social security to the sector (together with another ILO project TRIANGLE in ASEAN); and 2) working with DLPW in Mae Sot to invite key manufacturing employers in the border district (largely Federation of Thai Industries members) to a training on logics and techniques of social dialogue, particularly the benefits that good industrial relations can provide their businesses in terms of productivity, profit and worker retention. In the survey for this evaluation, the employer organization respondent replied as follows about relevance of MARs to employers:

"The project helps strengthen the knowledge and understanding of employees and employers regarding the rights and protections of migrant workers in Thailand." – Employer organization, survey response

As per Section 5.1, the ILO team who went on mission to Mae Sot in November 2025 recommend more work needs to be done with employers in border areas, continuing discussions on social dialogue, but also decent work and awareness of the Thai labour law.

- Workers' Organisations

Workers' organisations are key stakeholders and implementing partners in the MARs project. Their survey responses on relevance speak to the fact that they are concerned more about the relevance of MARs to migrant workers than of the project's relevance to their own organization. They note some challenges in that migrants are time poor and fear losing jobs, meaning that organizing activities can be challenging:

"We have been promoting education because most migrant workers have never known about their rights. We have been helping them to be more knowledgeable." – Workers' organization, survey response

"MARs is a very good project because it reaches out to informal workers, who were invisible earlier. All of us acknowledge the right to organize, but there is no time for the workers to organize and they are concerned they could be dismissed." – Workers' organization, survey response

An ILO specialist outlined relevance for workers' organizations as including on-the-ground understanding of conditions migrant workers face and how they are organizing on the border.

"The project also helped Thai unions better understand the challenges migrant workers face, such as sub-minimum wages and limited labour inspection. Continued focus on rights education and awareness-raising would further enhance relevance in the final year." – ILO staff, survey response

- Civil Society Organisations

The project has had a strategy of explicitly including CSOs in the project for two reasons: 1) they are operating in some areas like Mae Sot where there are no workers organizations, and 2) they have expertise in legal aid or connections to communities. Similar to the workers' organizations, officials from CSOs involved in the project said that MARs is relevant to the needs of the migrant workers, not mentioning their needs as CSOs.

Survey response recommendations for increased relevance toward the end of the project included:

- 1) a need for more time because "these are groups which have not really been reached before",
- 2) a need for ILO to bridge the dialogue gap between migrant workers and government,
- 3) giving migrants some assurance that it is ok to speak to government officials, and
- 4) increased relevance if large factories are included since "large factories are more likely to form groups and develop stronger bargaining power".

"We are working with workers in small factories and the agricultural sector which is still at an early stage. Groups have begun to form loosely. Therefore, if workers are to develop a strong group organization and gain bargaining power, the project's duration should be extended to allow further strengthening of these two groups—perhaps a project period of 3–5 years to ensure continuity." – CSO, survey response

- Alignment with International Frameworks

The project aligns with international frameworks related to migration. Thailand strongly supports the Global Compact on Migration (GCM) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The MARs project

implementing partners support the GCM objectives of providing access to basic services for migrants (objective 15) and providing timely and accurate information at all stages of migration (objective 3), as all partners have given positive feedback on knowledge gained through MARs-supported capacity building. Organizing work supports empowering migrants and societies to realise full inclusion (objective 16). The MARs-supported policy dialogue on Thailand's labour migration regulation supported the GCM objective of facilitating fair and ethical recruitment (objective 6). The same MARs work also aligns with SDG 8.8, 'Protect labour rights and promote safe and secure working environments for all workers, including migrant workers, in particular women migrants, and those in precarious employment', and SDG 10.7, 'Facilitate orderly, safe, regular and responsible migration and mobility of people, including through the implementation of planned and well-managed migration policies.'

Crucially, MARs also focuses on International Labour Standards, raising areas of non-compliance, recommending improvements, and providing support through social dialogue, research and technical assistance. The project has specifically focused on ILO Conventions No. 87, 98, and 181, provide global guidance on freedom of association, collective bargaining and fair recruitment. Non-binding policy guidelines referenced include the 2006 ILO Multilateral framework on labour migration and the 2018 General principles and operational guidelines for fair recruitment and definition of recruitment fees and related costs. MARs' work to promote transition from the informal to the formal economy and to promote decent work for displaced workers are guided by the Transition from the Informal to the Formal Economy Recommendation, 2015 (No. 204), and the Employment and Decent Work for Peace and Resilience Recommendation, 2017 (No. 205).

- Project and Budget and Decent Work Country Programme

The biennial ILO Project and Budget (P&B) agreed by the International Labour Conference (ILC) includes output 6.4, 'Increased capacity of Member States to develop fair and effective labour migration frameworks' in 2024-25. The Thailand Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP), 2023-27 also includes priority 2, 'Ensure social protection for all and inclusive decent work', with migrants in the outputs on social protection systems and increased opportunities of decent work for vulnerable populations. MARs jointly supported the ECOT workshop on Expansion of Social Security Coverage to the Agriculture Sector in Thailand in October 2024, for ECOT to collect their members' views on expansion of coverage. ECOT's director has been on the Social Security Board and reported taking recommendations from the meeting to the Board, urging the government to both simplify procedures to recruit migrant workers generally and to simplify procedures to pay contributions to the Social Security Fund. Partner service provision results also contributed to reporting frameworks.

- Alignment with donor priorities

There are alignments of the project with the priorities of the US Government. The project works to address labour exploitation, which would otherwise be part of American supply chains, among others through social dialogue and legal aid thus far in the project, and with labour inspection capacity building planned in 2026. Ultimately, the MARs project contributes to ensuring American agriculture and manufacturing businesses are not undercut by unfair business practices. It also supports a process of managed labour migration to Thailand, thus reducing irregular immigration and human trafficking.

3.2 Coherence

Key Findings- Coherence

Finding 5: The project has catalyzed and added to ILO's efforts on organizing and social dialogue at the enterprise level. **Finding 6:** There is also a niche the project has started to fill by bringing together workers' organizations and associations around seasonal agriculture, important for ongoing related policy reform.

Finding 7: The project is increasing coherence through joint collaboration with other ILO projects on labour migration and manufacturing, and sharing knowledge and information with UN agencies and other partners.

Finding 8: The project is increasing knowledge about worker organizations among other stakeholders, and more tripartite-plus conversations with migrant involvement are needed on various labour and migration topics.

Evaluation Questions

- ▶ Does the project remain compatible with other interventions in the country, sectors (agriculture and manufacturing), and ILO? Are there recommendations for better collaboration among tripartite-plus partners or others?

Comparative advantages and synergies with others

Some other ILO projects have elements of organizing, broadly in other sectors (fishing for Ship to Shore Rights Southeast Asia, and domestic work for TRIANGLE in ASEAN and PROTECT). MARS' primary focus on organizing in the project design and extension of that to include social dialogue in Mae Sot is compliments and catalyzes the work of other ILO projects. Similarly, added attention in the ILO projects' portfolio to agriculture and manufacturing has been welcome, as the sectors are large and significant employers of migrant workers. Particularly during the Ministry of Labour review of the policy governing working conditions in seasonal agriculture, MARS has added extra capacity to the ILO team. MARS has been able to convene workers' organizations constituents (where there is only one union in state-owned rubber, but not other agriculture) and also smaller groups of waged agriculture workers to contribute to the policy review in dialogue with the Ministry.

"This focus on organizing and empowering migrant workers supplements well other ongoing ILO projects, which do not have this dedicated focus." – ILO staff, survey response

"The project remains well aligned with national and sectoral interventions as well as broader ILO strategies on labour rights and social dialogue." – ILO staff, survey response

The project has collaborated or is planning upcoming joint work with ILO projects TRIANGLE in ASEAN, Ship to Shore Rights Southeast Asia, and Resilient, Inclusive and Sustainable Supply Chains Asia (RISSC)-Migration; as well as building on social dialogue experience from RISSC (focused on manufacturing) and the expertise of ACTRAV and other ILO specialists. In addition to this, the project is collaborating closely with the UN Thematic Working Group on the Cabinet Resolution on the Right to Work for Displaced Persons. This has included technical contribution related to international labour standards and Thai labour law and practice, with particular attention to the agriculture sector and to hiring and recruitment. The project contributed to two policy discussions with multiple government ministries in 2025.

Tripartite-plus collaboration

Survey participants were asked a particular question about tripartite-plus collaboration and how it could be improved. One noted concerns about many migrant workers not having access to formal work, thus no access to workers' organizations, and thus exclusion from the tripartite system. A worker organization representative also noted migrant workers should be encouraged to participate in the tripartite system. Aside from this systemic problem, evaluation participants asked for more tripartite consultation for specific project outputs, like research, or for specific policy issues, like migrant documentation. An ILO staff member appreciated that the project had fostered relationships between tripartite-plus actors, with CSOs and local actors gaining understanding of worker organizations.

"There should be consultations with the tripartite partners, possibly by organizing a workshop to verify the accuracy of the information [of briefs], as well as to discuss and collect feedback from all sectors before publishing the reports." – Government official, survey response

"[I recommend to] enhance cooperation among all parties involved in the employment of migrant workers." – Employers organization, survey response

"Activities should be organized... encouraging migrant workers to participate in the tripartite system." – Workers organization, survey response

"[T]he tripartite system is not aligned with the needs of migrant workers. Migrants in informal work are marginalized. That is the problem. Many are also undocumented. When they are outside the system, they are more vulnerable to exploitation and labour rights abuses. Some migrants may prefer to be outside of the system for greater personal agency, indicated by informal factories... and agriculture... The project is teaching how to become more of a group, but the question is what will happen once they speak out?" – CSO, survey response

"The meeting was only focused on DLPW, but we need DOE here too, because we have large documentation issues... We want to be able to do the documentation process ourselves. We have to pay brokers now, and they abandon us." – Migrant workers, FGD at agriculture policy workshop

"[MARs] strengthened coherence among tripartite-plus partners by engaging NGOs and local actors, many of whom previously had limited understanding of trade unions. Collaboration could be further improved by expanding engagement with employers and creating more structured opportunities for dialogue." – ILO staff, survey response

3.3 Effectiveness

Key Findings- Effectiveness

Finding 9: The project is on-track to achieve most of its planned objectives, outputs and indicator targets.

Finding 10: The project has used a phased approach first prioritizing outcomes 1 and 2, and rounded project success depends on implementation of outcome 3 in the remainder of the project.

Finding 11: While the project has been effective in forming migrant worker groups, there have been fewer avenues to unionizing than originally envisioned, partly because migrants are not employed in workplaces with existing unions (and are legally restricted from forming them). Migrant workers are, however, overcoming this in some Mae Sot factories through collective bargaining in the absence of any registered worker organizations in the border province.

Finding 12: Implementing partners and migrant workers face challenges related to worker organizing and training in terms of the workers' long hours, as well as loss of pay or threats from some employers if they participate.

Finding 13: Policy dialogues (related to labour migration governance, working conditions in seasonal agriculture, and social security for seasonal agriculture) have been targeted to include migrant workers.

Evaluation Questions

- ▶ To what extent has the project achieved - and is expected to achieve - its objectives, and its results?

- Are there any challenges to implementation faced by the project staff or partners that can be addressed in the last year?

Current status and key effectiveness challenges

The project is on-course to achieve most of the objectives and outputs of the project, though some may not be achieved due to delays described in section 3.4. The project has used a phased approach first prioritizing outcomes 1 and 2, and rounded project success depends on final phase implementation of outcome 3 in the remainder months of the project. Outcome 3 focuses on “effective enforcement of labor law in migrant labor workplaces, whether in formal or informal sectors, through labor inspection, or other methods such as complaints mechanisms and wage protection mechanisms.” A workshop is planned with the Thai labour inspectorate in 2026, and the project is waiting on feedback from the Ministry of Labour about wage protection research before starting. This challenge related to Outcome 3 on enforcement is seen in the quote below:

“Challenges remain in areas such as limited labour inspection and ongoing violations of minimum wage laws... The final year should prioritise strengthened employer engagement and clearer mechanisms for addressing reported violations.” – ILO staff, survey response

Overall, in terms of indicator measurement, while the project has surpassed some targets (related to legal aid, migrant worker group participation, advocacy and proposals by labour actors), other results indicators are behind the original schedule (worker organization outreach, worker organization membership, and policy proposals). Project partners are currently planning campaign activities, however, which may bring some of these in line during the remainder of the project. As there have been significant external delays to partner implementation (see section 3.4), lower numbers of migrants have been reached than originally planned. Finally, while the project has been effective in forming migrant worker groups, there have been fewer avenues to unionizing than originally envisioned, partly because migrants are not employed in workplaces with existent unions. Migrant workers are, however, overcoming this in some Mae Sot factories at least with engaging in collective bargaining in the absence of a single registered worker organization in the border province.

See Annex 3, for the Performance Indicator Tracking Table (PITT).

Evaluation respondents have given the following feedback on effectiveness overall:

“The project has progressed well, despite some delays caused by the temporary paused order from the U.S. government. It has still achieved results in supporting workers, building networks, and preparing policy briefs according to the original objectives.” – Government official, survey response

“I was fired and now I volunteer with [implementing partner]. The project is useful. We gained a lot of legal knowledge. I worked as an interpreter. My world was broadened and I could provide information now to migrant workers. The project disruption caused us to have to move our workforce. Having a group is important, better than MOL information with official language [terms]. CSOs and group information is easier. Now we organize a monthly discussion. The group is stronger and we are inviting new members.” – Migrant worker, FGD

“The project has been remarkably effective in delivering work even in the very challenging current conditions of US stop-work order, civil war in Myanmar and disruptions caused by the Cambodia-Thailand border conflict.” – ILO staff, survey response

"The project has made strong progress toward its objectives, including improving unions' understanding of migrant workers' rights and strengthening cross-border union cooperation. These changes have influenced local practices and contributed to identifying systemic issues affecting migrant workers." - ILO staff, survey response

Workers organizations and CSO implementing partners assessed their own effectiveness in implementing as broadly positive, with some realistic concerns that migrant workers groups may need more time to build more capacity:

"I think we have achieved about 80 percent in being able to provide assistance and knowledge, and the workers have gained more understanding." – Workers organization, survey response

"It is more or less on schedule, even though some things that were pushed are a bit late, like the research report and related seminar... The groups are showing greater cohesion and improved capacity, but it is difficult to say they will be able to start advocating for themselves within the timeframe granted." – CSO, survey response

Implementing partners also detailed very practical challenges in being able to reach workers, workers not having time for project activities due to their long work hours, workers losing pay, and employer threats.

"Agriculture and informal workers lose income every time they join us, and they are watched more closely." – Worker organization, FGD

"A challenge for agricultural workers is finding time to participate in activities, especially during harvest periods when they are particularly busy. Additionally, if one party attends, the other must stay home to work, so they cannot participate together. In some factories, employers do not allow workers to participate in training or learn about labour rights, sometimes even threatening them beforehand." - CSO, survey response

Government respondents noted the specificities of agriculture require comprehensive consideration, and also noted there was not enough budget for a larger scale research project to support policy review. The MARs project was designed to include a sectoral agriculture brief without an extensive survey or primary research. MOL was initially collaborating with a CSO on a large scale survey on working conditions, however funding for that CSO was withdrawn in early 2025 due to US reprioritization. When this larger research was no longer possible, MARs put together its agriculture brief with available existing ILO data related to the MOL six review questions for the agriculture policy.

"Workers in agriculture are largely employed on a seasonal basis and through subcontracting, and differ from other sectors in terms of severance pay, overtime compensation, and social security rights. Therefore, reviewing data from workers in this sector may require a more comprehensive and holistic consideration." – Government official, survey response

"[There are] budgetary challenges in implementing the project to gather feedback on the improvement and development of laws" - Government official, survey response

Key Achievements

Key achievements of the project include the below. Note that partner implementation related figures are as of end September 2025:

- **Migrant worker reach** totals 1,023 migrant workers reached by partner worker organizations and 1,567 reached by CSO partners through organizing and outreach. In addition to these, an estimated 5,000 Myanmar migrant workers were reached at an annual Karen Hand Tying Ceremony on 18 August 2024 with information about ILO Conventions 87 and 98, safe migration and worker organization/CSO hotlines. The project has also conducted trainings to provide labour, social protection and social dialogue knowledge to workers, as well as to train migrant leaders.
- **Legal aid** is being provided to migrant workers across Thailand, with cumulative 36 legal aid cases including 103 migrant workers and 30,788USD awarded. A workers organization and social partners also provided legal counselling for collective bargaining for 633 workers at 3 workplaces, with two successful CBAs. Further, another partner helped workers with social dialogue resulting in negotiated reduction of recruitment fees and costs from 14,000 THB to 11,200 THB for each of 200 workers (a total of 16,611USD saved for the workers).
- **Migrant Worker Resource Centres (MRCs)** were (re)established by Thai worker organizations: The worker organization MRCs are providing information and legal aid to migrants in Rayong (operated by the State Enterprise Workers' Relations Confederation Foundation (SERCF)); and in Greater Bangkok (operated by three private sector worker organizations, Thai Trade Union Congress (TTUC), in collaboration with Labour Congress of Thailand (LCT), National Congress of Private Industrial Employees (NCPE)).
- **New migrant worker groups** (membership-based) were founded:
 - "Friends for Peace" on 22 September 2024. 33 founding members are migrant workers in small-scale manufacturing and home-based work in the Bangbon area of Greater Bangkok.
 - "Pong Yang Group" in November 2024. 20 members are migrant workers in agriculture in the Pong Yang area of Chiang Mai. The group is focused on Occupational Safety in Health, with concerns about pesticide and smog pollution.
 - "Migrant Workers Solidarity Group" on 14 September 2025. 37 members and democratically elected leaders are primarily Cambodian migrant workers in the Eastern region of Thailand, with support from State Enterprises Workers' Relations Confederation Foundation (SERCF). Achievement of this despite the reduced numbers of Cambodians and fear around leaving accommodation is important to note. At the same time, given recent events on the border, a group to support Cambodians is timely and needed.
- **Policy reform** - Tripartite stakeholders including migrant workers have dialogued and developed policy recommendations on labour and migration issues. ILO has given additional technical policy advice:
 - **Labour migration governance:** ITUC-Thai Council representatives, including four migrant workers in agriculture and manufacturing, formulated 13 recommendations on labour migration governance to the Thai government on 14 August 2024, reviewing the Royal Ordinance Concerning Management of Employment of Migrant Workers 2017. Proposals focused on changing the term "alien", proportionate penalties and burden of proof for employers, ensuring subcontracting remains not allowed, and simplifying documentation processes, among others.
 - **Seasonal agriculture social security extension:** Jointly supported by MARs and another ILO project, ECOT organized a workshop on Expansion of Social Security Coverage to the Agriculture Sector in Thailand on 11 October 2024. As the sector has been wholly uncovered by social security and employers themselves are not enrolled, the workshop first raised awareness of agriculture employers about social security. ECOT then collected their members' views on expansion of coverage to the sector. ECOT's director sits on the Board and is taking recommendations from the meeting to the Board, urging the government to both simplify procedures to recruit migrant workers and to simply procedures to pay contributions to the Social Security Fund.

- Seasonal agriculture working condition policy:** On 30 July 2025, MARs staff participated in a meeting of the Working Group on the Reform of the Ministerial Regulation on Labour Protection for Workers in Agriculture 2014. Following this meeting, MARs held an informal online call on 13 August 2025 with Thai trade unions, CSOs and migrant worker groups in agriculture (a total of 11 participants, representing or supporting 6 agriculture workers groups in Thailand). Participants were interested to meet again. MARs then organized a “Workshop to Build Solidarity for Effective Laws and Protection for Workers in Agriculture” on 8 October 2025 for workers to dialogue with ILPD officials on the Ministerial Regulation and review process. ILPD officials at the meeting requested that the afternoon be spent specifically looking at the review survey questions, and this was duly accommodated with ILPD colleagues taking facilitating roles at a flip chart to focus on each survey question in turn. The project’s policy brief “Agriculture in Thailand: Policy and working conditions for nationals and migrants” first draft was presented at the workshop and then also at the PAC in end-October 2025. Government officials requested revision detailing methodology and further specificities of the sector. The brief responds to MOL’s data need in six agreed areas of reform for the Ministerial Regulation (See also section 3.1). At the above workshop, ILPD noted ongoing review meetings to be held with 60 workers each in four or five provinces, and will connect to some of the workers groups met at the workshop when these provincial discussions are held in 2026.
- Workers activities** and collaboration with government and employers to improve conditions in supply chains, including:
 - Social dialogue and collective bargaining:** The project is supporting migrant workers to understand legal processes for social dialogue to improve working conditions and industrial relations in factories
 - 24 August 2025: A union in an electronics factory that has both Thai and Myanmar members in Greater Bangkok area visited the TTUC MRC to consult on the CBA process in Thailand and proposals that they planned to submit to the employer. The CBA was finalized with 3 demands; (1) Diligence allowance (for not missing work) of THB700/month for all workers, (2) Payment of remaining annual leave to all employees, and (3) Retention of all existing benefits was agreed and signed. The union includes around **120 worker members, among them approximately 30 migrants**.
 - 21 July 2025: A total of **499 Myanmar workers** from a Mae Sot garment factory signed proposals to improve their working conditions for the second consecutive year. The first negotiation meeting, initially scheduled for 24 July, was postponed to 30 October.
 - 29 July 2025: A total of **164 Myanmar workers** from a Mae Sot electronics factory signed proposals to improve their working conditions for the second consecutive year. Four rounds of negotiation were held before reaching a new collective bargaining agreement. This year’s agreement introduced several notable improvements in rights and welfare benefits, and maintained last years’: provisions for interpreters and transport to hospitals, coverage of work-related medical expenses, establishment of a first-aid room with a nurse, protection against dismissal due to loss of migration documents, and employer support in renewing those documents.
 - Thai-Lao cross-border worker organization MOU:** The International Trade Union Confederation – Thai Council (ITUC-TC) and the Lao Federation of Trade Unions (LFTU) have finalized a “Memorandum of Understanding between LFTU and ITUC-TC on Protection of Migrant Workers for the Years 2025-2029” which aims to enhance protection, outreach and advocacy for the rights of migrant workers along the Lao PDR-Thailand corridor. The final draft is being considered for approval by the Lao PDR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and, assuming success of that process, the MOU is expected to be signed in 2026.
 - Thai-Myanmar cross-border worker organization collaboration, and social dialogue training with employers:** During 21-23 November 2024, leaders of the International Trade Union Confederation – Thai Council (ITUC-TC) visited Mae Sot and had collaborating discussion with members of the Confederation of Trade Unions Myanmar (CTUM) and other workers organizations and CSOs. ITUC-TC leaders visited and collected information about migrant

workers' living and working condition in the province, previously unaware and taken aback that there is a provincial practice among many employers to pay migrant workers under the Thai minimum wage. CTUM and ITUC-TC particularly discussed the possibility of ITUC-TC working in Mae Sot to train worker leaders. There are currently no registered worker organizations in Tak province. The leaders of the national worker organization centres then met with local authorities from DLPW, DOE and SSO, among others, discussing migrant pay below the minimum wage. DLPW requested ILO to return and train workers and employers organizations on industrial relations; and worker leaders on organizing and CBAs. This took place in November 2025 (See also section 5.2).

3.4 Efficiency

Key Findings- Efficiency

Finding 13: The project has had a relatively short time to implement, and had time-based challenges related to USEO stop-work order and delays in the initial PAC meeting.

Finding 14: Project activities must run at full pace in 2026 for efficiency criteria related to time and spending to be met.

Finding 15: Value for money has come from high-impact, low-cost interventions, as well as joint resources with other projects contributing to larger meetings attracting higher level attention.

Evaluation Questions

- Is the project delivering results in an economic and timely way, taking into account the US stop-work order in early 2025?

The project has had delays related to an effective six-month implementation disruption from the US Stop-Work Order in the first half of 2025, in addition to an extended nine-month inception period before the first Project Advisory Committee meeting could be held. Thus the project implementation has been limited to a 21 of 36-month project period.

Despite this, the project is attempting to maintain most originally planned activities. However, the project has requested that the donor and the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) consider omitting one research activity (either on cross-border MOUs or on wage protection mechanisms). MOL is currently discussing the utility of both, and will revert to the MARs project staff with a decision. Budget that would have gone to one of these research pieces is being invested in migrant organizing and legal aid for the latter months of the project. Project activities must run at full pace for the final nine months for efficiency criteria to be met.

As one respondent observed, the project is implementing "high-impact, low-cost interventions" such as trainings in venues close to workers, rather than in expensive hotel rooms. Some organizations, like Lao and Myanmar workers organizations, have not required funding or have self-funded their involvement. The project's joint work with other ILO projects, related to social security, safety and labour inspection also make the project's budget have compounded effect. Meetings with greater joint funding have been able to include more participants (labour inspection meeting planned) and attract attention from higher level officials (ECOT meeting).

"Despite external constraints—including the expected US stop-work order—the project has delivered results efficiently. Activities were implemented in a timely and cost-effective manner, with strong cooperation among unions and local partners. Focusing on high-impact, low-cost interventions such as training and cross-border cooperation will remain essential." – ILO staff, survey response

3.5 Impact

Key Findings- Impact

Finding 17: Stakeholders, including migrant workers, assess that there are positive evident short-term impacts, particularly related to the following:

- ▶ capacity building of migrant workers' knowledge of rights as well as ways to solve problems, including negotiating with employers and discussing practical solutions with local politicians;
- ▶ stakeholders' increased understanding of migrant worker realities leading to "better protection of migrant workers and more effective policy dialogue";
- ▶ migrant worker group formation and organizing;
- ▶ national security; and
- ▶ stronger cross-border union collaboration.

Finding 18: MARs is not working in isolation or starting from scratch, but working with partners and other ILO projects, which have been doing - and can build on - similar previous or complementary work.

Finding 19: Respondents see ways to further improve impact by:

- ▶ expanding workers' rights education;
- ▶ increasing opportunities to dialogue with employers;
- ▶ creating spaces for worker groups to network with each other;
- ▶ a joint partner campaign on C87 and C98, fair wages and social security;
- ▶ collaborating further and helping migrants engage with government; and
- ▶ involving the central bank and national development institutes for assessments of migration vis-à-vis economic growth.

Evaluation Questions

- ▶ To what extent have there been - and do you foresee - positive changes in the lives of migrant workers, and on policies and practices? What could increase impact?

The MARs project has made positive evident short-term impacts. Stakeholders, including migrant workers particularly, identified capacity building of migrant workers' knowledge of rights as well as ways to solve problems, including negotiating with employers (see below related to social dialogue about sick leave and non-confiscation of identity documents) and discussions with local leaders to change agriculture chemical management in their areas. Migrant worker group formation and organizing have been the vehicle through which to build knowledge, as well as the foundation for workers jointly having courage to discuss problems and agree solutions with decision makers at work or in government. Importantly, one implementing partner noted that group building in a short time has been able to start engaging in advocacy "in part because that group is in synergy with another project of ours that has built up capacity." Thus, MARs is not working in isolation or starting from scratch, but working with partners and ILO projects, which have been doing - and can build on - similar previous or complimentary work.

"Previously, I did not have knowledge and join any training. I did not know the solutions to solve the problems or issues. After being trained, I learned about organizing and solutions – Migrant workers, FGD

"The project has brought changes to the lives of migrant workers, including those in the agricultural sector and in small factories. For agricultural workers who have formed groups, they have addressed issues related to chemical use in their areas, leading to more systematic management of chemical waste and improving overall safety... [They] work with community leaders and local administrative organizations to improve the quality of life of workers in the project areas."– CSO, survey response

"The greatest success of this project for workers in small factories is that it has enabled the target workers—who previously had no knowledge of their rights—to become aware of their own rights. This has led them to

use their knowledge to address problems, such as negotiating with employers about sick leave or requesting that their personal documents be kept with the workers themselves. It has also created opportunities for workers in small factories to exchange and learn from one another, so that in the future they may form stronger groups with greater bargaining power.” – CSO, survey response

“I have learned that being a member of unions is a very good opportunity to develop my knowledge and communication skills.” - Migrant worker, FGD

Tripartite stakeholders have also increased their own understanding of migrant worker realities, which has led to grounded and rights protective policy discussion, and employers’ understanding of rights. One government respondent noted that the project benefits national security, reflecting a sense that there is a whole of government benefit though the causal link to national security was not elaborated in the survey. Another government official anticipates that reports and briefs will be of use to government officials to “address issues related to migrant workers’ rights”. Dedicated work with worker organizations has also enabled stronger cross-border union collaboration with both Lao and Myanmar unions (see section 3.3).

“The project has already contributed to improved advocacy, better understanding of migrant workers’ realities, and stronger cross-border union collaboration. These changes have supported better protection of migrant workers and more effective policy dialogue.” – ILO staff, survey response

“[The project has] benefits to migrant workers and national security.” – Government official, survey response

“The project increases knowledge of labour rights among migrant workers and employers. Data and information from the project, such as reports or policy briefs, will serve as an important database that the government can use to promote policy improvements, legal amendments, and address issues related to migrant workers’ rights. This will have a positive long-term impact on supporting and protecting the rights of migrant workers.” – Government official, survey response

The evaluation asked for opinions about how to further improve impact, as well as sustainability (See section 3.6). Respondents suggested the below to boost impact, some of which may be achievable in the remainder of the project, but others of which will need dedicated longer planning and further resources:

- ▶ expanding workers’ rights education;
- ▶ increasing opportunities to dialogue with employers;
- ▶ creating spaces for worker groups to network with each other;
- ▶ a joint partner campaign on C87 and C98, fair wages and social security;
- ▶ collaborating further and helping migrants engage with government; and
- ▶ involving the central bank and national development institutes for assessments of migration vis-à-vis economic growth.

“Impact could be increased by expanding workers’ rights education and creating more opportunities for dialogue with employers, which would support more durable improvements in workplace practices.” – ILO staff, survey response

“Organizing groups and bringing many groups together for advocacy is important. I would like the ILO to organize trainings that allow multiple groups to meet at the same time, with sessions held continuously, along with ongoing assessments of the workers’ understanding” – Workers organization, survey response

"We need 1) Joint activities to get fair wages. 2) C87 and C98. 3) A campaign on 3 things: C87 and C98; fair wages; social security. 4) Case and legal aid support. 5) Protection mechanisms need to work. Is there any ILO money for a campaign?" – Workers organization, FGD at IA partners meeting

"Consider involving in national level tripartite plus social dialogue, other influential actors in Thailand such as Central Bank, National Development institutes, etc who are in position to influence policy and who are aware that Thailand needs migrant labour for its growth (for both production and consumption) – their involvement may bring about some necessary changes in Government policy on migration and migrants." – ILO staff, survey response

"We want the government to listen to workers' reason." – Migrant worker, FGD at agriculture policy workshop

"[Impact could be increased through] collaboration with government" – Government official, survey response

3.6 Sustainability

Key Findings- Sustainability

Finding 20: National policy reform processes have been supported and may contribute to durable changes. Migrant workers would like to know the outcome of the policy discussions to which they inputted.

Finding 21: Migrant worker organizing, group building, social dialogue and support services have contributed to a built-up, longer-lasting empowerment of migrant workers.

Finding 22: Sustainability may also result from dedicated work with and strengthening of Thai workers' organizations. Respondents called for continued support to the trade union movement, migrant worker groups and the principles of freedom of association.

Finding 23: Sustained impact needs more time for this or similar projects and further financial resources.

Finding 24: Due to the evolving challenges linked to labour migration, work at a systemic level is still needed to address core needs related to labour and migration governance. An extended project phase or other investments would help capacitate stakeholders to address these. Stakeholder priorities for continued policy work include the following: Ratification of ILO Conventions 87 and 98, wage protection, social security access, documents untied from specific employers, enforcement of policies in small factories.

Evaluation Questions

- To what extent are the results of the intervention likely to have a long term, sustainable positive contribution?

As per section 3.3, national policy reform processes have been supported by the project, with contributions from workers and employers organizations and migrant workers, as well as ILO technical input. These may contribute to durable changes, though the outcomes of the related policy processes are not yet known. As below, migrant workers would like to know the outcome of the policy discussions to which they inputted.

"[MARs] benefits migrant workers as well as policies and practices at the level of government agencies responsible for promoting and enforcing the law, with long-term effects." – Government official, survey response

"There is discussion on laws but I want to know follow up/outcome later." - Migrant worker, FGD

"Additionally, the project includes [our CSO] research on the issues faced by workers in small factories, which will be published and used to develop policy recommendations, potentially leading to policy changes in the future." – CSO, survey response

Migrant worker empowerment is also likely to be lasting. This has been achieved through knowledge, training, outreach, group building, organizing, and social dialogue.

"Empowerment of workers will have sustainable effect." – ILO staff, survey response

"It will certainly have an impact that leads to long-term changes." – Employer organization, survey response

Sustainability may also result from dedicated work with and strengthening of Thai workers' organizations. Respondents called for continued support to the trade union movement, migrant worker groups and the principles of freedom of association. Respondents made recommendations for more and expanded support of the trade union movement and migrant worker groups:

"The project's results are likely to have a sustainable positive impact due to the strengthened perspectives of Thai unions, improved cross-border collaboration, and increased awareness among stakeholders." - ILO staff, survey response

"[The project could increase impact and sustainability by] continuously building networks with migrant worker groups in local areas to facilitate the dissemination of information about labour rights and to expand networks for carrying out other activities in the future." – Government official, survey response

"There are still a lot of migrant workers that unions and NGOs have not reached." – Workers organization, survey response

"We need more support after MARs. We need support of the trade union movement generally. The Government needs indicators so they will be more enthusiastic and teach employers about freedom of association. It has to start from the government and the government has to be sincere about promoting FOA." – Worker organization, FGD at IA Partners Meeting

As a major theme in respondents' answers, a longer, funded project duration is recommended in order to embed current interventions and "provide a more stable foundation for creating change." As in previous sections, respondents note that workers take time to form groups, build knowledge and arrive at a place where they have the ability and want to claim rights.

"In the short term, the project's impact may not be very visible, but if it continues for more than three years, I believe it will result in significant long-term positive impacts." – Workers organization, survey response

"In the long term, it is believed that the project's implementation will have lasting effects, especially for agricultural workers. Small factory workers are also likely to experience long-term impacts as they gain

greater awareness of their rights; access to rights and the ability to claim them will naturally follow. If the project can be extended for another 3–5 years, it could provide a more stable foundation for creating change.” – CSO, survey response

Work at a systemic level is still needed to address core needs related to labour and migration governance. An extended project phase or other investments would help capacitate stakeholders to address these. Stakeholder priorities for continued policy work include the following: Ratification of ILO Conventions 87 and 98, wage protection, social security access, documents untied from specific employers, enforcement of policies in small factories. As in Section 3.5, a workers’ organization recommendation to the evaluation was: “We need 1) Joint activities to get fair wages. 2) C87 and C98. 3) A campaign on 3 things: C87 and C98; fair wages; social security. 4) Case and legal aid support. 5) Protection mechanisms need to work.” Other stakeholders added recommendations as below:

“[Migrant workers need] access to documents that provide legal status that are delinked to employers and access to public services” - CSO, survey response

“Enforce stricter inspections of workers in small factories to address issues of workers not receiving their rights. The government should establish clear policies regarding the operation of small factories, as currently there is no defined framework. Small factories (home-based or shop-house factories) can be opened easily, and labor inspections do not reach these workplaces.” – CSO, survey response

► 4. Conclusions, recommendations and action to be taken

4.1 Conclusions

Overall, the project has had achievements in supporting stronger migrant workers organizations and workers organizations and bringing workers to the table for policy discussions related to labour migration governance and policy related to seasonal agriculture. It has been flexible to maintain relevance by responding to originally unforeseen areas such as social dialogue, collective bargaining, and displaced workers. Dedicated attention is needed in the remaining part of the project to achieving work under Objective 3 related to policy implementation, through support to the Thai labour inspectorate and possibly through research on wage protection (depending on MOL’s preference for research focus). The project aligns with national priorities in the DWCP and supporting international frameworks.

MARs has had particularly noted impact for migrant workers themselves, as the primary beneficiary, but also has been able to build stakeholders knowledge and consultation needs. More is needed in the coming months to finalize briefs and research, which -in addition to worker and employer input to policy- can provide an evidence base for grounded and informed policy reform.

Primarily due to the USEO stop-work order, as well as some other delays, the project has needed to reduce one activity and may not meet all originally set indicator targets. It is, however, largely on track to meet its objectives. Due to existing challenges linked to organizing migrant workers in these sectors, unions have primarily been able to organize only in migrant worker groups. Union membership for migrants has been

more challenging, as migrant workers largely are not working in workplaces with existing unions. Since they cannot form their own unions as per the national laws, if there is not one already in their workplace, then less formal migrant worker groups are their only option, rather than union membership.

4.2 Recommendations and action to be taken

Primarily recommendations come from the mid-term evaluation survey and FGD responses, which have been summarized and collated here. Only the sixth recommendation comes from the MARs project team. Given this is an internal evaluation, prioritizing survey and FGD recommendations enables some distance between the project team writing the evaluation and the recommendations. Further it allows the project team to be able to respond – as in the final column below – to the recommendations from migrant workers, tripartite-plus stakeholders and non-project ILO staff.

Recommendations	Addressed To	ILO project management response / ILO action to be taken where relevant
1. Continue and expand migrant worker knowledge building, group formation and inter-group discussion, social dialogue support and legal aid.	ILO, implementing partners, donor	MARs will continue to prioritize these activities in the final months of the project, and some savings from cancellation of one of the research projects (to be determined by MOL) will be reinvested in these types of support to migrant workers. Expansion to further geographic areas is not possible with the current budget and timeframe however.
2. Continue using ILO's convening power to organizing bi- and tri-partite discussions, especially bringing employers and a broader set of relevant government actors to the table.	ILO	This is duly noted by the project staff. The project is planning a workshop with ECOT in Chonburi province in February 2026 on enhancing agriculture employers' knowledge of OSH and the Workers' Compensation Fund (together with the ILO project RISSC-Migrant). The project has also offered to support MOL's ILPD to convene workers for further dialogue in Thai provinces related to the agriculture policy reform. Finally, discussions on the project research (see Recommendations 3) will involve tripartite discussions.
3. Ensure further discussion and tripartite-plus validation of research .	ILO	The project will plan for this consultative validation discussion.
4. More work needs to be done with employers in border areas , continuing discussions on social dialogue, but also decent work and awareness of the Thai labour law.	ILO, employers organizations, government	This continued technical support to employers in Mae Sot may be beyond the ability of this project's timeframe, however and may need to be continued by other ILO labour migration projects.
5. Increase support to the trade union movement, migrant worker groups and the principles of freedom of association .	ILO, government	The project will continue its current level of support, given current resources. The ILO will encourage and promote further support of workers' organizing and bargaining.
6. Project activities must run at full pace in 2026 for efficiency criteria related to time and spending to be met, as well as for Objective 3 to be fulfilled.	ILO, implementing partners	Project planning for 2026 is underway, with project staff making every effort to meet commitments for planned deliverables.
7. Work to improve the effectiveness and implementation of the national	ILO, government	Work on Objective 3 is a priority for the remainder of the project. Work on wage

complaints mechanism, wage protection and social protection access. This relates to MARs Objective 3.		protection will be confirmed or not by MOL in coming weeks. The legal aid components of the project support migrants to access the complaints mechanism and social protection, but systemic change to these will need to be planned for and prioritized in another project. The project has worked, however, with ECOT consulting members on extension of social security to seasonal agriculture workers.
8. Consider a joint partner campaign on ILO Conventions 87 and 98 , as well as fair wages and social security.	ILO, implementing partners	There is not additional funding for this in the project, but the MARs is happy to support re-distribution of current implementing partner budgets for this in the remaining months of their work.
9. Consider involving the central bank and national development institutes for assessments of labour migration vis-à-vis economic growth.	ILO, central bank, national development institutes	The ILO can consider this priority in design of other ILO projects or an extended phase of this project, if applicable.
10. An extended project phase or other similar investments would help capacitate stakeholders to continue efforts in addressing systemic change and would enable more longer-term change in migrants' lives. Consider expanding the scope more to large factories.	Donor	n/a
11. Stakeholder priorities for further policy work include the following: Ratification of ILO Conventions 87 and 98, wage protection, social security access, documents untied from specific employers, enforcement of policies in small factories. Work at a systemic level is still needed to address core needs related to labour and migration governance.	Government, ILO	The ILO can consider these priorities in design of other ILO projects or an extended phase of this project, if applicable. MARs will take into account challenges related to enforcement of policies in small factories when writing the upcoming brief on manufacturing.
12. Following outcomes of current policy reform processes, feed back to migrant workers who contributed to policy dialogues. They request to know if their inputs have contributed to change.	ILO	The MARs project team will endeavour to feed back to migrant workers as soon as policy reform outcomes are final.

► 5. Lessons learned and good practices

5.1 Select lessons learned

- **Employer strengthening:** Given this project has had a focus on worker strengthening, it has therefore had relatively less focus on employers. Workers asked for more employer dialogue. The project team and ILO specialists noted on the MARs November 2025 mission to Mae Sot on the Thai-

Myanmar border that, in addition to social dialogue between workers and employers, more discussion on ILS, social dialogue and/or ESG principles is also needed with employers as a singular group.

- ▶ **Attention to Mae Sot border province:** The project has given new attention to the Mae Sot area with Specialists and the Deputy Country Director engaging in workshops with workers and employers. Given working conditions there are comparatively poor, further attention is needed in that province specifically. Partners appreciated ILO staff direct presence and time dedication, in addition to funding support.
- ▶ **Flexibility to shifting labour migration context:** Unforeseen political and cross-border developments can substantially affect migrant workers' networks and advocacy spaces. The Cambodia-Thailand border situation that emerged during implementation was not anticipated at the design stage and constrained one partner's activities in particular, as Cambodians were main beneficiaries. On the other hand, it also opened space for the same partner to take up some outreach to displaced workers who were hired to replace some of the Cambodians in agriculture. This experience reinforces the importance of flexibility and adaptive implementation in dynamic migration contexts.

5.2 Emergent good practice

- ▶ **Social dialogue and collective bargaining agreements:** Per Finding 11 and Section 3.3, While the project has been effective in forming and supporting migrant worker groups, there are few opportunities for migrant workers to join unions. In Mae Sot and broader in Tak province, there are no private sector unions. This speaks partly to Thailand's low union density rate, but also to legal restrictions on migrants forming unions. Partners report that some workplaces in Mae Sot are composed of 90 per cent migrant workers, with nationals employed in management, human resources, accounting etc. Migrant workers are, however, overcoming this in some larger Mae Sot factories through collective bargaining. Under Thai law governing collective bargaining agreements, signatures are needed from 15 per cent of the workforce at an enterprise. MARs partners (ITUC-Thai Council and CSOs) and the ILO (including the Country Office and workers and social dialogue specialists) are supporting this through legal aid and training of workers, and -with the request of the provincial government- through training of employers. Worker organization partners are also supporting collective bargaining in the Greater Bangkok area in a factory with both Thai and migrant workers. MARs support to three completed collective bargaining agreements (CBAs) is below and in Section 3.3, and there is further support ongoing to workers groups negotiating other CBAs. MARs work has coherence with work by another ILO project, TRIANGLE in ASEAN, which supports an MRC Labour Law Clinic in Mae Sot. This MRC gives legal aid support to worker leaders if their jobs are terminated on account of their social dialogue and CBA work. Further, social partners are regularly represented on the national adjudicating body for these types of labour cases. ILO's work to build their understanding of the realities of migrant workers and employment of migrant workers enables them to input to that process with more full knowledge.

Table: Successfully agreed CBAs supported by MARs in 2025

24 August 2025: A union in an electronics factory that has both Thai and Myanmar members in Greater Bangkok area visited the TTUC MRC to consult on the CBA process in Thailand and proposals that they planned to submit to the employer. The CBA was finalized with 3 demands; (1) Diligence allowance (for not missing work) of THB700/month for all workers, (2) Payment of remaining annual leave to all employees, and (3) Retention of all existing benefits was agreed and signed. The union includes around 120 worker members, among them approximately 30 migrants.
21 July 2025: A total of 499 Myanmar workers from a Mae Sot garment factory signed proposals to improve their working conditions for the second consecutive year. The first negotiation meeting, initially scheduled for 24 July, was postponed to 30 October.
29 July 2025: A total of 164 Myanmar workers from a Mae Sot electronics factory signed proposals to improve their working conditions for the second consecutive year. Four rounds of negotiation were held before reaching a new collective bargaining agreement. This year's agreement introduced several

notable improvements in rights and welfare benefits, and maintained last years' provisions for interpreters and transport to hospitals, coverage of work

- ▶ **Connecting agriculture workers groups:** Aside from a public sector workers organization in rubber, there are no other registered agriculture sector workers organizations. This makes it difficult to hold tripartite dialogue about conditions in the sector. The Working Group on the Reform of the Ministerial Regulation on Labour Protection for Workers in Agriculture 2014, for instance, has workers represented by farmers' cooperatives. While it is good that farmers' cooperatives are on the committee, unfortunately they are smallholders who do work themselves and sometimes employ waged workers, meaning they employ rather than represent the seasonal waged workers which the Ministerial Regulation covers. Over the course of the MARs project, MARs set out to build and support migrant worker groups in agriculture through implementing partners, but also to find out what other groups or workers' associations might exist in the sector. This became increasingly important as the MOL reform process of the Ministerial Regulation progressed. MARs held an initial informal call with worker groups so MARs and the groups could all introduce each other. MARs then organized a "Workshop to Build Solidarity for Effective Laws and Protection for Workers in Agriculture" on 8 October 2025. This was an opportunity for the groups to meet in person, but also to meet and dialogue with MOL ILPD officials and the Working Group academic who are leading the collection of data to input into the reform process decisions. ILPD and the academic will continue to host four or five more dialogues in different parts of the country in 2026, and they noted at the Workshop that they will draw on the connections to worker groups they met at the Workshop to ensure a large number of workers in each region are able to attend and give inputs to the review survey queries. Both migrant workers and worker organization representatives recommend more spaces be created for groups to meet each other and dialogue, appreciating the newly made connections and also noting the time, logistics and financial resources needed to convene.

- ▶ **Decent work for displaced workers:** An emergent area of work related to agriculture and manufacturing sectors has been displaced persons' access to the Thai labour market as of 1 October 2025. The project has drawn on the ILO Employment and Decent Work for Peace and Resilience Recommendation, 2017 (No. 205), ILO's technical expertise, and partners to engage with displaced persons and the stakeholders who are invested in the success of the new scheme. These workers are primarily working in MARs project focus sectors: agriculture and manufacturing, and one project worker organization partner will include these workers in upcoming agriculture outreach in 2026. An initial Cabinet Resolution (CR) on 26 August 2025 issued the decision with ministry Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) issued subsequently. The government notified the UN that reviews of the policies would be held initially every three months. The review inputs are coordinated by another UN agency, and the ILO is collaborating closely with the UN Thematic Working Group on the Cabinet Resolution on the Right to Work for Displaced Persons. This has included technical contribution related to international labour standards and Thai labour law and practice, with particular attention to hiring and recruitment (promoting job fairs, written standard contracts, and social security enrolment, as well as reminding of MOL's intention that recruiters are not part of the current policy). The project contributed to two policy discussions with multiple government ministries in 2025 (See also sections 3.1 and 3.2). On the MARs November 2025 mission to Mae Sot, the project organized for ITUC-Thai Council leaders to meet displaced person leadership to be able to coordinate on any case management or labour issues in future. Coherently, the ILO TRIANGLE project is supporting legal aid of these new workers, while MARs worker organization partners will include outreach to this group, among other non-nationals in agriculture and manufacturing, in destination provinces.

► Annex 1: Evaluation TOR



► Mid-term internal self-evaluation of the Migrant Advocacy for Rights project

Terms of Reference

September 2025

► Overview

Title of project being evaluated	Migrant Advocacy for Rights (MARs)
Project DC Code	THA/23/01/USA
Type of evaluation	Mid-term internal self-evaluation
Timing of evaluation	Mid-September 2025 – Mid-January 2026
Donor	United States Government
Countries Covered	Thailand
Administrative Unit in the ILO responsible for administrating the project	CO-BANGKOK
Technical Unit(s) in the ILO responsible for backstopping the project	MIGRANT
P&B outcome (s) under evaluation	Outcome 6: Protection at work for all
SDG(s) under evaluation	SDG 8 – Target 8.8, SDG 10 – Target 10.7
Project Budget	USD 1,200,000
Project Manager and Lead on Self-Evaluation	Rebecca Napier-Moore, Technical Officer, MARs and TRIANGLE in ASEAN

► Introduction

Context

Thailand is the main country of destination for migrant workers in Southeast Asia, with around 3.5 million documented migrant workers from Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic (Lao PDR) and Myanmar, in addition to a large number of undocumented migrant workers. Many migrants have positive migration experiences, yet situations of rights abuses abound. Feeding into major global supply chains, informal agriculture and manufacturing can have decent work deficits. Migrants in the informal economy are largely excluded from labour and social protection and have very few opportunities to join workers organizations, bargain collectively and advocate for their rights. Those working informally particularly face low wages, passport confiscation, injuries due to unsafe workplaces, and excessive hours.

Responding to these challenges, and within the broader context of the ILO Decent Work Country Programme in Thailand, the ILO is implementing the Migrant Advocacy for Rights (MARs). Since the project started in September 2023, increased numbers of migrants from Myanmar have arrived, particularly after forced conscription commenced in April 2024. And in July and August 2025, a large number of Cambodians returned home, following border hostilities, leaving labour market demands especially in provinces nearer the Cambodian border but also in other areas. These dynamic changes in workforce and migration patterns have caused uncertainties for ILO tripartite partners and for migrant workers. At the same time during the

first half of the project, a significant migration policy and agriculture related labour and social protection policy have been under review.

Project background

The Migrant Advocacy for Rights (MARs) project aims at improving migrants' rights realization in informal agriculture and manufacturing in Thailand through migrant organizing and advocacy for full coverage in labor law and social protection, improved labor migration governance, and enforcement of rights-protective laws. MARs project works to formalize migrant labour in agriculture and manufacturing sectors in Thailand, through supporting consultative law and policy reform processes, enforcement of labour and migration laws and policies, and migrant worker knowledge and engagement in social dialogue. The project works to ensure exploitation is addressed and thus not part of international supply chains, among others through strengthening the labour inspectorate as well as complaints and wage protection mechanisms in the targeted sectors. The project runs from 27 September 2023 to 26 September 2026.

This project is centered in Thailand as the largest destination country for migrants in the region. Participant groups are Cambodian, Lao and Myanmar migrant workers of working age in informal agriculture and manufacturing. The project focusses broadly on three areas of Thailand with high numbers of migrant workers: Greater Bangkok, Tak province (including the Tak SEZ), and the Eastern Special Development Zone of Chachoengsao, Chonburi and Rayong provinces. All three are sites of manufacturing, and the latter two are sites with agriculture.

The purpose of the project

Responding to these challenges, the program "Migrant Advocacy for Rights" has a **goal** to improve rights realization of migrant workers in the informal agriculture and manufacturing sectors in, and beyond, special economic zones. Towards this goal, the program will implement a set of **activities** including support to migrant workers' organizing to advocate for rights in their workplaces and in law; support to consultative law and policy reform processes in Thailand and migration corridors; and participatory strengthening of labour inspectorates, access to complaints mechanisms and wage regulation enforcement. The project will contribute to the following summarized **outcomes**: 1a) Workers are aware of their rights to organize and do so; 1b) Labour and social protection law and policy reforms increasingly formalize informal sectors; 2) Thailand has more effective admission policies and practices in place and coordinates with Cambodia and Lao PDR, toward safe migration and fair recruitment; 3) Workers and civil society organizations advocate for diligent enforcement of labour law within migrant workplaces, including in SEZs. Ultimately, the project will contribute to **impacts** of worker empowerment, sustainable legal reform, improved freedom to organize, safe and fair migration, decent work and access to justice. With first-hand migrant input, evidence-based changes in law and practice have the potential to change the lives of millions of migrant workers now and in the future via migration reforms, labour reforms and enforcement. This program's **approach** is one of migrant worker organizing and advocacy, backed by provision of ILO's rights-based technical advice on legal reform.

► Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation

Purpose and scope

As per the Project Award Document, and in line with ILO's evaluation policy, the MARs project planned for a mid-term internal self-evaluation and a final independent evaluation. Per donor request and ILO's guidance on participatory approaches, the evaluation shall include participation of migrant workers.

The mid-term evaluation will identify lessons learned and good practices from project implementation at the mid-point, and generate recommendations on how to strengthen implementation and enhance project performance. The mid-term evaluation will identify and analyze expected and unexpected results by examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors and causality using appropriate OECD/DAC criteria including relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. Tripartite plus partners of MARs will be interviewed on those topics as related to the project's activities and outcomes on labour migration in agriculture and manufacturing in Thailand.

After a delay due to the US Executive Order that suspended the project and partners work in early 2025, the internal self-evaluation (originally planned for early 2025/1.5 years after the project started) will take place around 2 years after the project started, and will be conducted during the September 2025 - January 2026 period. It will be planned and led by the international Technical Officer with support from the National Project Officer and the ILO-ROAP Evaluation Officer. The mid-term evaluation aims to assess the continued relevance of interventions and progress made towards achieving planned objectives. Importantly, the mid-term evaluation offers an opportunity to make modifications to project strategy, partnerships and activities to ensure that the objectives are achieved. This evaluation provides an opportunity for in-depth reflection on the strategy and assumptions guiding the project.

Clients of the evaluation

The main clients of the evaluation are:

- ▶ ILO's tripartite-plus stakeholders, including government officials, worker and employer organizations, and civil society organizations
- ▶ Migrant workers in Thailand, particularly in agriculture and manufacturing and those who have participated in project activities
- ▶ ILO staff directly working on the project, in CO-BKK and in ROAP

The evaluation might also be of interest to development partners and policymakers.

▶ Evaluation criteria and questions

The evaluation will be conducted according to the criteria and approaches as defined in the ILO Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation², namely: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact. Per the project document, and as per the scope section above, the evaluation will look at expected and unexpected results by examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors and causality.

The following questions are intended to guide and facilitate the evaluation.

Table 1: Key evaluation questions and related evaluation criteria

ILO Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions
1. Relevance	1.2. Is the project relevant to beneficiary (migrant workers and tripartite-plus stakeholders) needs? Are there changes that could be made in the last year to make it more relevant?

² Available at: https://www.ilo.org/eval/Evaluationpolicy/WCMS_571339/lang--en/index.htm

2. Coherence	6.1. Does the project remain compatible with other interventions in the country, sectors (agriculture and manufacturing), and ILO? Are there recommendations for better collaboration among tripartite-plus partners or others?
3. Effectiveness	7.1. To what extent has the project achieved - and is expected to achieve - its objectives, and its results? 7.2. Are there any challenges to implementation faced by the project staff or partners that can be addressed in the last year?
4. Efficiency	8.1. Is the project delivering results in an economic and timely way, taking into account the US stop-work order in early 2025?
5. Impact	11.1. To what extent have there been - and do you foresee - positive changes in the lives of migrant workers, and on policies and practices? What could increase impact?
6. Sustainability	12.1. To what extent are the results of the intervention likely to have a long term, sustainable positive contribution?

► Approach and methodology

According to the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), internal evaluation is defined as, "Evaluation of a development intervention conducted by a unit and/or individuals reporting to the management of the donor, partner, or implementing organization." According to the ILO Evaluation Policy Guidelines, internal evaluation is conducted when a project has a modest budget and is of a short duration. Per ILO Guidance Note 2.2: Self and Internal Evaluations, these type of evaluations are suited to project improvement and organizational learning. These can be done quickly because staff are already familiar with the context, and then influence the end of the project's implementation. They can have a high level of usefulness because those who identify good practices are in a position to implement them.

The evaluation will be primarily qualitative in nature but will incorporate quantitative summative target values tracked and reported by the project. It will engage with tripartite-plus stakeholders, and migrant workers.

The evaluation methodology will include:

- **Document Analysis**, to include ILO CPO report for Thailand, Thailand DWCP document, partner progress reports, meeting summaries, project tracking of activities and indicator progress, and workshop and meeting proceedings.
- **Partners and ILO staff to interview involved migrant workers.** ILO staff will have the chance to interview migrant workers at an agriculture workshop 8 October 2025, and partners may ask questions of migrant workers before the project's PAC meeting on 27 October. Migrant workers will be assured of confidentiality, notified that they are being interviewed for project learning purposes, and only interviewed if they give verbal informed consent. The target will be to interview two migrant workers from each of five partners, covering all targeted provinces, and including six workers from manufacturing and four from agriculture (ten in total). Questions for migrant workers include:
 - *Has the work of [workers' organization/ CSO/ MARs] benefited you and other migrant workers? If yes, how? [prompt: in terms of organizing, awareness of labour laws and rights; accessing complaints mechanism]*

- *What work by [workers' organization/ CSO/ MARs] would most benefit you and other migrant workers in the next year?*
- ▶ **A dedicated discussion will be held at the MARs Project Advisory Committee (PAC) meeting**, with participation from tripartite-plus stakeholders and ILO staff. Project progress and the next year's work plan will be presented, followed by questions related to OECD DAC criteria as outlined above.
- ▶ **Production of the evaluation report.** The evaluation first draft will be circulated among the key stakeholders and ILO staff. Subsequently, the project team will consolidate any written comments and revise to develop the final version of the report.

▶ Outputs

The internal evaluation team will produce and deliver the following deliverables:

- ▶ **Deliverable 1: Draft evaluation report** – the report should answer the questions related to the evaluation criteria, including the recommendations, lessons learned, and good practices. Annexes should include the questions matrix, field work schedule, a list of interviewees. The report must be no longer than 10 pages excluding annexes. The report will be sent to EVAL, MIGRANT, CO-BKK, stakeholders and the donor for review.
- ▶ **Deliverable 2: Final evaluation report** – incorporating written comments received.
- ▶ **Deliverable 3: Evaluation Summary** – per template provided in ILO Policy Guidelines for Evaluation Checklist 8. The Evaluation Summary shall only be prepared once the final evaluation report has been approved.

▶ Management arrangements and work plan (including timeframe)

The staffing of an internal evaluation is different from that of other types of evaluation in the ILO. Because of a lack of evaluation management capacity and the fact that independence is not a claimed attribute of the evaluation, it is ILO EVAL's policy that all internal evaluations should be managed by the project manager.

Evaluation Timetable and Schedule

The mid-term internal self-evaluation is planned to take place from September 2025 - January 2026

Phase	Responsible Person	Tasks	Effort and Tentative Dates
I - Inception	Project manager	Draft and finalize the TOR	12-15 September 2025
		Submit the draft TOR for MIGRANT, CO-BKK review	15-19 September 2025
		Submit the draft TOR to the donor for review	22-26 September 2025
		Submit TOR to PAC participants, invited to 27 October PAC, for	29 September 2025

		comment and noting discussion upcoming at PAC	
II – Data Collection	Project manager and NPC	Desk analysis	1-30 October 2025
		Interviews and discussion with migrant workers and stakeholders	Migrants: At agriculture meeting on 8 October, and partners to interview in field before PAC on 27 October Stakeholders: At PAC 27 October
III – Report preparation	Project manager	Draft report	30 November 2025
		Circulate draft report to ILO REO, MIGRANT, CO-BKK for a two-week review period	30 November-14 December 2025
		Circulate draft report to stakeholders for a two-week review period	15-30 December 2025
	Project manager	Finalize the report	2 January-15 January 2026
	Project manager and NPC	Initiates the follow-up to evaluation recommendations	15 January 2026

► Annex 2: Evaluation questions, per stakeholder

Questions tailored to stakeholder groups, as below, are based on the core evaluation criteria and questions in Section 2.2.

Migrant workers – Focus group discussion questions

- *Has the work of [workers' organization/ CSO/ MARs] benefited you and other migrant workers? If yes, how? [prompt: in terms of organizing, awareness of labour laws and rights; accessing complaints mechanism]*
- *What work by [workers' organization/ CSO/ MARs] would most benefit you and other migrant workers in the next year?*

Tripartite-plus stakeholders and implementing partners – Survey questions

ILO Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions
เกณฑ์การประเมิน	คำถาม

1. Relevance and coherence ความสอดคล้อง	1.1. Is the project relevant to migrant workers' and tripartite-plus stakeholders' needs? Please give an example if you have one. โครงการมีความสอดคล้องกับความต้องการของแรงงานข้ามชาติและผู้มีส่วนได้ส่วนเสียภาคีไตรภาคีหรือไม่? หากมีกรรณยกตัวอย่างประกอบ 1.2. Are there changes you recommend to make it meet your needs better and to encourage better collaboration among tripartite-plus partners? มีข้อเสนอแนะในการปรับปรุงหรือพัฒนาใดบ้าง เพื่อให้การดำเนินงานตอบสนองต่อความต้องการของท่านได้ดียิ่งขึ้น และเพื่อส่งเสริมความร่วมมือที่มีประสิทธิภาพมากขึ้นระหว่างภาคีไตรภาคี?
2. Effectiveness and efficiency ประสิทธิผล	2.1 To what extent is the project achieving its objectives? Are they being achieved in an economic and timely way, taking into account the US stop-work order in early 2025? โครงการสามารถบรรลุวัตถุประสงค์ที่ตั้งไว้ได้ในระดับใด? และการบรรลุวัตถุประสงค์ดังกล่าวเป็นไปอย่างคุ้มค่าและทันเวลาหรือไม่ โดยคำนึงถึงคำสั่งระงับการดำเนินงาน (stop-work order) จากสหรัฐอเมริกาในช่วงต้นปี 2025?" 2.2 Are there any challenges to implementation faced by the partners that can be addressed in the last year? มีอุปสรรคหรือความท้าทายใดบ้างในการดำเนินโครงการที่เจ้าหน้าที่โครงการหรือพาร์ทเนอร์ของโครงการยังสามารถแก้ไขหรือปรับปรุงได้ในช่วงปีสุดท้ายของโครงการ?
3. Impact and sustainability ผลกระทบ	3.1 To what extent is the project making positive changes in the lives of migrant workers, and on policies and practices? Do you think the project work is going to have long-term impacts? โครงการได้มีส่วนสร้างการเปลี่ยนแปลงเชิงบวกต่อชีวิตของแรงงานข้ามชาติ รวมถึงต่อนโยบายและแนวปฏิบัติในระดับใด? และท่านเห็นว่าโครงการมีแนวโน้มที่จะก่อให้เกิดผลลัพธ์ในระยะยาวหรือไม่? 3.2 What could increase impact and sustainability? ปัจจัยใดบ้างที่จะช่วยเพิ่มผลลัพธ์และความยั่งยืนของโครงการ??

ILO staff – Survey questions

ILO Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions
1. Relevance	3.1. Is the project relevant to beneficiary (migrant workers and tripartite-plus stakeholders) needs? Are there changes that could be made in the last year to make it more relevant?

2. Coherence	2.1. Does the project remain compatible with other interventions in the country, sectors (agriculture and manufacturing), and ILO? Are there recommendations for better collaboration among tripartite-plus partners or others?
3. Effectiveness	3.1. To what extent has the project achieved - and is expected to achieve - its objectives, and its results? 3.2. Are there any challenges to implementation faced by the project staff or partners that can be addressed in the last year?
4. Efficiency	4.1. Is the project delivering results in an economic and timely way, taking into account the US stop-work order in early 2025?
5. Impact	5.1. To what extent have there been - and do you foresee - positive changes in the lives of migrant workers, and on policies and practices? What could increase impact?
6. Sustainability	6.1. To what extent are the results of the intervention likely to have a long term, sustainable positive contribution?

► Annex 3: Project Implementation Tracking Table (PITT)

The Project Implementation Tracking Table includes indicator tracking up to end September 2025. See Excel file, as separate attachment.