



International Labour Organization

iTrack

Evaluation Unit (EVAL)

# ILO - EVALUATION

- **Evaluation Title:** “Migrants Rights and Decent Work (MIRIDEW) project combined with labour migration related component under the Skills for Employment Programme (SEP)”
  
- **ILO TC/SYMBOL :** NPL/18/01/CHE & NPL/17/01/GBR
- **Type of Evaluation:** Mid-Term Evaluation
- **Country:** Nepal
- **Date of the evaluation:** December 2020 – January 2021
- **Name of consultant(s):** Pierre Mahy
- **Administrative Office:** Regional Office for Asia & the Pacific (ROAP)
- **Technical Backstopping Office:** DWT-New Delhi
- **Date project ends:** August 2021 (MIRIDEW) & July 2021 (SEP)
- **Donor: country and budget** MIRIDEW (CHF 1,398,880 – SDC)  
SEP migration component (US\$ 1,986,814 – DFID)
- **Evaluation Manager:** Basanta Kumar Karki
  
- **Key Words:**

**This evaluation has been conducted according to ILO’s evaluation policies and procedures. It has been quality controlled by the ILO Evaluation Unit**

# Table of Contents

<b>1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2 BACKGROUND INFORMATION .....</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC BACKGROUND	9
2.2 INTERVENTION LOGIC OF MIRIDEW AND SEP	10
2.3 IMPLEMENTATION MODALITIES	11
<b>3 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY AND EVALUATION QUESTIONS.....</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1 PURPOSE, SCOPE AND BENEFICIARIES OF THE EVALUATION	13
3.2 EVALUATION QUESTIONS (EQ)	14
3.3 METHODOLOGY	16
3.4 LIMITATIONS	17
<b>4 FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION .....</b>	<b>19</b>
4.1 RELEVANCE AND VALIDITY OF DESIGN	19
4.2 COHERENCE AND STRATEGIC FIT	23
4.3 EFFECTIVENESS (PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTATION)	25
4.4 EFFECTIVENESS OF MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENT	31
4.5 EFFICIENCY	31
4.6 POSSIBILITY OF EXTENSION AND SUSTAINABILITY	33
4.7 REPORTING	38
4.8 DONOR'S ROLE AND INFLUENCE ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION	38
<b>5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>40</b>
5.1 OVERALL ASSESSMENT	40
5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS	40
<b>6 LESSONS LEARNED AND GOOD PRACTICES .....</b>	<b>43</b>
6.1 LESSONS LEARNED	43
6.1 GOOD PRACTICES	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>45</b>
APPENDIX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION	46
APPENDIX 2: LIST OF PERSONS AND ORGANISATIONS INTERVIEWED	64
APPENDIX 3: LIST OF DOCUMENTS AND PUBLICATIONS CONSULTED	65
APPENDIX 4: LESSONS LEARNED	66
APPENDIX 5: GOOD PRACTICES	69
APPENDIX 6: SDC ASSESSMENT GRID	72

## List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

CA	Constituent Assembly
CP	Colombo Process
DOFE	Department of Foreign Employment
DWT	(ILO) Decent Work Team
EQ	Evaluation question
FAIR	Integrated Programme on Fair Recruitment
FCDO	Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office
FEB	Foreign Employment Board
FET	Foreign Employment Tribunal
GCM	Global Compact for Migration
GEFONT	General Federation of Nepalese Trade Unions
GoN	Government of Nepal
HQ	Headquarters
ILO	International Labour Organization
LAPSOJ	Law and Policy Forum for Social Justice
LFM	Logical Framework Matrix
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MoFA	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NHRC	National Human Rights Commission
MoLESS	Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NPC	National Planning Commission
NRNA	Non-Resident Nepali Association
OVI	Objectively Verifiable Indicator
PNCC	Pravasi Nepali Coordination Committee
PSC	Project Steering Committee
RMA	Rapid Market Appraisal
ROAP	(ILO) Regional Office for Asia and Pacific
SCB	Social Science Baha
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SEP	Skills for Employment Project
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
VSDTA	Vocational and Skill Development Training Academy
WIF	Work in Freedom

# 1 Executive Summary

---

The objective of the **Migrant Rights and Decent Work (MIRIDEW)** project is to strengthen support systems of the Government of Nepal to better protect the rights of Nepali migrant workers along with increased benefits from labour migration. To achieve this, the project aims at achieving four outcomes:

- **Outcome 1:** Labour migration policies strengthened and implemented at federal and state levels.
- **Outcome 2:** Bilateral and regional mechanisms strengthened to improve Nepali migrant workers' access to better jobs.
- **Outcome 3:** Nepali consular and diplomatic missions in country of destinations provide effective support services to Nepali migrant workers.
- **Outcome 4:** The GoN has effectively engaged with regional and global policy dialogues on labour migration and has implemented relevant policy outcomes.

The overall goal of the **Skills for Employment Programme (SEP)** is to support the Government of Nepal to adopt and effectively implement evidence-based policies enabling the creation of new domestic jobs, increase productive employment and enable a higher development impact from migration. Labour migration is covered under the following outcomes:

- **Outcome 3:** National policies strengthened and implemented to enhance the governance of labour migration in Nepal.
- **Outcome 4:** Bilateral and regional mechanisms strengthened to improve Nepali migrant workers' access to better jobs.

The MIRIDEW project is funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) and formally started on 1 October 2018 for a duration of 35 months with an initial budget allocation of CHF 1,398.880 as a contribution to ILO's overarching programme on labour migration. MIRIDEW complements the SEP project funded by the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO) for a duration of 4 years (August 2017-July 2021).

## **Purpose, Scope, and Methodology of the Evaluation**

The main purpose of the internal Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is to improve project performance, enhance accountability and learning for the International Labour Organization (ILO) and key stakeholders and look into need and relevance of its extension.

The scope of the MTE covers all interventions of MIRIDEW and SEP (labour migration only) that ILO has implemented until 30th September 2020.

Due to COVID-19 travel restrictions, the MTE has been undertaken remotely by an international expert with the support of a national expert based in Kathmandu.

## **Key Findings of the Evaluation**

### **Relevance, strategic fit and design**

The MIRIDEW project, as well as the SEP project, perfectly match the key priorities of ILO's Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) and fall in line with the Government of Nepal's main policy and legal frameworks governing labour migration, i.e. the Foreign Employment Policy 2012, Foreign Employment Act (FEA) 2007 and the Foreign Employment Regulation 2008. When MIRIDEW was designed, it adequately responded to the needs of the country to address the

difficulties faced by migrant workers, vulnerable to exploitation and abuses in both their home country Nepal and in destination countries.

The overall approach of the design aiming at addressing the migrant workers' problems in the destination countries is coherent, though ambitious considering the budget allocated to cover developing and/or strengthening policies at federal and state level, strengthening bilateral and regional mechanisms to improve working conditions in destination countries, reinforce the services provided by diplomatic missions abroad and support the government in engaging more effectively in regional and global policy dialogues.

Outputs have overall been realistically defined under the assumption that the project would benefit from full cooperation of the government. Outcome 4 has proven to be the most challenging during implementation.

### **Effectiveness**

Up to 30/09/2020, MIRIDEW and SEP have been able to implement a remarkable number of activities despite a certain reluctance of the government to fully engage with the project in all actions, and also considering the emergence of the COVID-19 outbreak.

A significant number of outputs have been delivered, some of which already have allowed to partially achieve outcome indicators, as for example:

- the production of the Nepal Labour Migration Report 2020 and the expansion of the Shuvayatra platform (O1),
- the signature of a new bilateral labour agreement with Mauritius (O2),
- the draft National Strategy for the Implementation of the Global Compact for Migration (GCM) supported by SEP (O2),
- the formation of high-level working team by MoFA including representation from MoLESS that carried out capacity gap assessment of Nepali missions and drafting an operational guideline (O3)
- the implementation of outreach activities in Malaysia, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia (O3), and/or
- the government's interventions in regional dialogues (O4).

Several other important outputs prepared by the project are ready for further processing and approval by the government, among which:

- the draft Monitoring and Reporting Framework (O1) on labour migration related SDGs targets and indicators,
- a draft MoU with Oman and the Rapid Market Assessment of 10 new potential destination countries (O2),
- draft operational guidelines for diplomatic and consular missions (O3).

MIRIDEW has also launched an important response to the COVID-19 situation in providing direct support to thousands of migrant workers in Malaysia, Saudi Arabia, Qatar and United Arab Emirates for which funds were provided in reallocating resources from other planned activities, topped up by an additional contribution of SDC and ILO.

Overall, work is still in progress and even though some actions have been delayed in prioritizing the COVID-19 response, the project is expected to be able to roll-out all planned activities by the end of the contractual implementation time, hence delivering all outputs contributing to the outcomes which however remain subject to the government's further follow-up and decisions.

### Efficiency

Financial data provided by the project team shows that 24 months into implementation (i.e. up to 30/09/2020), only 29.9% of the budget have been disbursed (actual expenditures), and that 52.5% of the budget have been committed. The low level of expenditures partially reflects the delays in implementation caused by the COVID-19 situation and a considerable transaction time taken to make the major interventions owned by concerned government authorities mainly MoFA, MoLESS and NPC.

The level of engagement (actual expenditures + commitments) for each outcome is the following:

- Outcome 1: 90.7%
- Outcome 2: 41.4%
- Outcome 3: 98.7%
- Outcome 4: 70.0%

Spending and/or engagement is in accordance to proposed budget lines, though the allocation for outreach activities in 3 countries (under O3) is high considering the limited achievements.

The methodology of implementation is adequate and relies on the management capacity of the ILO. The absence of a Project Steering Committee has not affected the implementation of the project but would have been of added value to enhance government engagement with the joint support of the donor and other stakeholders. However this seems to be balanced by the overall steering of ILO work in Nepal through the DWCP steering committee.

### Impact and Sustainability

Impact at **policy level** (O1) will only emerge once the Monitoring and Reporting Framework is finalized, approved and operational, and when revised and/or new policies to which the project has contributed are enacted by the government. This requires a higher degree of priority as is currently the case due to both the COVID-19 situation and the ongoing political crisis. It is however reasonable to expect the government to build on the results of the intervention, as NPC, MoLESS and MoFA, as well as other informants, unanimously consider that the most important outcome for MIRIDEW is the improvement of the policy framework.

**Access to better jobs** (O2) by means of bilateral agreements with destination countries can be further boosted on basis of the recommendations and experience provided by the project if the government decides to further engage in this direction.

The activities of the project to **support migrant workers in destination countries** (O3) will provide diplomatic and consular offices with a new and better framework to deliver services to the Nepali migrants when finalized and approved. This will depend on the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' commitment to enforce the new guidelines, as well as on the availability of human and financial resources to reinforce the institutional capability of the diplomatic and consular offices in destination countries. Likewise it will be important for diplomatic missions to commit to the delivery of better services to the migrant workers, which is not always the case.

The project's efforts to support Nepal's **regional and global engagement** (O4) have been rather challenging considering the fact that the GoN has been hesitant to accept external support, which is expected to persist in the future. It will require further encouragement from the ILO to boost the engagement of the government at regional and global levels.

Both impact and sustainability depend on the government's choices on how to proceed to maintain the benefits of the intervention. The level of interest and ownership among the key partners of the project is different from one ministry to another and from one activity to

another, and as stated by different informants, the government's priorities seem right now to have shifted more towards promoting decent work within the country rather than abroad.

Besides a stronger engagement of the government in the early stages of implementation, the project would have benefited from a greater involvement of the private sector and from the presence of a formal Project Steering Committee which could have enabled all stakeholders to jointly take ownership of the intervention.

### **Recommendations**

1. Priority should be given to develop inter-ministerial coordination and policy engagement of all stakeholders involved in labour migration issues.
2. Boost ownership of project outputs by the Government towards impact and sustainability.
3. Despite having reached mid-term of project implementation and the existence of the DWCP Steering Committee, set up the MIRIDEW Project Steering Committee with all relevant stakeholders.
4. Enhance the participation of the private sector in order to secure better protection of migrant workers.
5. Revise inadequate indicators in the LFM and add gender-specific indicators at output level.
6. Given the virtual setting that we all are working in, seek to ensure long term sustainability of the Shuvayatra platform so that information and services, job matching, skilling, and entrepreneurship development are promoted to a large section of migrant workers.
7. Provide time extension to MIRIDEW project to offset the time loss due to COVID-19 impact and to conclude the major interventions to the expected results level.
8. Prepare exit strategies based on increased government ownership of project achievements.
9. Define options for future possible interventions building on the achievements of MIRIDEW particularly to work with MoFA for the implementation of concrete recommendations put forth by the Nepali missions' capacity gap assessment report.

### **Good practices**

Good practices identified during the evaluation are:

1. The coordination within the ILO Country Office of labour migration related projects to promote synergies and interlinkages while avoiding overlaps.
2. Combining policy with an improvement of operational efficiency of the government is a well-founded approach to promote better protection of the migrant workers.
3. The flexibility of the project and the donor to adapt to unexpected events.

### **Lessons learned**

The lessons learned emerging from the evaluation of the project are:

1. Assumptions and Risks of any intervention need to be better analysed at the design stage.
2. Proper calculation of time is required to achieve the results in relation to engagement with government authorities and on policy issues as these needs considerable time to build the momentum and get the right opportunity.

3. The commitment of all partners is central to achieve sizeable results for the benefit of migrant workers. Mobilizing public authorities at all levels to engage in a project is a challenge.

## 2 Background Information

---

### 2.1 Political and Economic Background

#### Political Context<sup>1</sup>

Since 2006 when the Comprehensive Peace Agreement was signed ending a 10-year conflict, Nepal has gone through lengthy and complex transitions towards a new Constitution in 2015 that set the stage for a federal structure. By the end of 2017, elections were successfully held at the federal, state, and local levels, which marked the arrival of a new government backed by a historic majority in parliament.

State governments largely mirror the coalition at the centre. At the sub-national level, funds, functions, and functionaries hitherto managed by the central, district and village authorities are moving to the seven new states and 753 local governments for which new legislation, institutions and administrative procedures are being formalized as constitutionally prescribed. Meanwhile, the central level authority is being streamlined with a focus on oversight. These exercises at state restructuring are expected to result in improved outreach and service delivery but will likely take time before they become fully operational.

There is (was<sup>2</sup>) a newfound optimism for greater political stability, inclusion, good governance, and sustainable growth. The new federal structure presents unprecedented opportunities for Nepal to reset its development storyline. At the same time, the shift to federalism poses new challenges and source of fragility, given the heightened popular aspirations and expectations. Key challenges include the need to clarify the functions and accountabilities of the federal, state, and local governments; deliver basic services and maintain infrastructure development; create a conducive environment for the private sector; and address governance weaknesses that may worsen in the early years of the new federal system.

#### Economic Context

Nepal is among the least developed countries in the world, with about one-quarter of its population living below the poverty line. Agriculture is the mainstay of the economy, providing a livelihood for almost two-thirds of the population but accounting for only one-third of GDP. Industrial activity mainly involves the processing of agricultural products. Nepal is heavily dependent on remittances, which amounted to 28% of the GDP in 2018, and 26.9% in 2019. Nepal is the fifth-most remittance-dependent economy (in terms of equivalence to GDP) in the world.

Nepali migrant workers have played a vital role in keeping the national economy afloat during times of political instability and conflict as the remittances they send become an essential source of income.

The country's key economic challenge is to generate high, inclusive, sustainable growth that is necessary to create employment opportunities for Nepal's people, as well as more rapid and sustainable poverty reduction. More than 1,200 Nepalese used to leave the country every day due to the lack of job opportunities at home and the lure of high wages abroad. This outmigration to find work in destinations such as Malaysia and the Gulf States has resulted in a

---

<sup>1</sup> Source: World Bank

<sup>2</sup> The dissolution of the parliament in December 2020 may however once again lead Nepal towards a new political crisis

shortage of workers in the agriculture and industrial sectors. Growing internal migration from rural to urban areas has further impacted the agriculture sector. Against the backdrop of the weak industrial sector, lack of adequate investment, and an economy where demand for goods and services is largely met by imports, remittance inflows have been crucial in supporting not only macroeconomic stability but also household consumption and expenditures.

COVID-19 has increased external and fiscal pressure by reducing foreign currency inflows and revenues. The world-wide pandemic is forcing an unprecedented level of reverse migration of Nepali migrant workers from around the world, which imposed both a supply and a demand shock on Nepal's economy (between 400,000 and 750,000 Nepalese came back to Nepal from India via land borders between 22 March and 8 June<sup>3</sup>, while 400,000 overseas workers are expected to return when travel restrictions are eased). COVID-19 is likely to induce a long and a pervasive global economic crisis, which will have disastrous consequences for low-paid migrant workers and the welfare of their families, as their source of income dries up. Remittances were expected to decrease considerably, but surprisingly they increased by 0.9% in the first half of fiscal year 2019/2020 compared to the same period of the previous fiscal year.

Nepal aspires to graduate from Least Developed Country (LDC) to Middle-Income Country status by the end of 2030 and to High-Income Country by 2043. Sustainable economic development and inclusive economic performance and growth will be the key to reach these ambitious goals.

## 2.2 Intervention Logic of MIRIDEW and SEP

The overall goal of the **MIRIDEW** project is stated as “Migrants (M/F/discriminated groups) and their families are better protected by democratic institutions in Nepal and benefit from decent work conditions abroad”.

The main objective of the project is to strengthen support systems of the Government of Nepal in order to better protect the rights of Nepali migrant workers along with increase benefits from labour migration.

In order to achieve this, the project has been defined with the following outcomes and outputs:

**Outcome 1:** Labour migration policies strengthened and implemented at federal and state levels.

- **Output 1.1:** The National Planning Commission (NPC) and the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security (MoLESS) have monitoring mechanisms in place for key labour migration indicators.

**Outcome 2:** Bilateral and regional mechanisms strengthened to improve Nepali migrant workers' access to better jobs.

- **Output 2.1:** MoLESS has completed preparations for the formalization of new labour markets for low skilled workers.
- **Output 2.2:** MoLESS develops system to respond to migration related policy trends in countries of destination.

**Outcome 3:** Nepali consular and diplomatic missions in country of destinations provide effective support services to Nepali migrant workers.

- **Output 3.1:** The Government of Nepal (GoN) has piloted newly endorsed operational guidelines for Nepali consular and diplomatic missions.

---

<sup>3</sup> Source: Kantipur News 8 June 2020

- **Output 3.2:** Diplomatic and consular missions benefit from increased coordination with non-governmental support structures, including from support structures for women migrants, in countries of destination.

**Outcome 4:** The GoN has effectively engaged with regional and global policy dialogues on labour migration and has implemented relevant policy outcomes.

- **Output 4.1:** The GoN has developed a national position, including priorities and concrete messages for the regional and global policy dialogues on labour migration.
- **Output 4.2:** Global and regional policy dialogues on labour migration reflected in the policy making process of the GoN.

The overall goal of the **SEP** project is to support the Government of Nepal to adopt and effectively implement evidence-based policies enabling the creation of new domestic jobs, increase productive employment and enable a higher development impact from migration.

In order to achieve this, the project has been defined with 4 outcomes, of which outcomes 3 and 4 relate to labour migration and feed into the MIRIDEW project:

**Outcome 3:** National policies strengthened and implemented to enhance the governance of labour migration in Nepal, for which 3 areas of work are defined:

1. Enhancing administrative capacity at central and provincial levels.
2. Strengthen current approaches for and coordination on the return and reintegration of migrants.
3. Provide support for the drafting and revision of national legislation and regulations on labour migration.

**Outcome 4:** Bilateral and regional mechanisms strengthened to improve Nepali migrant workers' access to better jobs, for which 4 areas of work are defined:

1. Assess implementation challenges for current BLAs/MOUs and support the signing of new BLAs/MOUs.
2. Identify niche markets for Nepali workers and design a fair recruitment model.
3. Support the collection and analysis of labour market information in countries of destination.
4. Strengthen regional cooperation through SAARC.

## 2.3 Implementation Modalities

The **MIRIDEW** project is funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) and implemented by the ILO. The project is implemented through a partnership between the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security (MoLESS), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA), the ILO as a Technical Assistance provider, other government partners (e.g. the National Human Rights Commission, the Foreign Employment Board, the Department of Foreign Employment, etc.), the National Planning commission (NPC) and civil society organizations.

The project formally started on 1 October 2018 for a duration of 35 months with a budget allocation of CHF 1,398.880 divided in the form of an outcome-wise phased budget. The allocation is to be considered as a contribution to ILO's overarching programme on labour migration which encompasses several interlinked projects. The ILO is the executing agency responsible for overseeing the technical and administrative aspects of project implementation and is responsible for the financial and administrative management in accordance with ILO rules and regulations.

The project document defined the staffing of the project to include a national member of staff responsible for the overall project management and a part-time member of staff responsible for the monitoring and evaluation of the project, as well as for ensuring linkages between ILO projects, regional offices and key project stakeholders within Nepal, regionally and in countries of destination. The oversight of the project is the responsibility of the ILO Country Director, supported by a Project Steering Committee (PSC)<sup>4</sup> comprising representatives from key government partners, workers' organisations, civil society organizations, and donor partners, in an advising role on the direction of the project.

MIRIDEW complements the Skills for Employment (SEP) project funded by DFID and also implemented by the ILO.

The **SEP** project has a duration of 4 years (August 2017-July2021), a budget of GBP 2.9 million and is implemented in partnership with the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security (MoLESS), the Ministry of Education (MoE), the Ministry of Industry (Mol), the National Planning Commission (NPC), the Prime Minister's Office (PMO), the Federation of Nepalese Chambers of Commerce and Industry (FNCCI), the Trade Union Federations (GEFONT, NTUC, ANTUF), youth organisations, migration workers' organisations and other stakeholders.

---

<sup>4</sup> The PSC however has not been put in place as will be explained in this report.

## 3 Evaluation Methodology and Evaluation Questions

---

### 3.1 Purpose, scope and beneficiaries of the evaluation

#### Purpose

The main purpose of this internal mid-term evaluation is to improve project performance, enhance accountability and learning for the International Labour Organization (ILO) and key stakeholders and look into the need and relevance of its extension. Moreover, it helps to ensure that progress and results of the projects are monitored, communicated and acted upon in a timely, efficient and result-based manner. The Evaluation is also intended to assess the relevance, performance, management arrangements and success of the projects by identifying developed documents, lessons learned and makes recommendations that the project partners and stakeholders might use to improve the design and implementation of other related labour migration management projects.

The Terms of Reference define the specific objectives of the evaluation as follows:

1. Establish result-based evaluation framework
  - a. Assess the coherence and logic of project's design and whether it is still valid within the current economic, political and development circumstances in Nepal.
  - b. Assess the project design in terms of its relevance to the overall development situation at the national level, relevance to national strategies, ILO's Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) project framework and relevance to beneficiaries.
  - c. Assess performance of the project in terms of effectiveness, efficiency, and timeliness of producing the expected output, including the progress made towards achieving its long-term and medium-term outcomes (including intended and unintended, positive and negative results) as stated in the original project document, the challenges affecting the achievement of the objectives, factors that hindered or facilitated achievement so far.
  - d. Assess the complementarity and synergies between the project components' interventions.
2. Evaluate and report on progress and results
  - a. Assess the timeliness and quality of inputs, the reporting and evaluation system and extent to which these have been effective.
  - b. Assess relevance of the project's management arrangements; identify advantages, bottlenecks and lessons learned with regard to the management arrangements.
  - c. Track and analyse progress towards agreed outputs of each of the four outcomes of the initiative in line with the evaluation framework.
  - d. Identify constraints, failures, achievements and best practices and propose recommendations to make adjustments to ensure the achievement of the project within its remaining lifetime.
  - e. Assess efficiency of resource use.
  - f. Assess the likelihood of extension and sustainability of the interventions.
3. Document good practices and lessons learned
  - a. Analyse underlying factors beyond ILO's control that affected the achievement of the project outcomes.
  - b. Good practices.

### **Scope**

The scope of the MTE will cover all interventions of MIRIDEW and SEP (labour migration only) that ILO has implemented until 30th September 2020.

### **Beneficiaries**

The primary clients of this evaluation mentioned in the ToR are the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security (MoLESS), the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA), the National Planning Commission (NPC), the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC), the Department of Foreign Employment (DOFE), the Foreign Employment Board (FEB), the Pravasi Nepali Coordination Committee (PNCC), the General Federation of Nepalese Trade Unions (GEFONT), Social Science Baha (SCB), the Law and Policy Forum for Social Justice (LAPSOJ), the Asia Foundation (TAF), the Embassy of Switzerland in Nepal/Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), Technical/Thematic experts engaged with the project, the Safer Migration Project (SAMI)/HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation Nepal, the Skills for Employment Project (SEP), the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO), the ILO MIRIDEW Project Team (and broader Migration Unit), the ILO Country Office for Nepal, the DWT-New Delhi, MIGRANT and the ILO Headquarters.

Secondary clients are defined as other key stakeholders, including migrant themselves.

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

## **3.2 Evaluation Questions (EQ)**

The Evaluation questions suggested in the Terms of Reference have been slightly edited in the Inception Report. Additional questions suggested by the evaluators have been approved by the Evaluation Manager.

### **Relevance and Validity of the Design**

- EQ1: To what extent is the project design appropriate to ILOs' DWCP framework?
- EQ2: How does the GoN see the component of the project contributing to their larger framework?
- EQ3: To what extent are that objectives of the project consistent with the beneficiaries' requirements, and relevant to country needs?
- EQ4: To what extent are the project design (objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities) and its underlining theory of change logical and coherence?
- EQ5: Does the design need to be modified in the second half of the project, and why?
- EQ6: How appropriate and useful are the indicators described in the project document in assessing the project's progress? If necessary, how should they be modified to be more useful? Are indicators gender sensitive?
- EQ7: Were any lessons learned from previous projects in the area?
- EQ8: Were the outputs achievable or overly ambitious?
- EQ9: Were risks properly assessed? Overall, are project assumptions realistic; did the project undergo a risk analysis and design readjustment when necessary?
- EQ10: How relevant the project is in terms of core ILO functions such as promoting international labour standards, social dialogue, gender equality and non-discrimination, tripartite processes, and constituent capacity development?

### **Coherence and Strategic Fit of the Intervention**

- EQ11: The extent to which other interventions and policies support or undermine the project interventions, and vice versa.
- EQ12: Adaptation and realignment of interventions based on contexts i.e. COVID
- EQ13: The extent of synergies and interlinkages between the project interventions and other interventions carried out by ILO Kathmandu, Government and social partners.
- EQ14: Have there been new intervening factors/actors (e.g. other donor assisted projects) that have emerged since the inception of the project which may have impaired or enhanced project performance or future ILO development assistance in these strategic areas?

### **Effectiveness (Progress in Implementation)**

- EQ15: To what extent has the project been making sufficient progress towards its planned results (including intended and unintended, positive and negative)? Will the project be likely to achieve its planned long-term and medium-term outcomes by the end of the project? Are there any external factors that hindered or facilitated achievement of the project?
- EQ16: Were there any non-planned effects and were these good or bad?
- EQ17: Was coordination with social partners effective? Has the absence of a Project Steering Committee affected implementation?
- EQ18: The extent to which has gender mainstreaming been addressed in the design and implementation of the project?

### **Effectiveness of Management Arrangements**

- EQ19: To what extent do the project management capacities and arrangements put in place support the achievement of the planned results?

### **Efficiency**

- EQ20: To what extent has the project delivered value for money? How well resources and inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) been allocated or used strategically to achieve the planned results? Have they been delivered in a timely manner? If not, what were the factors that have hindered timely delivery of outputs? Any measures that have been put in place? Where possible, analyze intervention benefits and related costs of integrated gender equality (or not).
- EQ21: To what extent have the project resources been leveraged with other related interventions to maximize impact, if any?
- EQ22: Was the methodology of implementation the right one under the circumstances?
- EQ23: Was the budget spent according to the proposed budget lines?
- EQ24: Was the rate of spending acceptable and according to plan?
- EQ25: What was the value of this project? (% of budget that actually reached the beneficiaries)

### **Possibility of Extension and Sustainability**

- EQ26: To what extent are the planned results of the project likely to be durable and can maintained or even scaled up and replicated by other partners after major assistance has been completed?

- EQ27: What is the need, importance and relevancy for the extension of the project period? What are the areas of engagements that should be continued? What are the areas that needs further build up?
- EQ28: How effective has the project been in establishing national ownership? Is there any room for improvement for steering the project?
- EQ29: To what extent have government institutions benefited from policy dialogue support and process etc.?
- EQ30: To what extent the government benefited from the activities and outputs?
- To what extent can the outputs be expected to be sustainable over the longer (5-10 years) term?
- EQ31: Does the government institutions fully support the initiatives taken by the project?
- EQ32: To what extent have government partners been involved in the implementation of the project?
- EQ33: To what extent has the project strengthened the capacities of the government structures?
- EQ34: To what extent are the migrant themselves contributing to the sustainability of the initiatives?
- EQ35: To what extent is the impact sustainable over the longer term?
- EQ36: Has the project increased or decreased dependency on outside intervention?
- EQ37: Has the project been able to leverage the ILO contributions through its comparative advantages including social dialogue?
- EQ38: To which extent was there a change observed as regards to the beneficiaries' knowledge of skills, and have the results of the projects influenced practices?

#### **Reporting**

- EQ39: Transparency of reporting

#### **Donor's Role and Influence on Project Implementation**

- EQ40: Were communications with the donor satisfactory in terms of promptness and content?
- EQ41: Was technical/administrative support provided timely and adequately when requested?
- EQ42: Were financial release procedures and actions timely taken care of and did these influence project implementation in any way?
- EQ43: Was monitoring and progress reporting adequate according to the ILO and donor requirements?

### **3.3 Methodology**

The Evaluation was carried out in accordance with the ILO evaluation policy based on the United Nations Evaluation Norms and Standards, following ILO Evaluation Guidelines and Support Guidance Documentation. It fully adheres to ILO evaluation norms, standards and ethical safeguards.

The evaluation has been conducted by Mr. Pierre Mahy (Team Leader) and Dr. Narayan Prasad Bhatta (National Expert) between November 2020 and January 2021. Due to the situation resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic, the Team Leader has not been able to travel to Nepal and interviews have therefore been conducted online.

The work of the Evaluation took place over three phases:

Phase	Activities and outputs	Schedule
Preparation/Desk Phase	Review of documents Submission Inception Report	20-30 November 2020 30 November 2020
Data collection (online) phase	Virtual meetings by International Expert and face-to-face interviews by National Experts (see Appendix 2 for complete list of persons interviewed)	7 December 2020 – 15 January 2021
Synthesis and Reporting Phase	Synthesis and preparation draft evaluation report Submission draft report ILO comments to evaluator Preparation of Final Report Submission of Final report with Executive Summary and Annexes	18-20 January 2021  20 January 2021 26 January 2021 27-29 January 2021 29 January 2021

The evaluation tools employed were documentary analysis, identification of relevant evaluation questions and sub-questions, semi-structured interviews to elicit the facts relevant to the evaluation questions and synthesis of findings, conclusions and recommendations. Findings were validated by means of various cross-checks with stakeholders whenever possible.

Evaluation tools have been described in the Inception Report submitted on November 30. Particular attention has been given to multiple verification of information provided on basis of the triangulation methodology.

### Triangulation of Information

Whenever possible, several sources of information have been used to verify data provided in the project reports and statements made by informants.

Confronting statements with opinions from different sources allows triangulating information received and avoid non-verifiable data or information to influence the evaluation.

Triangulation not only facilitates validation of data, but also tests the consistency of findings obtained and increases the chances to assess some of the causes influencing results.

## 3.4 Limitations

The main limitation for this evaluation comes from the working conditions resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic (travel restrictions, work from home, etc.) and the decision to undertake a partially remote evaluation.

In order to carry out “remote” evaluations, the ILO has prepared specific COVID-19 operating procedures providing guidelines for remote or hybrid evaluations.

These guidelines indeed provide practical tips on adapting to the situation, but more hitches have to be taken into consideration than those suggested by these procedures. The difficulties which have emerged during this evaluation could be considered as lessons learned for future “remote” evaluations if this will become the “new normal”:

- Some informants prefer to have face-to-face discussions and dislike Skype or Zoom interviews, which has been the case for government officials.
- Assessing the benefits of certain activities (e.g. capacity building activities, outreach activities, etc.) requires physical contact with beneficiaries; statements about changing attitudes or working procedures require visual verification in the field, hence the need to involve national experts in country.

- Connections can sometimes be so bad that interviews are not possible at all (this has been the case on two occasions); the in-country presence of a national expert compensates for this technical problem.
- Informants connected via Skype or Zoom do not always pay full attention to the interview (informants working from home and are often distracted by different interferences like family, unexpected phone calls, somebody ringing at the front door, and even performing other tasks while on the call).
- Interviews are mostly limited to informants suggested by the programme team; not being present in the field excludes the possibility to encounter unexpected informants showing up at a meeting, and which often can provide valuable information.

Compensating (at least partly) for the above weaknesses can only be done in involving national consultants/experts who can physically interact with informants and/or compensate for technical hiccups. In the particular case of the present evaluation, despite the involvement of a national consultant, the opportunity to fully address certain evaluation questions has been somewhat limited.

A further limitation for this evaluation has been the refusal for an interview from several potential informants suggested by the MIRIDEW National Project Coordinator, despite their involvement in the implementation of the project.

## 4 Findings of the Evaluation

---

The presentation of the following sections (4.1 – 4.8) is based on the evaluation questions provided in the Terms of Reference of the evaluation (edited in the Inception Report).

### 4.1 Relevance and Validity of Design

#### Relevance to ILO's DWCP

##### *To what extent is the project design appropriate to ILO's DWCP framework? (EQ1)*

The DWCP 2018-2022 for Nepal was being finalized when the MIRIDEW project was designed.

The two key priorities of the DWCP framework were defined as:

1. Enabling decent work for all through sustainable, inclusive and gender responsive growth; and
2. Strengthening institutional capacities, enhancing social dialogue and applying fundamental Conventions and other international labour standards.

Under priority 2, the DWCP identified the role of the ILO to support the Government of Nepal, including the diplomatic missions, and social partners at the central and sub-national levels to effectively implement governance frameworks which result in fair labour migration practices and protection of the rights of migrant workers.

The four Outcomes defined for the MIRIDEW project, as well as Outcomes 3 and 4 of the SEP project, perfectly fit in the DWCP framework.

#### Relevance to the Government's priorities

##### *How does the GoN see the component of the project contributing to their larger framework? (EQ2)*

The Foreign Employment Act (FEA) 2007 supported by the Foreign Employment Regulation 2008 are the main legal frameworks governing labour migration in Nepal. As mentioned in the project document, the law and regulations are intended to “make foreign employment safe, managed and decent, and to protect the rights and interests of workers”. There is also a Foreign Employment Policy, 2012 which defines the overall policy framework for better management of the sector.

The challenges of labour migration, some of which are addressed by the MIRIDEW and SEP projects, as well as others implemented by the ILO, are well-known and clearly described in the Nepal Labour Migration Report 2020.

The 15<sup>th</sup> Five-Year Development Plan (2019/20-2023/24) defines Nepal's larger framework under the vision “Prosperous Nepal, Happy Nepali” aiming at achieving the Agenda 2030 for sustainable development and the SDGs and becoming a middle-income country in 2030. The long-term vision of the Plan is to promote good governance, development and prosperity.

Despite the fact that the Nepali economy is heavily dependent on remittances from migrant workers and the fact that the government is aware of the important challenges related to labour migration, the latest development plan is noticeably silent about labour migration. This may be confirming the government's intention to focus on domestic employment rather than on foreign employment in a more long-term vision.

Nevertheless, the MIRIDEW project remains totally relevant to the immediate needs of the government.

### **Relevance to country needs**

#### ***To what extent are that objectives of the project consistent with the beneficiaries' requirements, and relevant to country needs? (EQ3)***

Despite the above-mentioned policies, acts and rules put in place by the GoN, most migrants remain insufficiently protected by the legal framework making them vulnerable to exploitation and abuses in both their home country Nepal and in destination countries.

Starting with the recruitment process and associated high fees and abuse of recruiting agencies, the lack of information and adequate support in the destination countries, the decent work deficits and mistreatment during employment, discrimination, contract violations, problems faced by women migrant workers, trafficking, the lack of access to justice, etc. migrant workers "still feel neglected<sup>5</sup>".

Multiple reports prepared by the ILO, Civil Society organizations and others reflect the vulnerability of migrant workers and their needs are increasing year after year. The needs of the migrant workers are also the needs of the country for which migration remains an important source of foreign currency earning and household level income. The MIRIDEW project unquestionably contributes to improving the situation and therefore is totally relevant.

### **Logic and coherence of the design**

#### ***To what extent are the project design (objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities) and its underlining theory of change logical and coherence? (EQ4)***

The project document presents a clear overview of the project strategy, its overall goal and objective, describes the four outcomes and outputs (as per above section 2.2), while also defining the possible activities to be implemented in order to achieve the objectives.

The overall approach of the design aiming at addressing the migrant workers' problems in the destination countries is coherent, though ambitious considering the budget allocated to cover developing and/or strengthening policies at federal and state level, strengthening bilateral and regional mechanisms to improve working conditions in destination countries, reinforce the services provided by diplomatic missions abroad and support the government in engaging more effectively in regional and global policy dialogues.

The output/outcome association is logical and coherent for Outcomes 2, 3 and 4, but not clear for Outcome 1. The project document does not explain how a monitoring mechanism for key labour migration indicators (Output 1.1) can contribute to strengthened and implemented policies at federal and state level (Outcome 1). The project document indeed refers to the ILO/DFID<sup>6</sup> project which is meant to address policy issues ("*support for the process of adjusting policies and laws to the newly emerging federal structures, as well as for the Shuvayatra platform*"), but how it actually will contribute to Outcome 1 of MIRIDEW is not explained.

The project document clarifies the scope of the MIRIDEW project for this Outcome ("*work with the GoN, particularly the National Planning Commission and the MoLESS, to address the existing information gap with regards to labour migration*" and provide "*support in developing appropriate indicators, monitoring and reporting on Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) related to labour migration*"), but does not describe how the two projects will interact and/or cooperate.

---

<sup>5</sup> The Kathmandu Post 11 December 2020

<sup>6</sup> Now Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO)

### **Steadiness of the design**

#### ***Does the design need to be modified in the second half of the project, and why? (EQ5)***

There is no need to modify the design of the project, though the work plan and certain activities may need to be adapted taking into consideration the adjustments implied by the response to COVID-19. This is for example the case for the detailed Labour Market Analysis to be undertaken in countries identified through the Rapid Market Appraisal, which may require to reconsider the priority countries in view of the COVID-19 situation.

Some corrections should be made for indicators (see EQ6)

### **Validity of indicators**

#### ***How appropriate and useful are the indicators described in the project document in assessing the project's progress? If necessary, how should they be modified to be more useful? Are indicators gender sensitive? (EQ6)***

The Logical Framework Matrix (LFM) of the MIRIDEW project provides a mix of adequate and substandard indicators:

- At the level of the overall objective none of the two indicators causally relates to decent work. The satisfaction indicator can be considered as adequate to measure better protection through improved services of diplomatic and consular missions in countries of destination, but the recognition of Nepal as strong advocate for migrant rights does not reflect a possible improvement of the migrants' working conditions.
- Indicators for Outcome 1 indeed connect to monitoring and reporting, but have no relation to the policy level, which does not provide any better clarification than the project document itself as already mentioned above.
- Indicators for Outcomes 2, 3 and 4 are more appropriate and quantified with target values to be reached.
- Output indicators are suitable to measure progress and target values are realistic under the assumption that project implementation proceeds according to plans and with the full support and engagement of the government.
- Indicators are not gender sensitive, though the project document dedicates a separate section to the integration of gender issues. Gender disaggregation of data is mentioned, however without suggesting specific target values for men or women.

In order to facilitate an end of project impact assessment, indicators at overall objective and Outcome 1 levels should be improved.

With regard to the SEP LFM, Outcome 4 indicators are not causally related to the objective: "recruitment costs as part of the yearly income" do not reflect "Nepali migrant workers' access to better jobs as a result of improved bilateral and regional mechanisms".

### **Lessons learned**

#### ***Were any lessons learned from previous projects in the area? (EQ7)***

The project document refers to lessons learned from Sri Lanka ("*ILO will hold a regular exchange on lessons learned and good practices from the Sri Lankan experience in order to integrate them into this project in the Nepali context and to generate the synergies project will hold regular exchange with concerned counterparts of Sri Lanka*") and from Africa ("*ILO is also implementing programmes in several countries in East and West Africa that may reveal good practices and lessons learned for consideration in Nepal*").

While Sri Lanka and African experiences have not played a crucial role in designing the project, the year-long engagement of the ILO and also SDC in labour migration issues in Nepal have

provided more lessons for the design of the MIRIDEW project. During the course of implementation, the Project Coordinator reports that an important exchange of information has taken place with Sri Lanka, in particular with regard to the work related to the preparation of operational guidelines for diplomatic and consular missions.

### **Realism of outputs**

#### ***Were the outputs achievable or overly ambitious? (EQ8)***

Outputs have overall been realistically defined under the assumption that the project would benefit from full cooperation of the government. The most challenging outputs however are those related to Outcome 4, which has proven to be the most difficult during implementation.

While the outputs are achievable, the ambition lies at the level of Outcomes as the Outputs do not automatically lead to the achievement of the respective Outcomes. This largely depends on the willingness and commitment of the government to proceed.

### **Assumptions and Risks**

#### ***Were risks properly assessed? Overall, are project assumptions realistic; did the project undergo a risk analysis and design readjustment when necessary? (EQ9)***

Risks and Assumptions have not been discussed in the narrative section of the project document but are stated in the LFM for Outcomes 3 and 4. Nothing is mentioned for Outcomes 1 and 2, though assumptions are stated at the level of Outputs.

Overall both assumptions and risks have been defined in a sensible way and subsequently reviewed in annual and semi-annual progress reports, also suggesting mitigation measures to overcome the problematic situations which may affect the implementation of the project.

One of the key assumptions mentioned in the 2019 report (*“Internal priorities of the concerned government entities often delay the project’s planned activities as sustainability of major interventions of the project rely on its ownership taken by them”*) no longer appears in the 2020 semi-annual progress report as the project had then been able to institutionalize activities with different ministries.

### **Relevance to ILO core functions**

#### ***How relevant the project is in terms of core ILO functions such as promoting international labour standards, social dialogue, gender equality and non-discrimination, tripartite processes, and constituent capacity development? (EQ10)***

The ILO’s mandate is to advance social justice and promote decent work by setting international labour standards. The ILO promotes dialogue and cooperation between governments, employers, and workers and assists them to coordinate strategies for promoting decent employment and stands out as the lead UN agency for development cooperation in the field of skills and employment promotion, while also paying particular attention to value chain development, gender, disability and green jobs among other cross-cutting issues.

ILO’s core functions are repeatedly referred to in the project document which states: *“ILO promotes decent work for all through promoting four inter-related strategic objectives: labour standards, more and better jobs, social protection, and social dialogue”*. The reference to international labour standards is included in indicators for Outcome 2.

The project respects the tripartite function of the ILO in working closely with the government, employers’ and workers’ organizations which are regularly consulted in the framework of ILO’s regular operations.

The integration of gender issues has been covered by a dedicated section in the project document, though, as stated above, indicators are not gender sensitive.

The MIRIDEW and the SEP projects are in line with ILO's core values and priorities of the DWCP and will remain relevant in the framework of the next DWCP focussing on labour migration, reintegration and employment.

## 4.2 Coherence and strategic fit

### Complementarity

#### *The extent to which other interventions and policies support or undermine the project interventions, and vice versa (EQ11)*

The most challenging objectives of the MIRIDEW and SEP projects undoubtedly are those aiming at supporting the GoN at policy level as well as in its engagement in regional and global dialogues, which require the willingness of the government to accept the contribution of external parties.

Through its long-term engagement in Nepal (Nepal became a member of the ILO in 1966 and the ILO Country Office for Nepal was established in 1994), the ILO has been able to develop a constructive relationship with different governments, granting the ILO the recognition of a reliable and professional partner on different issues among which labour migration is a pertinent one.

In 2006, Nepal also became a member of the IOM. While IOM's initial focus was on the resettlement of Bhutanese refugees, it expanded its range of programmes and progressively shifted from migration to labour migration, especially when it became the Secretariat of the Colombo Process (CP). Since Nepal became the chair of the CP in 2017, the CP Technical Support Unit based in IOM Sri Lanka provides technical and administrative support to the GoN to fulfil its responsibilities as chair of the CP, hence potentially creating the impression that IOM has an important role to play in labour migration, as well as in other key issues of the CP which are typical ILO mandate, namely fair recruitment and skills development.

IOM furthermore manages the secretariat of the UN Network on Migration which supports the Global Compact for Migration (GCM), in the framework of which the ILO, through the SEP project, supports the development of the national strategy for the implementation of the GCM.

Despite the fact that the mandate of IOM's role as secretariat of the CP and of UN Network for Migration is well defined, its interaction with the GoN has created confusion among certain government officials which might have destabilized the projects' interventions.

### COVID-19

#### *Adaptation and realignment of interventions based on contexts i.e. COVID (EQ12)*

Like anywhere else in the world, the COVID-19 pandemic has adversely affected the life of all Nepalese citizens, in particular migrant workers. The effect of the pandemic in Nepal is exhaustively described in the study report "the effect of COVID-19 pandemic on foreign employment and its impact on the economy of Nepal" developed by the National Planning Commission in June 2020, which also outlines the GoN Initiatives and Policy Response for revival of the economy.

As the pandemic stalled most of the planned activities, the MIRIDEW project rearranged the budget and activities to support Nepali migrant workers affected by COVID-19 in major destination countries. SDC approved a budget realignment of CHF 535,219 to be managed under Outcome 3. SDC also approved the COVID-19 response to be implemented in Malaysia, Saudi Arabia, Qatar and United Arab Emirates (UAE) which are the top four major destinations for Nepali workers. Subsequently SDC allocated additional funds to the COVID-19 response which in total amounts to CHF 981,219, further topped up from the ILO budget (US\$ 30,000).

The project selected the Non-Resident Nepali Association (NRNA) to implement the COVID-19 response as of 01 July 2020, while the Pravasi Nepali Coordination Committee (PNCC) was also assigned to deliver part of the COVID-19 response (achievements of the project's COVID-19 response are presented in chapter 4.3 under EQ15 – Overall progress in implementation).

Likewise, the SEP project also affected by the COVID-19 situation revised its work plan with a focus on supporting returning migrants who had lost their jobs abroad and were returning to Nepal.

***The extent of synergies and interlinkages between the project interventions and other interventions carried out by ILO Kathmandu, Government and social partners (EQ13)***

More than developing synergies, MIRIDEW and SEP are closely interlinked as they both aim at achieving the same goals on labour migration, though with different areas of intervention. While SEP is more focused on policy issues at federal, provincial and municipal levels, MIRIDEW's attention is more directed towards destination countries of the migrant workers.

Both projects jointly support the government, in particular MoLESS, in enhancing the legal framework of migration as well as in addressing other important questions linked to labour migration (destination countries, agreements with other countries, service delivery, policy dialogues, etc.)

MIRIDEW and SEP are both integrated in ILO's overall technical assistance programme on labour migration supporting the government of Nepal, which also includes:

- The Integrated Programme on Fair Recruitment (FAIR) with which MIRIDEW did not implement any joint activity, but which offers useful background information from the Nepal-Jordan migration corridor possibly providing inspiration for the preparation of MoUs with destination countries. The assessment of possible new destination countries could in return be used by FAIR for the design of a third phase of the programme.
- The Work in Freedom (WIF) Programme, with which MIRIDEW has more actively cooperated, for example in jointly lobbying a Parliamentary Committee to lift the ban on women migration. WIF also actively worked with SEP in policy consultations in province 5 and consulted with MIRIDEW to avoid overlaps with the work done by the Non-Resident Nepali Association (NRNA) on the COVID-19 response.

Besides the above four projects implemented by the ILO, there is only one significant project active on labour migration issues in Nepal, i.e. the Safer Migration Project (SaMi) implemented by HELVETAS currently in its third phase (2018-2022). The overall goal of SaMi is that migrants & their families are better protected by concerned Nepali institutions and benefit from decent work conditions abroad. Phase III of SaMi takes place in the context of the state's federalization process, which gives important competencies to the local governments (palikas), including on Foreign Employment. The SaMi project works closely with the MoLESS, the Department of Foreign Employment (DoFE), the Foreign Employment Board (FEB), as well as the provincial and local governments which are also important stakeholders for MIRIDEW and SEP. SaMi cooperates with MIRIDEW, especially in relation to the COVID-19 response whereby SaMi has referred many cases (problem faced by Nepali migrants in countries of destinations) to the MIRIDEW partner NRNA for rescue and repatriation of Nepali workers.

Besides the cooperation on the COVID-19 response, SaMi and the ILO also join forces for policy advocacy issues such as for the ban of domestic workers in Gulf countries and Malaysia.

### Unexpected events

*Have there been new intervening factors/actors (e.g. other donor assisted projects) that have emerged since the inception of the project which may have impaired or enhanced project performance or future ILO development assistance in these strategic areas? (EQ14)*

Based on consultations with different organizations, no other donor assisted project seems to have emerged after inception of the MIRIDEW and SEP projects.

As reported by the MIRIDEW project, the new federal government put in place after the project was designed was found to be restrictive and doubtful towards external actors' engagement on policy issues, hence restricting the possible engagement of the ILO at policy level. Interviews with different stakeholders indeed confirmed this restrictive attitude of the government, which has affected the project, in particular with regard to Outcome 4.

## 4.3 Effectiveness (Progress in Implementation)

### Overall progress in implementation

*To what extent has the project been making sufficient progress towards its planned results (including intended and unintended, positive and negative)? Will the project be likely to achieve its planned long-term and medium-term outcomes by the end of the project? Are there any external factors that hindered or facilitated achievement of the project? (EQ15)*

Up to 30 September 2020, the key activities implemented and outputs achieved, as well as their contribution to the respective outcomes, are the following<sup>7</sup>:

#### Policy level

**Outcome 1 (MIRIDEW):** labour migration policies strengthened and implemented at federal and state levels.

- Output 1.1 - The National Planning Commission (NPC) and the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security (MoLESS) have monitoring mechanisms in place for key labour migration indicators.
  - Center for the Study of Labour and Mobility (CESLAM)/Social Science Baha (SCB) developed tools, mechanisms, and processes to allow NPC to monitor and report against SDG targets. Matrix on existing indicators, potential new indicators and issues associated, sources of data/information, etc. developed and ready for consultations (*"Monitoring and Reporting Framework for the Government of Nepal on labour migration related Sustainable Development Goals targets and indicators"-draft 4/12/2020*).
  - Labour Migration Status Report 2020 including a chapter analyzing skills category of Nepali migrant workers published by MoLESS with the support of both MIRIDEW and SEP projects.

**Outcome 3 (SEP – Work area 3):** National policies strengthened and implemented to enhance the governance of labour migration in Nepal:

- Output 3.3 - Provide support for the drafting and revision of national legislation and regulations on labour migration.
  - Province 2 migration policy draft prepared with the support of Law and Policy Forum for Social Justice (LAPSOJ) – Policy registered in province assembly.
  - Assessment of the legal framework for looking into the federalization of labour migration governance (LAPSOJ).

<sup>7</sup> Source: Outcome Monitoring Summary Reports, Progress Reports, Project Outputs, Interviews

- Consultation held with different stakeholders including with a provincial parliamentary committee to have a provincial level labour migration policy in Province 5.
- Shuvayatra platform upgraded (mobile wallet, financial literacy course modules, feed-back application, etc.).

**Contribution of outputs to policy level outcomes:**

The development of monitoring mechanisms for MoLESS and NPC has been delayed due to the COVID-19 situation which obstructs consultations. The draft Monitoring and Reporting Framework needs to be finalized to become operational. **(Outcome indicator on reporting not (yet) achieved).**

The Labour Migration Status Report 2020 provides comprehensive information about labour migration including data on low-skilled, semi-skilled and skilled migration – chapter 2.7 Skills **(Outcome indicator achieved).**

The submission of policies developed at provincial level which need cabinet approval is delayed due to the COVID-19 situation, which shifted the attention of the government to other priorities related to alleviating the devastating effects of the pandemic on the population, as well as on the migrant workers. **(Outcome indicator on the revision of national legislation not (yet) achieved).**

Services provided through the Shuvayatra platform have been expanded **(Outcome indicator achieved).**

Overall, work is in progress and all activities being implemented are relevant to achieve the planned outcomes; a more appropriate support and responsiveness of the GoN is needed to speed up the progression on all fronts despite the priority given to the COVID-19 situation. The recent political developments are also likely to affect the revision and/or approval process of legislation.

**Access to better jobs**

**Outcome 2 (MIRIDEW):** Bilateral and regional mechanisms strengthened to improve Nepali migrant workers' access to better jobs (same as Outcome 4 of SEP)

- Output 2.1 - MoLESS has completed preparations for the formalization of new labour markets for low skilled workers.
  - MoU signed with Mauritius in 2019.
  - Revision and technical inputs in the draft MoUs/BLAs provided for United Arab Emirates, Mauritius and Malaysia to align the agreements with international standards, including on the removal of fees, protection of workers' right to organize and collective bargaining, access to justice and standard contract, etc. (joint efforts as ILO with contributions from SEP, WIF and FAIR projects).
  - Draft MoU prepared for Oman in 2020 ("Recruitment, Employment, Protection and Training of Workers") – ILO support focused on fair recruitment elements, occupational safety and health, social protection and equality of treatment.
  - Rapid Market Appraisal conducted (with SEP) of 10 potential destination countries for low-skilled and medium-skilled workers, of which 6 shortlisted by MoLESS for more detailed labour market analysis (Portugal, Poland, Romania, Czech Republic, New Zealand and Thailand).
- Output 2.2 - MoLESS develops system to respond to migration related policy trends in countries of destination.
  - No output.

**Outcome 4 (SEP):** Bilateral and regional mechanisms strengthened to improve Nepali migrant workers' access to better jobs, for which 4 areas of work are defined:

- Output 4.1: MOUs and BLAs signed and implemented with countries of destination to promote better wages and working conditions for Nepali women and men
  - Revision and technical inputs in the draft MoUs/BLAs prepared for United Arab Emirates, Mauritius and Malaysia to align the agreements with international standards, including on the removal of fees, protection of workers' right to organize and collective bargaining, access to justice and standard contract, etc.
- Output 4.2: Innovative model to promote fair recruitment into an identified sector and country of destination designed, and
- Output 4.3: Information on labour market needs in countries of destination is collected and analysed in a systematic manner and used to inform skills training programmes.
  - Cruise Sector has been recommended as one of the potential labour migration sectors and technical report on operationalization of the sector submitted.
  - Rapid Market Appraisal (RMA) report of 10 potential new destinations (Denmark, Romania, Portugal, New Zealand, Fiji, Czech Republic, Poland, China, Thailand and Seychelles) conducted. The RMA jointly undertaken with MIRIDEW was submitted to MoLESS and based on the RMA, MoLESS selected 6 potential destinations for detailed Labour Market Analysis (delayed because of COVID-19 travel restrictions).
- Output 4.4: Regional cooperation and platforms on labour migration strengthened through the implementation of identified areas of regional cooperation.
  - Support provided to MoLESS for drafting the National Strategy for the Implementation of the Global Compact on Migration (GCM) (draft September 2020).

**Contribution of outputs to access to better jobs:**

As for Policy related outputs, COVID-19 is also affecting the implementation of activities for this component of the project.

- With one MoU signed for a new destination (Mauritius) and another one drafted (Oman), the target of "2 new BLAs for new labour markets" has almost been achieved, but the finalization of the second one is still pending due to delays related to COVID-19 (**Outcome indicator partially achieved**).
- In absence of any activity related to Output 2.2 the corresponding **Outcome indicator has not been achieved**.
- SEP's contribution to improve access to better jobs for migrant workers is important but cannot be reflected though the indicator referring to recruitment costs (**Outcome indicator has not been achieved**).
- No activity under the SAARC plan of Action (**Outcome indicator has not been achieved**).

As for Outcome 2 work is in progress and will proceed once the COVID-19 restrictions are eased. It is however unlikely that access to better jobs will be significantly improved by the end of the project.

**Support to migrant workers in destination countries**

**For Outcome 3:** Nepali consular and diplomatic missions in country of destinations provide effective support services to Nepali migrant workers.

- Output 3.1 - The Government of Nepal (GoN) has piloted newly endorsed operational guidelines for Nepali consular and diplomatic missions.
  - Capacity Gap assessment completed (fact-finding Malaysia, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait)
  - Recommendations to strengthen service delivery of Nepali missions made.
- Output 3.2 - Diplomatic and consular missions benefit from increased coordination with non-governmental support structures, including from support structures for women migrants, in countries of destination.
  - Basic operating guidelines drafted taking into consideration findings of gap assessment report.
  - Outreach activities conducted by Pravasi Nepali Coordination Committee (PNCC) in Malaysia and Saudi Arabia, and by the General Federation of Nepalese Trade Unions (GEFONT) in Kuwait reaching out to 676 Nepali migrant workers (279 in Malaysia, 187 in Saudi Arabia and 210 in Kuwait)
  - Awareness raising on COVID-19 online campaigns launched.
- COVID-19 response<sup>8</sup>
  - 12,471 workers including 1,168 women workers in the four target countries have been provided with assistance to link them up with the repatriation process.
  - 7,000 workers received information and counselling through telephone, social media and in-person meetings.
  - 2,449 workers including 173 women workers have been repatriated.
  - 730 migrant workers including 225 women workers have been given temporary shelters in the destination countries.
  - 435 workers including 57 women workers have been assisted to find new jobs.
  - 263 workers including five women workers were supported to get back their unpaid salary from the employers.
  - Fees and fines for overstay to be paid before returning to Nepal have been allocated to 121 workers (8 women).
  - 83 workers (21 women) received support for conducting mandatory COVID-19 test to return back to Nepal.
  - 669 workers were reached through outreach camps, help desks and health camps in Qatar, Malaysia and Saudi Arabia through 10 different events organized in close collaboration with Nepali missions in concerned countries.
  - Five volunteers are mobilized in Kathmandu to link the returnee workers with different support provided by the project along with reaching out to those who might have some grievances.
  - 268 workers (8 women) were provided with transportation support from Kathmandu to reach their hometown.
  - Local NRNA committees in destination countries collaborating with other organizations provided different support (mainly food and shelter) to 27,413 Nepali workers including 9,912 women workers.
  - Different awareness and information materials in relation to COVID-19 and support system available were posted in three different online media operated from Malaysia, Saudi Arabia and Nepal, and posted on Facebook.

***Contribution of outputs to outcome 3:***

Activities under Outcome 3 were being rolled out according to plan when COVID-19 started disrupting the implementation.

---

<sup>8</sup> Information taken from COVID-19 Progress Report July-November 2020

Output indicators have not been reached yet but are likely to be achieved before the project ends:

- Operational guidelines are available in draft form and planned to be finalized by February/March 2021 enabling reporting in line with the guidelines to be possible and the MoLESS/DoFE Foreign Employment Information Management System to be upgraded
- Outreach activities have been implemented in 3 countries of destination by project partners with some support of diplomatic missions; the number of migrants reached out is small considering the presence of thousands of workers in these destination countries. The outreach has however been converted into the COVID-19 response.
- Sustainable model for diplomatic missions (pending)

**Outcome 3 indicators have not been achieved (yet)**, but the project aims at providing the consular and diplomatic missions with the necessary conditions to achieve more effective support services to Nepali migrant workers. The indicator “**one additional** labour attaché or labour counsellor” however is beyond the project’s responsibility and solely depends on a decision of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security and Ministry of Finance to provide additional resources to diplomatic missions.

The achievements of the COVID-19 response described above match expectations as described in the proposal for reprogramming MIRIDEW activities.

#### Regional and global engagement

**For Outcome 4:** The GoN has effectively engaged with regional and global policy dialogues on labour migration and has implemented relevant policy outcomes.

- Output 4.1 - The GoN has developed a national position, including priorities and concrete messages for the regional and global policy dialogues on labour migration.
  - In March 2019 Nepal co-hosted a side event entitled “Empowering Migrants through Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration in Asia and the Pacific” organized during the Asia Pacific Forum on Sustainable Development held in Bangkok where a Joint Secretary of MoLESS shared experiences from Nepal.
  - In December 2019 MoLESS participated and presented in an inter-regional policy dialogue entitled “Labour Mobility between Asia and Arab States: Sharing of Experiences and Progress under the Bali Declaration with specific focus on Women Migrant Workers”.
  - The National Planning Commission (NPC) participated in the regional policy dialogue on labour migration “Future of Labour Migration in Asia: Challenges and opportunities in the next decade” organized jointly by Asian Development Bank (ADB), the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the ILO.
- Output 4.2 - Global and regional policy dialogues on labour migration reflected in the policy making process of the GoN.
  - The Nepal Labour Migration Report 2020 includes a chapter on Nepalese engagement in regional and global policy dialogues and major take away from such engagement.
  - Technical assistance provided to NPC to develop a national policy document on the “Effect of COVID 19 Pandemic on Foreign Employment and its impact on the Economy of Nepal”. The report provided concrete policy recommendations to minimize the impacts and to develop and implement short-term, medium-term and long-term interventions in line with the relevant SDG targets and GCM objectives.

- The projects' engagement with and support to National Human Rights Commission and Parliamentary Committee on Industry, Commerce, Labour and Consumer Welfare significantly contributed for latter's decision to recommend government to lift ban on Nepali to work as domestic workers in major countries of destinations.
- Support to GCM shifted to SEP (as per above section on access to better jobs).

#### **Contribution of outputs to outcome 4:**

Even though the GoN participated in the above regional policy forums, there is room for progress with the support of the project. The advisory team proposed by the project to support the GoN in its engagement at regional and global levels has not received endorsement by MoLESS, hence creating a challenge for the project to achieve more, in particular for output 4.2 (**Outcome indicator partially achieved**).

#### **Unplanned effects**

##### ***Were there any non-planned effects and were these good or bad? (EQ16)***

The main non-planned effect was the appearance of the COVID-19 pandemic which certainly did not lead to an easier implementation of planned activities, though it has given the project the opportunity to demonstrate its capability to respond effectively to emergency situations as stated under above EQ12.

Another unexpected circumstance was the change in government leadership from the time the project was developed until it came into implementation, which mainly led to a reluctance of the government to accept external support.

The dissolution of the parliament in December 2020 developing into a new political crisis certainly is another non-planned event which is likely to affect the further implementation of the projects.

#### **Coordination with social partners**

##### ***Was coordination with social partners effective? Has the absence of a Project Steering Committee affected implementation? (EQ17)***

The absence of a Project Steering Committee (PSC) has removed the option to have a formal setting to gather the social partners and all other important stakeholders to provide advice on the direction of the project, as it was foreseen in the project document.

Stakeholders interviewed during this evaluation have expressed conflicting views on the absence of a PSC, ranging from "poor and ineffective coordination of government and social partners" to "effective coordination in absence of a PSC was delivered by the ILO office".

The interviews with all partners however tend to suggest that the absence of a PSC has not affected the implementation of the project.

In order to reconcile the different opinions, it may be worth considering the formation of a formal PSC even at this stage of implementation.

#### **Gender mainstreaming**

##### ***The extent to which has gender mainstreaming been addressed in the design and implementation of the project? (EQ18)***

The integration of gender issues is covered in section 4 of the project document stating that "the project will tap into the large pool of resources and best practices on the specific barriers female migrant workers face with regard to accessing support services at the countries of destination

*and the systematic process of exploiting rights of female migrant workers*". The project document furthermore suggested that issues of female migrant workers would be placed in the centre of all policy discussions while promoting the voices of female migrant workers.

The workplan 2019 for MIRIDEW states that due attention would be given to the issue of female migrant workers while conducting the capacity gap assessment of diplomatic missions in destination countries.

The final report of the capacity gap assessment shows that gender issues have indeed been taken into consideration, which eventually will lead to gender sensitive recommendations for the diplomatic and consular missions.

Gender issues also have been considered during Nepal's engagement in regional and global dialogues. As mentioned under above EQ15, MoLESS made a presentation on "Labour Mobility between Asia and Arab States: Sharing of Experiences and Progress under the Bali Declaration with specific focus on Women Migrant Workers" at the inter-regional policy dialogue organized by the ILO in Bangkok in December 2019.

## **4.4 Effectiveness of Management Arrangement**

### **Management capacity**

*To what extent do the project management capacities and arrangements put in place support the achievement of the planned results? (EQ19)*

The ILO is the executing agency responsible for overseeing the technical and administrative aspects of project implementation in cooperation with project partners (MoLESS, MoFA, workers' organisations, returnee migrants' organizations, civil society and research institutes). The project administration is managed by the ILO Office in Kathmandu. The ILO Country Director is responsible for the overall oversight of the project.

As foreseen in the project document, a national member of ILO's staff has been assigned the position of National Project Coordinator (NPC) to manage the overall implementation of the project, whereas the planned Project Steering Committee (PSC) meant to provide advice on the direction of the project has not been put in place (how this affects the implementation of the project is covered in above EQ17).

The NPC has an outstanding understanding of the issues covered by the project and enjoys an excellent relationship with the project's stakeholders and partners, as does the ILO Country Office in general with the tripartite constituents. Other staff members of the country office support the NPC during implementation, in particular the CO Director and the Migration Focal Point; support is also provided by the Regional Migration Specialist of the Decent Work Team based in New Delhi who visited Nepal on several occasions (prior to the COVID-19 outbreak).

The management set-up of the MIRIDEW project is adequate to achieve the planned results and favourably compares to other management arrangements for other projects throughout the ILO offices in the Asia-Pacific region.

## **4.5 Efficiency**

### **Value for money**

*To what extent has the project delivered value for money? How well resources and inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) been allocated or used strategically to achieve the planned results? Have they been delivered in a timely manner? If not, what were the factors that have*

***hindered timely delivery of outputs? Any measures that have been put in place? Where possible, analyze intervention benefits and related costs of integrated gender equality (or not)? (EQ20)***

24 months into implementation (i.e. up to 30 September 2020), the financial report shows that only 29.9% of the budget have been disbursed (actual expenditures), and that 52.5% of the budget have been committed. The low level of expenditures partially reflects the delays in implementation caused by the COVID-19 situation and longer time taken to establish ownership with concerned government entities.

The level of engagement (actual expenditures + commitments) for each outcome is the following:

- Outcome 1: 90.7%
- Outcome 2: 41.4%
- Outcome 3: 98.7%
- Outcome 4: 70.0%

The level of engagement for each outcome overall reflects the level of achievement of outcome indicators as mentioned in section 4.3 – Effectiveness.

The largest part of resources (64.3% of the total budget) is allocated to Outcome 3 which is the core intervention of the project. The distribution of resources is in line with the respective outputs, but there is no specific budget allocation for gender equality activities.

Two thirds of the budget allocated for personnel, operational costs and M&E have been engaged, which is in line with the implementation time of 24 months of the project.

Overall, the project is delivering in line with the contractual budget, however affected by the COVID-19 situation which is partially delaying activities and consequently disbursements.

**Complementary resources**

***To what extent have the project resources been leveraged with other related interventions to maximize impact, if any? (EQ21)***

MIRIDEW and SEP have combined project resources for the labour market assessment in preparing joint Terms of Reference and avoiding double recruitment of consultants. Likewise, in some policy related interventions MIRIDEW and SEP are working alternatively such as for developing National Strategy for the implementation of GCM and participation of key stakeholders in relevant policy dialogues. Both project worked jointly in supporting MoLESS in developing and publishing the Nepal Labour Migration Report 2020. As mentioned above, MIRIDEW also benefited from the SaMi project for the identification of migrants in need of assistance under the COVID-19 response, which allowed faster and more efficient intervention.

**Adequacy of implementation methodology**

***Was the methodology of implementation the right one under the circumstances? (EQ22)***

The methodology of implementation is found to be adequate and relies on the management capacity of the ILO (already discussed under EQ19).

The absence of a Project Steering Committee (already mentioned under EQ17 - Coordination with Social Partners) has not affected the implementation of the project but would have been of added value to enhance government engagement with the support of the donor.

**Expenditures & Disbursements**

***Was the budget spent according to the proposed budget lines? (EQ23)***

***Was the rate of spending acceptable and according to plan? (EQ24)***

Adding to the comments made under EQ 20, no deviation of the regular budget has been identified. Budget line reallocations however have been made to fund the project's COVID-19 response with the agreement of the donor as reported under EQ12 – COVID-19.

Spending and/or engagement is in accordance to proposed budget lines, though one allocation seems to be high considering the level of achievement, i.e. for output 3.2 (outreach activities in 3 destinations countries) for which a budget of US\$ 350.784 has been provided. The scope of work included (among other things): i) mapping the migrant community and the support mechanisms in place, and ii) design a plan for outreach activities. The mapping of migrant communities (groups/networks) in Saudi Arabia and Malaysia has been prepared by PNCC, but no evidence of such mapping has been found for Kuwait where GEFONT was assigned to these outreach activities. In relation to design/plan for outreach activities, there is no written plan as such as this was expected to be agreed between the partners and the respective diplomatic missions. The missions asked for a formal letter from MoFA to collaborate with PNCC, but MoFA did not provide such a letter, hence not allowing the missions to collaborate with the partners openly and officially. Outreach activities have been planned through informal consultations with the missions and implemented accordingly with their presence/involvement. As stated above (EQ15), only 676 migrant workers have benefited from the outreach activities, which however have been converted to the COVID-19 response reaching out to higher number of migrant workers.

#### **Budgetary outreach**

##### ***What was the value of this project? (% of budget that actually reached the beneficiaries) (EQ25)***

Under the assumption that the indirect, but ultimate beneficiaries of the project are the migrant workers, the value of the project in terms of % of budget reaching the beneficiaries cannot be established as most of the Outcomes still have to be achieved. Ultimately, the migrant workers however will benefit from the project's results, hence from the entire budget. At short notice, the migrant workers have directly benefited from the COVID-19 response which was designed to directly support their needs.

Under the assumption that the key government authorities are more direct beneficiaries of the project considering that most of the activities are designed to strengthen their capacity, the budget allocations for Outcomes 1-4 can be considered as directly reaching the beneficiaries, i.e. 72.9% of the total budget (83.2% in terms of actual expenditures and commitments up to 30/9/2020), excluding the COVID-19 response.

## **4.6 Possibility of Extension and Sustainability**

#### **Sustainability of results**

##### ***To what extent are the planned results of the project likely to be durable and can maintained or even scaled up and replicated by other partners after major assistance has been completed? (EQ26)***

At **policy level** (Outcome 1), once the Monitoring and Reporting Framework is finalized, approved and operational, the NPC and MoLESS will be in a position to respectively report annually on SDG targets and deliver further updates of the Labour Migration Report in the coming years. It has however been mentioned that it will be difficult to measure indicators at municipal and provincial levels if the Framework is not further disaggregated at the field level.

With regard to strengthening labour migration policies at federal and state level, the sustainability of revised policies once enacted by the cabinet will entirely depend on the willingness of the government to enforce better policies, which requires a higher degree of

priority as is currently the case due to both the COVID-19 situation and the ongoing political crisis.

**Access to better jobs** (Outcome 2) by means of bilateral agreements with destination countries can be further boosted on basis of the recommendations and experience provided by the project if the government decides to further engage in this direction. This however is unlikely to be a priority in referring to the latest development plan which is silent about labour migration but rather suggests promoting domestic employment rather than sending out workers.

The main focus of the MIRIDEW project to **support migrant workers in destination countries** (Outcome 3) will provide diplomatic and consular offices with a new and better framework to deliver services to the Nepali migrants. While a “model” will be in place, its usage by the embassies will depend on the Ministry of Foreign Affairs commitment to enforce new guidelines, as well as on the availability of human and financial resources to reinforce the institutional capability of the diplomatic and consular offices in destination countries. In this regard, interviews have revealed that embassies have different opinions about their role and duty with regard to supporting their nationals. According to different informants, better support to migrant workers in destination countries could be delivered if the responsibility to deal, supervise and monitor migrant workers was given to the Department of Foreign Employment.

The project’s efforts to support Nepal’s **regional and global engagement** (Outcome 4) have been rather challenging considering the fact that the GoN has been unfavourable to external support, which is expected to persist in the future. Despite of this, it can be assumed that the GoN will take advantage of the support provided by the project for its future engagement on the international scene.

#### **Need for extension**

*What is the need, importance and relevancy for the extension of the project period? What are the areas of engagements that should be continued? What are the areas that needs further build up? (EQ27)*

Considering that COVID-19 has suspended a number of activities and also considering that it has taken a long time to ensure government’s ownership on the initiatives, the need for a project extension has been considered to compensate for the delays. Such an extension is felt to be necessary as all activities have already been initiated by the project, some of which however need some more time to progress to the level of results. A number of decisions need to be made by the government to transform outputs into outcomes, but this is largely beyond the project’s responsibility.

The working conditions of migrant workers may have improved over time, but the COVID-19 crisis has once again drawn attention to their vulnerability. Supporting migrant workers in the destination countries remains a key issue and the contribution of MIRIDEW alone, though of great importance, will not put an end to their exposure to unfair working and living conditions. The ILO is considered by all parties as the only organization capable of improving the situation of migrant workers and further support is needed and expected, in particular on the ground rather than in international conferences.

#### **National ownership**

*How effective has the project been in establishing national ownership? Is there any room for improvement for steering the project? (EQ28)*

The level of interest and ownership among the key partners of the project is different from one ministry to another and from one activity to another. While the MoLESS as a long-standing partner of the ILO has generally been strongly engaged in the projects (both MIRIDEW and SEP),

the MoFA has been more reluctant to connect with the MIRIDEW project. MoFA indeed owned and took lead for carrying out capacity gap assessment of Nepali missions, but more hesitantly engaged with the project on regional and global issues. This may be due to the fact that working with the ILO is new for MoFA and that a certain learning process is required. Nevertheless several informants have reported that MoFA does not really show evidence of ownership of the project.

With regard to NPC, a rather passive mindset has been reported to take ownership of the activities. Though there was no intention to object or restrict activities, informants suggest that NPC did not pro-actively seek to push things forward.

Engaging with multiple partners with different priorities and agenda is not an easy task, especially when the contribution of all parties is required to successfully implement a project and achieve the overall objective of an intervention. The absence of a Project Steering Committee has already been discussed above, but it is worth mentioning that regular meetings of all partners contribute not only to better coordination, but also to joint ownership of an intervention.

### **Contribution to policy dialogue**

#### ***To what extent have government institutions benefited from policy dialogue support and process etc.? (EQ29)***

It is interesting to note that both MoLESS and MoFA, as well as other informants, unanimously consider that the most important Outcome for MIRIDEW is the policy component for which expectations are focusing on a better coordination between all parties involved at local and federal levels, including diplomatic missions and agencies involved in labour migration.

Dialogues among and between different stakeholders in relation to policy issues are largely hampered due to COVID-19 related restrictions; the projects could not undertake many of the planned consultations in relation to developing the monitoring and reporting framework on labour migration related SDG targets and indicators, and for developing the national strategy for the implementation of GCM.

How a better reporting framework and strengthened policies will actually contribute to increased and constructive policy dialogue among all stakeholders is not yet determined. Expectations are that beyond supporting the development of processes and policies, the ILO will help in promoting more dialogue which, at short term and in the framework of the project, could be facilitated in bringing all stakeholders together in the structure of the PSC.

### **Long-term sustainability**

#### ***To what extent the government benefited from the activities and outputs? To what extent can the outputs be expected to be sustainable over the longer (5-10 years) term? (EQ30)***

In view of the progress made by the project as reported above, the benefit of outputs still has to materialize for most of the activities implemented. The immediate benefits from the support provided by the project relate e.g. to the signature of a MoU with Oman, to the government's successful participation in regional dialogues and/or to the publication of the Labour Migration Report. Other initiatives will need to be finalized before the government will be able to fully benefit from the outputs, which will be sustainable by nature, but subject to the commitment of the government as mentioned under EQ28.

### **Government support**

#### ***Do the government institutions fully support the initiatives taken by the project? (EQ31)***

The MIRIDEW project was designed to meet the needs and priorities of the government and the initiatives of the project have been supported by the government institutions, though with different levels of intensity as already mentioned under EQ28. As stated by different informants, the government's priorities seem now to have shifted more towards promoting decent work within the country rather than abroad.

### **Involvement of partners**

#### ***To what extent have government partners been involved in the implementation of the project? (EQ32)***

The MTE is not in a position to provide a comprehensive analysis of all stakeholders' engagement with or in the project, but overall most beneficiaries and other parties directly or indirectly involved with the project appear to be cooperating with the project team.

Two major stakeholders however could (and should) be much more involved, i.e.:

- **The private sector**, which for now plays a limited role in the project. Despite efforts on the part of the Nepali government to regulate the recruitment process and to make labour migration safer for Nepali migrants, the recruitment process is still flawed. Among the most common problems is that migrants are misguided or misinformed by recruitment agencies and agents, for instance, through false contracts, by charging exorbitant service costs or by not complying with employment/recruitment agreements. This can have severe consequences for the migration process and employment situation abroad (e.g., exploitation, limited mobility, high migration costs/debts). Labour migrants are also at risk of becoming victims of human trafficking, for instance, due to limited knowledge and information regarding the recruitment and migration process. MIRIDEW's focus is not on the recruitment process, which is being addressed by the ILO through other projects but involving the private sector in policy dialogue would be beneficial for achieving better protection of the workers abroad.
- **The Ministry of Foreign Affairs** which is one of the two key partners of the project. The success of the project's key intervention in supporting diplomatic missions to provide better services to the migrants in destination countries requires the Ministry's endorsement and support to provide diplomatic missions with relevant instructions to protect the Nepali workers abroad. Several assertions were made that in diplomatic missions political affairs (for which MoFA is responsible) prevail over the support to the migrants workers (for which MoLESS is responsible), hence the lack of interest or priority of certain diplomatic missions showing a passive attitude towards migrant workers.

### **Capacity building**

#### ***To what extent has the project strengthened the capacities of the government structures? (EQ33)***

The project document stated that capacities of MoLESS and MoFA staff would be strengthened through trainings/orientations to identify and report policy changes, for which the modalities of implementation would be defined in the first year of the project.

The work plan for 2019 indeed mentions that the project will support MoLESS for effective regional and global policy dialogues in setting up an advisory team and strengthen their capacity.

This did allegedly not happen as MoLESS was not ready to set up such a team, which may also be linked to the frequent transfer of officials. It was then agreed with the donor to have an NGO partner work with MoLESS in 2020, but this was put on hold due to the COVID-19 outbreak.

Capacity development has therefore up to now been limited to training/orientations linked to the operational guidelines under Outcome3 and the process of developing the guidelines.

#### **Beneficiaries' contribution to sustainability**

##### ***To what extent are the migrant themselves contributing to the sustainability of the initiatives? (EQ34)***

Migrant workers have not engaged directly with the project (except for the COVID-19 response) and are not in front line to provide any contribution to the sustainability of the initiatives. In a longer-term perspective, their contribution could however be to respect new policies in place and/or MoUs signed with destination countries in avoiding unofficial channels for migration.

#### **Longer-term impact**

##### ***To what extent is the impact sustainable over the longer term? (EQ35)***

Covered under EQ30.

#### **Independence of intervention**

##### ***Has the project increased or decreased dependency on outside intervention? (EQ36)***

The ILO has been supporting the Government of Nepal for more than 25 years and is recognized as a strong partner in promoting decent work and labour migration among several other areas of work. MIRIDEW is one of the four ongoing projects implemented by the ILO to support the government of Nepal on labour migration issues and cannot be assessed in terms of increasing or decreasing dependency on outside intervention.

#### **Comparative advantages**

##### ***Has the project been able to leverage the ILO contributions through its comparative advantages including social dialogue? (EQ37)***

The project has involved tripartite constituents on several occasions and more particularly in assigning outreach activities in Kuwait to the General Federation of Nepalese Trade Unions (GEFONT), which coordinated its work with the Kuwait Trade Union Federation (KTUF). KTUF agreed extending membership and support to Nepali migrant workers, while also providing space for GEFONT representative in KTUF office, facilitating in handling the cases and raising the issues of migrant workers collectively.

#### **Beneficiaries' knowledge of skills**

##### ***To which extent was there a change observed as regards to the beneficiaries' knowledge of skills, and have the results of the projects influenced practices? (EQ38)***

The important question of skills has been highlighted in the Nepal Labour Migration Report which frequently refers to the need to establish skills partnerships and promote skills development.

MIRIDEW does not have a focus on skills development as it complements the Skills for Employment Project (SEP) as well as the Work in Freedom (WIF) project which, among other things, aims at enhancing the knowledge and skills of migrant women and girls. MIRIDEW's skill related scope mainly is about categorizing skills in order to identify accurate data for reporting under Outcome 1.

Once Outcome 1 will have been achieved and a Monitoring and Reporting Framework is in place, practices are likely to be influenced as policy decisions made by the government will be based on accurate data.

## 4.7 Reporting

### Transparency of reporting (EQ39)

The MIRIDEW project has prepared and released the following reports:

- Progress report October-December 2018
- Annual Progress Report 2019
- Semi-Annual Progress Report January-June 2020
- Outcome Monitoring Summary 1 (2018-2019)
- Outcome Monitoring Summary 2 (2019-2020)
- Progress Update on COVID-19 (up to November 2020)

Progress Reports follow the ILO reporting formats and Outcome Monitoring Summaries discuss progress on basis of indicators.

All reports are found to be clear and adequate for external readers to understand the status of implementation.

## 4.8 Donor's Role and Influence on Project Implementation

### Communication

#### *Were communications with the donor satisfactory in terms of promptness and content? (EQ40)*

SDC regrets the absence of a formal Project Steering Committee but recognizes that communication with the ILO has been excellent, both with the National Project Coordinator as with the ILO-CO Director who has dedicated adequate time to meetings and communication.

As mentioned under EQ22, the absence of a PSC would have allowed the donor to be involved in a more formal communication set-up with the ILO and other stakeholders, in particular the Ministries involved, as is the case for the SEP project.

FCDO likewise confirms the excellent communication with the ILO.

### Technical/administrative support

#### *Was technical/administrative support provided timely and adequately when requested? (EQ41)*

As this evaluation has mainly been performed remotely, it is difficult to assess the degree of cooperation between the ILO and the donors, but the support provided mutually by all parties has not been negatively commented, hence the evaluation can only conclude that the relationship between all parties is beneficial to a smooth implementation of the projects.

### Funding arrangements

#### *Were financial release procedures and actions timely taken care of and did these influence project implementation in any way? (EQ42)*

Nothing particular has been reported to the evaluator. Financial release procedures have been smooth and timely, in particular for the release of funds allocated to the COVID response to Nepali migrant workers.

### Monitoring

#### *Was monitoring and progress reporting adequate according to the ILO and donor requirements? (EQ43)*

The project document of MIRIDEW states that the project will report against indicators that measure the progress and results achieved. Various steps and tools for reporting including the frequency of reporting are indicated in the project document (section 9 – Monitoring and Evaluation Plan).

All reports have been delivered as planned. Besides the formal ILO reporting format, the project has prepared Outcome monitoring summaries, which clearly describe the link between outputs and outcomes.

## 5 Conclusions and Recommendations

### 5.1 Overall Assessment

MIRIDEW is a well-designed project which responds to the need to the country and falls in line with ILO's DWCP. Up to 30/09/2020, the project has implemented a remarkable number of activities despite a certain reluctance of the government to fully engage with the project in all actions, and also considering the emergence of the COVID-19 outbreak.

Overall, work is still in progress. Activities are adequate and correctly implemented, though the COVID-19 situation and the time taken to ensure the ownership of government authorities has delayed the implementation of some of them.

Many outputs have already been delivered, some of which have allowed to partially achieve outcome indicators while others are ready for further processing and approval by the government.

A project extension is likely to be necessary with a few improvements to ensure a successful completion of the project and the sustainability of its achievements.

### 5.2 Recommendations

Based on the above answers to the evaluation questions and conclusions, the evaluator would like to present the following recommendations:

	Recommendation	Justification
1	Priority should be given to develop inter-ministerial coordination and policy engagement of all stakeholders involved in labour migration issues.	MIRIDEW's project document highlighted a lack of coordination between MoFA and MoLESS in addressing issues and challenges of labour migration governance as one of the challenges the project would have to deal with. As mentioned under EQ29, informants of both MoLESS and MoFA stated that expectations of both ministries were focusing on a better coordination, not only between the two ministries, but between all parties involved at local and federal levels, including diplomatic missions and agencies involved in labour migration. While the project can support enhancing such coordination, it is the government's responsibility to develop appropriate coordination mechanisms to involve all parties in order to maximize the benefits of the project's achievements.  <b>Addressed to the Government of Nepal – High priority – No financial resources required</b>
2	Boost ownership of project outputs by the Government towards impact and sustainability.	Sustaining the work of the projects requires engagement and commitment of all beneficiaries, especially at the level of government institutions. The evaluation has revealed that ownership is often weak. The project has delivered multiple outputs (EQ15) which need to be further processed by the Government to transform into outcomes and ultimately contribute to the overall objective of the intervention. This requires the GoN to take full ownership of the project's

		<p>achievements, which is not occurring for all components as revealed by the interviews conducted, but also confirmed by the lack of decisions by the Government and/or by its hesitancy to accept external advice on different issues.</p> <p>The concerned authorities should be involved in all levels of the project to develop a real sense of ownership in order to maximize impact of the intervention and sustain its benefits in a longer-term perspective.</p> <p>ILO has an important role to play in promoting clearer ownership of the intervention by the government.</p> <p><b>Addressed to the Government of Nepal/ILO – High priority – No financial resources required</b></p>
3	<p>Despite having reached mid-term of project implementation and the existence of the DWCP Steering Committee, set up the MIRIDEW Project Steering Committee with all relevant stakeholders.</p>	<p>In line with the above two recommendations, the Project Steering Committee comprising representatives from key government partners, workers' organisations, civil society organizations, and donor partners should be put in place as foreseen in the project document.</p> <p>Although its absence has not affected the implementation of the project (EQ17), the PSC would allow to bring together all relevant stakeholders dealing with labour migration, which could develop a better sense of ownership and facilitate an integrated approach at national and sub-national levels possibly paving the way towards an enhanced coordination mechanism led by the Government.</p> <p><b>Addressed to Project Management – High priority – No financial resources required</b></p>
4	<p>Enhance the participation of the private sector in order to secure better protection of migrant workers.</p>	<p>As stated under EQ32, the private sector plays a limited role in the project. MIRIDEW's focus is not on the recruitment process, which is being addressed by the ILO through other projects but involving the private sector in policy dialogue would be beneficial for achieving better protection of the workers abroad. Setting up the Project Steering Committee as suggested above, offers a good opportunity to involve the private sector in discussions surrounding the project as it was suggested in the project document of MIRIDEW.</p> <p><b>Addressed to Project Management – High priority – No financial resources required.</b></p>
5	<p>Revise inadequate indicators in the LFM and add gender-specific indicators at output level.</p>	<p>In order to facilitate a final results analysis upon completion of the project, it is important to update in very precise terms the indicators of achievement. This goes beyond outputs and implies more than just showing numbers reached in order to prepare for a post-project impact evaluation which would possibly pave the way for new projects under the new DWCP.</p> <p>As mentioned EQ6, some corrections should be made for indicators at the level of Outcome 1 and for the overall objective. The same applies for gender sensitive indicators which should suggest specific target values for men or women at output level.</p>

		<p>It is furthermore recommended to take into consideration the migration-related indicators in the Sustainable Development Goals (2030).</p> <p><b>Addressed to Programme Management – Medium priority – no financial resources required.</b></p>
6	<p>Given the virtual setting that we all are working in, seek to ensure long term sustainability of the Shuvayatra platform so that information and services, job matching, skilling, and entrepreneurship development are promoted to a large section of migrant workers.</p>	<p>The COVID-19 pandemic has pushed everybody to look for alternative ways to reach out to target groups as direct interactions could no longer be possible in safe conditions. As part of the project’s response to COVID-19 awareness and information materials in relation to COVID-19 support available were posted in different online media operated from Malaysia, Saudi Arabia and Nepal as well as through Facebook, reaching out to more than 3 million users. This obviously shows the advantage of online dissemination of information as opposed to direct outreach activities.</p> <p>The online Shuvayatra platform which has been expanded during implementation, is a useful tool which should be maintained beyond the project’s lifetime and ILO/SEP’s support.</p> <p>All options to host, maintain and continue upgrading the platform should be explored before the project ends.</p> <p><b>Addressed to ILO/Programme Manager – High priority – No financial resources required</b></p>
7	<p>Provide time extension to MIRIDEW project to offset the time loss due to COVID-19 impact and to conclude the major interventions to the expected results level.</p>	<p>COVID-19 has delayed the implementation of a number of activities, which are now all well underway. A slight extension in time of the project will be needed to transform the activities into outputs and further on into results. Such an extension should be relatively short in time and without additional financial resources.</p> <p><b>Addressed to ILO/SDC – High priority – No financial resources required</b></p>
8	<p>Prepare exit strategies based on increased ownership of project achievements by the government.</p>	<p>In conjunction with the above recommendations, the project should develop an exit strategy which will pave the way for the definition of further projects aiming at supporting the Government of Nepal to build on the achievements of MIRIDEW and SEP.</p> <p>This strategy should take into consideration realistic assumptions about ownership, time (policy changes take time to be implemented), financial limitations (in particular for the reinforcement of diplomatic missions) and options/possibilities for further support.</p> <p><b>Addressed to Programme Manager – High priority – No financial resources required</b></p>
9	<p>Define options for future possible interventions building on the achievements of MIRIDEW particularly to work</p>	<p>Among the options for future support, the work with Nepali diplomatic missions should be given particular attention as well as the engagement of CSOs in destination countries both for outreach and for direct support to migrant workers.</p>

with MoFA for the implementation of concrete recommendations put forth by Nepali missions' capacity gap assessment report.	The implementation of the COVID-19 response has shown the importance of CSO engagement in destination countries, where diplomatic missions often remain ineffective in responding to urgent needs of distressed migrant workers.  <i>Addressed to ILO/donors – Medium priority – Financial resources required</i>
--	---

## 6 Lessons Learned and Good Practices

---

### 6.1 Lessons Learned

The lessons learned emerging from the evaluation of the project are:

1. Assumptions and Risks of any intervention need to be better analysed at the design stage.
2. Proper calculation of time is required to achieve the results in relation to engagement with government authorities and on policy issues as these needs considerable time to build the momentum and get the right opportunity.
3. The commitment of all partners is central to achieve sizeable results for the benefit of migrant workers. Mobilizing public authorities at all levels to engage in a project is a challenge.

Details about these lessons learned are provided in the ILO/EVAL template presented in Annex 4.

### 6.2 Good Practices

The evaluation has allowed to identify two good practices from the ongoing project which are important to be mentioned:

1. The coordination within the ILO Country Office of labour migration related projects to promote synergies and interlinkages while avoiding overlaps.
2. Combining policy with an improvement of operational efficiency of the government is a well-founded approach to promote better protection of the migrant workers.
3. The flexibility of the project and the donor to adapt to unexpected events.

Details about these emerging good practices are provided in the ILO/EVAL template presented in Annex 5.



## **Appendices**

## Appendix 1: Terms of Reference for the Evaluation

### International Labour Organization Country Office for Nepal

#### Terms of Reference (ToR)

#### Mid-Term Evaluation of Migrant Rights and Decent Work (MIRIDEW) Project combined with labour migration related components under Skills for Employment Programme (SEP)

<b>Title of Project</b>	<b>Migrant Rights and Decent Work (MIRIDEW) combined with Skills for Employment Programme (SEP) labour migration components</b>
<b>TC CODE</b>	<b>NPL/18/01/CHE and NPL/17/01/GBR</b>
<b>Administrative Unit</b>	<b>ILO Kathmandu</b>
<b>Technical Backstopping Unit</b>	<b>DWT-Delhi ILO Decent Work Technical Support Team for South Asia, New Delhi (DWT-New Delhi); MIRIDEW-Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA), Switzerland acting through the Embassy of Switzerland in Nepal</b>
<b>Donor</b>	<b>SEP-Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO, former DFID), United Kingdom</b>
<b>Implementation Partner</b>	<b>Government of Nepal, Civil Society Organizations, Worker Organizations, Academia</b>
<b>Type of Evaluation</b>	<b>Mid Term Evaluation</b>
<b>Timing of Evaluation</b>	<b>01 October 2018 - 30 October 2020</b>
<b>Project budget</b>	<b>MIRIDEW - CHF 1,398,880 SEP – US\$ 1,986,814 (Migration component only)</b>
<b>Project duration</b>	<b>MIRIDEW-35 months (01 October 2018 – 31 August 2021) SEP-48 Months (01 August 2017-31 July 2021)</b>

#### A. Introduction and rationale for evaluation

This Terms of Reference for the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of the above project known as ‘MIRIDEW Project’ combined with labour migration related components of SEP is in compliance with the ILO Policy Guidelines for

Evaluation published in 2017 and as per the requirement of Article 7 (1) of the project agreement between Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA), Switzerland and ILO signed on 26 September 2018. This evaluation will be conducted as an internal evaluation where, the evaluation is managed by an ILO official and conducted by an external evaluator selected in consultation with the ILO country office in Kathmandu, DWT for South Asia and Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific. Key stakeholders, ILO constituents, partners and the donor will be consulted throughout the evaluation process.

This mid-term evaluation of the MIRIDEW Project is planned from **November, 2020** with the final report expected to be completed latest by end of **January, 2021**. This evaluation is being conducted to review the programme performance and enhance learning within the ILO and among key stakeholders. The evaluation findings and recommendations will help guide the MIRIDEW and SEP Project team in planning and implementation of the remaining period of the project together with need and possibility of its extension beyond. It is also important for ILO to look into how effective are the relevant components of Skills for Employment Programme (SEP) in achieving expected results and to bring strong synergies and complementarity for better and bigger results. This will also help ILO together with donors of both the projects to take decisions on how the work of both projects could be further strengthened and better collaborated for producing effective and greater impact in future. It would also provide valuable inputs to strengthening ILO's management capacity, reflecting the changes which have occurred in the operational and administrative environment since October 2018, when the project commenced.

The Evaluation Focal Point in the ILO Nepal Office will provide technical backstopping for the evaluation.

## B. Brief Background on project and context

### Contextual Background

Lack of adequate and decent jobs at home and the higher earning potentials in destination countries are key factors driving Nepal's workforce abroad. With an average 1,700 workers leaving for foreign employment each day, and 5.62 million labour permits issued for Nepali in the last twenty five years<sup>9</sup>, international labour migration has become an intrinsic part of the lives of many Nepali. Regularized labour migration from Nepal reached to its peak during 2014/15 when above 700,000 labour permits were issued including for re-migrants. Thereafter the flow of out migration is declining every year with an average issuance of 500,000 labour permits a year. The decline in number of people opting for labour migration is largely attributed by the earthquake of 2015 followed by various obstacles emerged on various labour migration corridors. In relation to internal scenario of labour migration, the density of migration is higher from eastern part of Nepal namely Province 1 and 2 with 24.1 and 26.4 percent of total labour approval issued in the year 2017/18 and 2018/19<sup>10</sup>. But the phenomenon is common across the country with Province 5, Bagmati Province and Gandaki Province having larger shares respectively<sup>11</sup>. Only difference is, labour migration to India is higher from western part which is not considered as 'foreign employment' by the existing laws. Likewise, number of women migrant workers is under-reported in the official data which is meagre 4.82 per cent of the total labour permits issued. It is mainly due to different types of ban and restrictions

---

<sup>9</sup> Based on the analysis of annual data published by Department of Foreign Employment in different years. Note: The data does not reflect labour migration through India or irregular channels.

<sup>10</sup> Nepal Labour Migration Report 2020; MoLESS, 2020

<sup>11</sup> Ibid

imposed on the mobility of women time and again forcing them to opt for irregular/undocumented channels for migration mainly via India<sup>12</sup>.

Official data on labour permits issued by the Government of Nepal (GoN) states that nearly 90% Nepali workers migrate to Malaysia and the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC). India remains a major destination country for Nepali workers, particularly for seasonal labour migration. Nepal Labour Force Survey (2018) indicated that migration to India from Karnali and Sudur Paschim Provinces are 73 and 90 per cent respectively. As the existing laws doesn't recognize labor migration to India as 'foreign employment', there is no mechanism to keep the records of Nepali migrants working in India.

Migration plays a critical role at the macroeconomic level – remittances sent by Nepali workers abroad hovering between 25 to 30 per cent equivalent of Nepal's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) during last five fiscal years. In this context, Nepal is ranked in the list of top five remittance receiving countries in the world. Much of Nepal's poverty reduction can be attributed to the large amounts of remittances, with NPR 879.27 billion received in 2018/19. However, the benefits of migration have yet to be fully realised in Nepal. High levels of informality permeate most aspects of the labour migration process, caused in part by gaps in proper management and regulation of labour migration.

## Project Background

---

Migrant Rights and Decent Work (MIRIDEW) project is a bilateral initiative of the Government of Switzerland represented by the Embassy of Switzerland in Nepal and the International Labour Organization (ILO) represented by the International Labour Office in Nepal. Similarly, Skills for Employment Programme (SEP) is an initiative taken up by Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO; formerly known as Department for International Development DFID), United Kingdom and part of the technical assistance component of the SEP is implemented by ILO. After rolling out of SEP by ILO, the MIRIDEW project is developed to contribute in the bigger and wider results foreseen by SEP in relation to labour migration related issues of Nepal. MIRIDEW is being implemented in close collaboration with Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA) and the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security (MoLESS) together with other concerned government line agencies whereas SEP largely works with MoLESS on labour migration components. The project interventions of MIRIDEW are planned to be executed in three major destinations (Malaysia, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait) of Nepali migrant workers and in Nepal with the support of selected government agencies, civil society organizations, media, returnee and in-service migrant workers and their networks. For SEP, all the migration related initiatives are country based with some important engagement at sub-national level as well.

Nepal has expressed its commitments for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and prepared a roadmap for its implementation, monitoring and reporting. The roadmap prepared for this by National Planning Commission (NPC), the national entity responsible for overall national development planning and monitoring, also have responsibility to monitor and report against the targets set on SDGs. There are key labour migration related targets and indicators as well that needs to be monitored and reported. However, there is lacking of understanding of those targets and indicators, their monitoring framework, relevant data collection and responsibilities and finally reporting. So the project aims at filling those gaps by supporting NPC in defining the indicators and developing a comprehensive monitoring and reporting framework on labour migration related SDG targets. (Outcome 1)

Documented Nepalese migrants workers are found to be working in 153 different countries but almost 90% of them are headed towards Malaysia and GCC countries. That shows high level of dependency of Nepalese migrant workers in these traditional destinations. In recent years, there are few efforts to diversify the destinations but those

---

<sup>12</sup> The DoFE's main source of data is the labour permits issued thus it only captures migrant workers using regular channels. There are multiple reasons to female migrants using irregular channels to migrate. There are socio-cultural patriarchal norms which restrict mobility and agency for women. The Government of Nepal has also adopted various directives/restrictions for Nepali female workers migrating to work in the domestic sector over the year.

are not becoming so successful to attract large numbers. Specially, the destinations or sectors for low-skilled Nepalese migrant workers are very limited. So if there will be certain shifts in the labour market of traditional destinations, it may largely impact the fate of hundreds of thousands of Nepalese workers and the import-based economy of Nepal. Therefore, there is need for exploring and diversifying destinations or sectors in existing destinations where low-skilled Nepalese workers get decent work opportunities. And, the project has plan to support Nepal Government in identifying and operationalizing new labour market destinations for low-skill Nepali workers. (Outcome 2)

The government of Nepal has embassies in most destination countries however their service delivery capacities are limited as they need to serve the big numbers of workers seeking consular support with limited human and financial resources. The labour counselors and attachés are not equipped for their job as expected and often lack the resources to provide the necessary services to workers in need. Lack of clarity and accountability towards roles and responsibilities among consular and labour officials in the missions playing a critical role in inadequate service delivery by the missions. As a result, migrants, and particularly women migrants, often do not get necessary assistance they require particularly to resolve their grievances largely with employers. In this relation, the project plans to work together with Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA) and Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security (MoLESS) to strengthen service delivery capacity of the missions. (Outcome 3)

For last three years, Nepal remained a Chair of the Colombo Process (CP), a Regional Consultative Process on the management of overseas employment and contractual labour for 12 countries of origin in Asia. Nepal also led the technical working group on migration of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) and was able to influence the 18<sup>th</sup> SAARC Summit resulting to inclusion of labour migration agenda for the first time in the declaration. Accordingly, Nepal took lead in developing an Action Plan for the implementation of the labour migration agenda of the declaration. In addition to the active roles in those two processes, Nepal contributed actively to the Global Compact for Migration (GCM) and regularly engaged in the Abu Dhabi Dialogue (ADD) and the Global Forum for Migration and Development (GFMD). However, there are few gaps observed in relation to prioritizing the issues, better positioning in the fora and trickling down the commitments back in the country. Therefore to have greater leverages from those fora, GoN requires support in documenting and communicating key issues and experiences in an effective manner and harmonizing the commitments made into its own frameworks and mechanisms. In this relation, the project have plans to provide technical assistance to MoLESS for their strong policy engagement at regional and global policy forums and in reflecting and implementing the commitments made at those levels. (Outcome 4)

The overall goal of the project is stated as *Migrants (M/F/discriminated groups) and their families are better protected by democratic institutions in Nepal and benefit from decent work conditions abroad.*

The main objective of the project is *to strengthen support systems of the Government of Nepal in order to better protect the rights of Nepali migrant workers along with increase benefits from labour migration.*

The project aim to achieve following outcomes and delivery of the related outputs.

Outcome 1: To have monitoring mechanism in place for key labor migration indicators

Outputs:

- Technical support to the National Planning Commission and MoLESS to improve monitoring and reporting on SDGs related to labour migration (8.8, 1.7 & 10.c)
- Technical support provided to DoFE to standardized skills categorization in FEIMS
- Technical support provided to FEB to develop database on deaths and injuries faced by Nepali migrant workers

Outcome 2: Bilateral and regional mechanisms strengthened to improve Nepali migrant workers' access to better jobs

Outputs:

- MoLESS prepared for formalization of new labour markets for low skilled workers
- MoLESS (close collaboration with MoFA) develops system to respond to migration related policy trends in countries of destination

Outcome 3: Nepali consular and diplomatic missions in country of destinations provide effective support services to Nepali migrant workers

Outputs:

- GoN (MoFA & MoLESS) developed and piloted operational guidelines for Nepali consular and diplomatic missions (including training, reporting in FEIMS and handbook on mass evacuation)
- Missions benefit from increased coordination with non-governmental support structures, including from support structures for women migrants, in countries of destination (mobilization of missions and CSOs)

Outcome 4: Effectively engaged with regional and global policy dialogues on labour migration and implemented relevant policy outcomes

Outputs:

- Developed a national position, including priorities and concrete messages for the regional and global policy dialogues on labour migrations (advisory team, consultations at different level, concretizing priorities)
- Global and regional policy dialogues on labour migration reflected in policy making process of the GoN (gap analysis and implementation of action points of GCM, CP, ADD, SAARC)

Likewise, ILO Country Office for Nepal is implementing Technical Assistance (TA) component of the United Kingdom's Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office's (FCDO) Skills for Employment Programme (SEP). Within the broader framework developed by SEP on labour migration related issues, MIRIDEW was conceptualized later to contribute in some specific elements not adequately addressed by SEP. The programme was started from 01 August 2017 and ending on 31 July 2021. SEP aims to provide Nepali workers with more productive domestic employment opportunities by filling skill gaps in both formal and informal sectors, with a focus on sectors that are instrumental for transformational economic growth in Nepal. Further, SEP also aims to increase incomes of migrant workers through reduced cost of migration and increased incomes in employment and facilitate higher savings and more productive investment of remittances. The overall aim of the programme is to support domestic employment creation and reduce long-term dependency on migration, whilst recognizing the importance of labour migration as one of the major source of employment for Nepali workers.

The Technical Assistance components on labour migration under SEP aims to achieve results in the above areas of work by supporting the Government of Nepal in creating partnerships with key stakeholders, increasing coordination, developing research and evidence, and developing and implementing relevant policies/laws that enable a higher development impact from labour migration.

Specifically, the following outcomes and outputs areas of the programme aim at improving benefits of labour migration for Nepal and the migrant workers at individual level:

Outcome 3: National policies strengthened and implemented to enhance the governance of labour migration in Nepal

Outputs:

- Support to national laws, regulations, policies, information and standards that enhance the governance of foreign employment.
- Technical assistance for the expansion of the Shuvayatra platform to enhance access to financial and employment services to migrants and their families
- Technical assistance to support provincial governments to establish and implement labour migration governance structures in selected provinces

Outcome 4: Bilateral and regional mechanisms strengthened or initiated to improve Nepali migrant workers access to better jobs

Outputs:

- Technical assistance provided to GoN for entering into new BLAs and revising existing BLAs/MoUs with destination countries
- Technical Assistance to Government to identify and scope new niche markets or new sectors in existing corridors for Nepali workers
- Technical assistance to develop a system for collection of data in countries of destination

So the MTE is principally intended for the MIRIDEW project but also intends to look into relevant outcomes and outputs of SEP for its effectiveness and impacts together with complementarities and synergies between the two projects.

### **Partners and Geographical coverage**

The MIRIDEW and SEP projects principally have three different levels of partners. The major and most important partners of MIRIDEW are Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA) and Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security (MoLESS) but for SEP, MoLESS is the key government partner. Both the project components are largely designed keeping in mind the most crucial element of the interventions – its sustainability. Therefore, major interventions are focused on developing system, process and mechanism of government entities and building ownership of the government entities. Likewise, some of the outputs are linked with specific government institutions mainly with National Planning Commission (NPC), Department of Foreign Employment (DoFE) and Foreign Employment Board (FEB). Hence the project works in close collaboration with these government partners.

The second level of partners are trade unions and CSOs/NGOs who are playing key role in bridging gaps between the government institutions and the primary beneficiaries – the migrant workers. The project is currently collaborating with General Federation of Nepalese Trade Unions (GEFONT), Pravasi Nepali Coordination Committee (PNCC) and Non-Resident Nepali Association (NRNA) in order to support Nepali diplomatic missions in selected destinations. The project is also collaborating with a research institution, Social Science Baha that facilitates the process for developing monitoring and reporting framework on labour migration related SDGs targets and indicators. A new CSO partner is envisaged to support MoLESS in relation to policy review and dissemination of the policy changes to the wider public using effective media platforms. For SEP, Law and Policy Forum for Social Justice (LAPSOJ) is the key partner in relation to law and policy related work while some of its work is also technically supported by Social Science Baha relating to development of National Strategy for the Implementation of Global Compact on Migration (GCM). The Asia Foundation (TAF) is another key partner for SEP that is engaged in developing and promoting an mobile app called Shuva Yatra.

For both project components, the third layer of the partners are the thematic and technical experts who support in delivery of project outputs and ensure the quality of the delivery of the projects. Such experts are used or are planned to be used in the areas of capacity gap assessment of missions and development of operational guideline

for the missions, labour market assessment to identify potential new destinations, support in policy dialogue issues etc.

MIRIDEW was initially designed to implement in Nepal and three major destination countries namely Malaysia, Qatar and Kuwait. However, due to some political sensitivity and other critical issues, Saudi Arabia was selected instead of Qatar. The project mainly focuses its interventions at national level but limited involvement of provincial and local governments are also expected for selected activities. In relation to SEP, it is planned to engage with and at all three tiers of government namely federal, provincial and local in relation to federalization of labour migration governance and related interventions.

## **Relevance and Strategic Fit**

Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP for 2018-2022) is the core strategic guidance for ILO that is finalized and adopted by tripartite constituents (GoN, employers' organizations and workers' organizations). The DWCP reflects the social, economic and political priorities of the country. The framework has identified two key priorities as the focus of its activities for 2018 to 2022, which include the following:

- Priority 1: Enabling decent work for all through sustainable, inclusive and gender responsive growth
- Priority 2: Strengthening institutional capacities, enhancing social dialogue and applying fundamental Conventions and other international labour standards.

Under priority 2, the DWCP identified the role of the ILO to support the GoN, including the diplomatic missions, and social partners at the central and sub-national levels to effectively implement governance frameworks which result in fair labour migration practices and protection of the rights of migrant workers. A strategic priority of the ILO has been identified as supporting diplomatic missions to enhance capacity to deliver evidence-based administrative and operational functions, and have strengthened redress mechanisms and service delivery to migrant workers.

The activities outlined in this project are also directly aligned with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF 2018-22), which aims to increase access to safe and decent employment for economically vulnerable, unemployed and under-employed people by 2022. The project contributes to the ILO's Global Outcome 9: Fair and effective international labour migration and mobility. Under this outcome, the ILO aims to support its constituents to "adopt fair and effective international labour migration and mobility policies and establish measures for their implementation at the national, regional or sub regional levels to protect the rights of persons working abroad and meet labour market needs".

Labour migration is a priority for the ILO at global, regional and country levels. The ILO is actively involved in regional processes and global dialogues on migration and development. ILO technical cooperation projects exist in several countries in South and Southeast Asia where similar policies and programmes are being introduced. The ILO is also implementing programmes in several countries in East and West Africa that may reveal good practices and lessons learned for consideration in Nepal. Moreover, the ILO has programmes in a number of destination countries, in Malaysia and the GCC countries. Links will be built with those programmes to ensure more effective corridor approaches between the governments, the private sector, trade unions and CSOs.

## **Project Management Arrangement**

The ILO is the executing agency responsible for overseeing the technical and administrative aspects of project implementation, in close partnership with project partners. The direct project partners are MoLESS, MoFA, returnee migrants' organizations, civil society and research institutes. In order to produce certain outputs, the project work closely with other government partners e.g. National Planning Commission, Central Bureau of Statistics, National Human Rights Commission, Foreign Employment Board, and Department of Foreign

Employment as necessary along with diaspora organizations. The project outputs, and the financial and administrative rules of the ILO govern the institutional framework of the Project.

A National Project Coordinator (NPC) is responsible for the overall implementation and management of the project which also include coordination, collaboration and cooperation with various stakeholders and facilitating their effective buy-in. NPC is also responsible for in-house coordination with the various specialists based in country and regional offices of ILO and bringing their expertise for the successful deliveries of the project. A Finance and Admin Assistant (FAA) manages overall financial and administrative aspects of the project and supports NPC in the implementation of the project activities. For the financial and administrative management, ILO Country Office's Finance and Admin team support the NPC and FAA in organizational financial and administrative management. NPC also collaborate and coordinate with other in-house projects namely SEP, FAIR and WIF to generate synergies and strengthen the outputs and outcomes of the project. Whenever required NPCs of those projects are also engaged to ensure proper implementation of this project.

A Project Steering Committee (PSC) was initially provisioned to provide strategic advice and decision making on the direction of the project that was proposed to comprise representatives from MoFA, MoLESS, MoF, NPC, CBS, SDC and ILO. Representatives from FEB, DoFE, DoCS and other line agencies were also expected to invite on need basis. But due to unwillingness of MoLESS to establish a separate PSC for each project in the context where overall ILO work encapsulated in the Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) which already have a set steering mechanism, separate PSC could not be established.

Project administration is managed by the ILO Office in Kathmandu. The ILO Country Director is responsible for overall oversight of the project. ILO and SDC hold regular meetings in order to ensure information flow and discussion on challenges and strategic steering of the project.

The project is technically backstopped by ILO's Regional Migration Specialist at the Decent Work Team in New Delhi, India. The ILO's Regional Office in Asia and the Pacific (ROAP) and the International Labour Migration Branch (MIGRANT) at ILO headquarters in Geneva also provide policy level support on various aspects.

## C. Purpose, scope and clients of evaluation

### Purpose

The main purposes of this internal mid-term evaluation are to improve programme performance; enhance accountability and learning for the ILO and key stakeholders and look into need and relevancy of its extension. Moreover it helps to ensure that progress and results of the projects are monitored, communicated and acted upon in a timely, efficient and result-based manner. The Evaluation is also intended to assess the relevance, performance, management arrangements and success of the projects by identifying developed documents, lessons learned and makes recommendations that the project partners and stakeholders might use to improve the design and implementation of other related labour migration management projects and programs.

### Scope

The scope of the MTE will cover all interventions of MIRIDEW and SEP (labour migration only) that ILO has implemented till 30<sup>th</sup> September 2020. This MTE was initially scheduled in May 2020 and postponed due to the CoVID-19 pandemic. Gender dimension will be considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report. In terms of this evaluation, this implies involving both men and women in the consultation, evaluation analysis and evaluation team. Moreover the evaluators should review data and information that is disaggregated by sex and gender and assess the relevance and effectiveness of gender-related strategies and outcomes to improve the lives of women and men. All this information should be accurately included in the inception report and evaluation report.

The evaluation is expected to commence from November, 2020 and conclude latest by the end of January, 2021 and will have a national coverage in general. However for specific initiatives where the Project has worked in

destination countries, the evaluator/s will meet with relevant implementing partners in Nepal. The evaluation will integrate gender and social inclusion as a cross-cutting concern throughout its methodology and all deliverables including the final report.

More Specifically the evaluation is expected to cover the following project components:

### **1. Establish result-based evaluation framework:**

- Assess the coherence and logic of project's design and, whether it is still valid within the current economic, political and development circumstances in Nepal;
- Assess the project design in terms of its relevance to the overall development situation at the national level; relevance to national strategies, ILOs' DWCP program framework and relevance to beneficiaries;
- Assess performance of the project in terms of effectiveness, efficiency, and timeliness of producing the expected outputs; including the progress made towards achieving its long-term and medium-term outcomes (including intended and unintended, positive and negative results) as stated in the original project document, the challenges affecting the achievement of the objectives, factors that hindered or facilitated achievement so far;
- Assess the complementarity and synergies between the project components' interventions

### **2. Evaluate and report on progress and results:**

- Assess the quality and timeliness of inputs, the reporting and evaluation system and extent to which these have been effective;
- Assess relevance of the project's management arrangements; identify advantages, bottlenecks and lessons learned with regard to the management arrangements;
- Track and analyze progress towards agreed outputs of each of the four outcomes of the initiative in-line with the evaluation framework;
- Identify constraints, failures, achievements and best practices and propose recommendations to make adjustments to ensure the achievement of the project within the remaining lifetime of the project;
- Assess efficiency of resource use; and
- Assess the likelihood of extension and sustainability of the interventions

### **3. Document good practices and lessons learned:**

- Analyze underlying factors beyond ILO's control that affected the achievement of the project outcomes
- Good practices

### **4. Clients of the evaluation**

- **Primary Clients:**
  - Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security (MoLESS)
  - Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA)(Include the stakeholders in those CoDs where gap assessment was conducted)
  - National Planning Commission (NPC)
  - National Human Rights Commission (NHRC)
  - Department of Foreign Employment (DoFE)
  - Foreign Employment Board (FEB)
  - Pravasi Nepali Coordination Committee (PNCC)
  - General Federation of Nepalese Trade Unions (GEFONT)
  - Social Science Baha (SCB)
  - Law and Policy Forum for Social Justice (LAPSOJ)
  - The Asia Foundation (TAF)

- Embassy of Switzerland in Nepal/Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
  - Technical/Thematic Experts engaged with project
  - Safer Migration Project (SaMi)/HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation Nepal
  - Skills for Employment Programme (SEP)
  - Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO)
- The ILO MIRIDEW Project Team (and broader Migration Unit), ILO Country Office for Nepal, DWT-New Delhi, ROAP, MIGRANT at the ILO HQ, and
  - **Secondary clients** are other key stakeholders, including migrants themselves.

## D. Key evaluation questions

For the purpose of internal evaluation, the questions will consider core evaluation criteria (e.g. relevance and validity of the design, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and/or sustainability) against the initiatives carried out by the Project during the evaluated time frame.

It is expected that the evaluation would address all of the questions detailed below to the extent possible. The evaluator may adapt the evaluation criteria and questions, but any fundamental changes should be agreed upon between the ILO Evaluation manager and the evaluator. The evaluation instruments (to be summarized in the inception report) should identify the general areas of focus listed here as well as other priority aspects to be addressed in the evaluation. Suggested evaluation criteria and evaluation questions are summarized below.

### Relevance and Validity of the Design:

- To what extent the project design is appropriate to ILOs' DWCP framework?
- How does the GoN see the component of the project contributing to their larger framework?
- To what extent are that objectives of the project consistent with the beneficiaries' requirements, and relevant to country needs?
- To what extent are the project design (objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities) and its underlining theory of change logical and coherence?
- Does the design need to be modified in the second half of the project, and why?
- How appropriate and useful are the indicators described in the project document in assessing the project's progress? If necessary, how should they be modified to be more useful? Are indicators gender sensitive?
- Were any lessons learned from previous projects in the area?
- Were the outputs achievable or overly ambitious?
- Were risks properly assessed?
- How relevant the project is in terms of core ILO functions such as promoting international labour standards, social dialogue, gender equality and non-discrimination, tripartite processes, and constituent capacity development?

### Coherence-How well does the intervention fit?

- The extent to which other interventions and policies support or undermine the project interventions, and vice versa.
- Adaptation and realignment of interventions based on contexts i.e. COVID
- The extent of synergies and interlinkages between the project interventions and other interventions carried out by ILO Kathmandu, Government and social partners.
- Have there been new intervening factors/actors (e.g. other donor assisted programmes) that have emerged since the inception of the project which may have impaired or enhanced project performance or future ILO development assistance in these strategic areas?

- What are the ways to maximize synergies and improve collaboration with these new actors? Also explore possible duplication of effort/resources.

### **Intervention Progress and Effectiveness (including effectiveness of management arrangement)**

- To what extent has the project been making sufficient progress towards its planned results (including intended and unintended, positive and negative)? Will the project be likely to achieve its planned long-term and medium-term outcomes by the end of the project? Are there any external factors that hindered or facilitated achievement of the project?
- Were there any non-planned effects and were these good or bad?
- Was coordination with social partners effective?
- The extent to which has gender mainstreaming been addressed in the design and implementation of the project?
- To what extent do the project management capacities and arrangements put in place support the achievement of the planned results?

### **Efficiency**

- To what extent has the project delivered value for money? How well resources and inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) been allocated or used strategically to achieve the planned results? Have they been delivered in a timely manner? If not, what were the factors that have hindered timely delivery of outputs? Any measures that have been put in place? Where possible, analyze intervention benefits and related costs of integrated gender equality (or not).
- To what extent have the project resources been leveraged with other related interventions to maximize impact, if any?
- Was the methodology of implementation the right one under the circumstances?
- Was the budget spent according to the proposed budget lines?
- Was the rate of spending acceptable and according to plan?
- What was the value of this project? (% of budget that actually reached the beneficiaries)

### **Possibility of Extension and Sustainability**

- To what extent are the planned results of the project likely to be durable and can maintained or even scaled up and replicated by other partners after major assistance has been completed?
- What is the need, importance and relevancy for the extension of the project period? What are the areas of engagements that should be continued? What are the areas that needs further build up?
- How effective has the project been in establishing national ownership? Is there any room for improvement for steering the project?
- To what extent have government institutions benefited from policy dialogue support and process etc?
- To what extent the government benefited from the activities and outputs?
- To what extent can the outputs be expected to be sustainable over the longer (5-10 years) term?
- Does the government institutions fully support the initiatives taken by the project?
- To what extent has government partners been involved in the implementation of the project?
- To what extent has the project strengthened the capacities of the government structures?
- To what extent are the migrant themselves contributing to the sustainability of the initiatives?
- To what extent is the impact sustainable over the longer term?
- Has the project increased or decreased dependency on outside intervention?
- Has the project been able to leverage the ILO contributions through its comparative advantages including social dialogue?

**Reporting:** Transparency in reporting

**Observations on donor's role and influence on project implementation:**

- Were communications with the donor satisfactory in terms of promptness and content?
- Was technical/administrative support provided timely and adequately when requested?
- Were financial release procedures and actions timely taken care of and did these influence project implementation in any way?
- Was monitoring and progress reporting adequate according to the ILO and donor requirements?

## **E. Methodology to be followed**

The evaluation will be carried out through a desk review and field visit to the project site in Kathmandu, Nepal and consult with donor, implementing partners, beneficiaries and other key stakeholders. Consultations with relevant units and officials in Geneva, Decent Work Team in New Delhi and ILO's Regional Office in Asia and the Pacific (ROAP) will be done and the method for doing so will be decided by the evaluation team. The evaluation team will review inputs by all ILO and non ILO stakeholders involved in the project, from project staff, constituents and a range of partners from the private and civil sectors. The evaluation team will be comprised of an international and a national consultant. The evaluation team itself will do the division of role between the consultants.

The draft evaluation report will be shared with all relevant stakeholders and a request for comments will be asked within a specified time (not more than 5 working days). The evaluation team will seek to apply a variety of evaluation techniques – desk review, meetings with stakeholders, focus group discussions, field visits, informed judgement, and scoring, ranking or rating techniques.

### **Desk review**

A desk review will analyse project and other documentation including the approved log frame, periodic progress reports to donors, research products, tools, mission reports, seminar and stakeholder consultation reports, concept notes and any other related documentation provided by the project management and backstopping officers. The desk review will suggest a number of initial findings that in turn may point to additional or fine-tuned evaluation questions. This will guide the final evaluation instrument which should be finalized in consultation with the evaluation manager. The evaluation team will review the documents before conducting any interview.

More specifically the following documents will be shared with the evaluator at the commencement of the work:

1. Project Documents, respective Work Plans and Logical Frameworks
2. Periodic Progress Reports submitted to the Donors by ILO as per PARDEV reporting guidelines
3. All studies and reports produced for and by the Projects to support the stated outcomes
4. Progress reports submitted by the implementing partners
5. All other relevant documents and publications

### **Interviews with ILO Staff**

The evaluation team will undertake group and/or individual discussions with project staff in Kathmandu. The evaluation team will also interview ILO staff responsible for financial, administrative and technical backstopping of the project. An indicative list of persons to be interviewed will be shared by the project management (NPC) after further discussion with the Evaluation Manager.

## Interviews with Key Stakeholders in Kathmandu

A first meeting will be held with the ILO CO Director and with the Project Team. After that the evaluator will meet relevant stakeholders to undertake more in depth reviews of the respective national strategies and the delivery of outputs and outcomes of the respective components in the country. The evaluator may conduct Partner visits/Field Observations and interviews with all government and CSO partners, labour migration experts, external consultants and the donor.

### F. Main Outputs: inception report, draft and final evaluation report

1. The evaluator will develop an **inception report** and work plan for meeting the objectives of this TOR. This should include participatory engagements with all key stakeholders. The inception report and work plan will be submitted to the ILO and agreed prior to Commencement of Work. All data gathering mechanisms and methods used should be disaggregated by sex. Evaluation methodology and subsequent analysis should address gender concerns. Linkages should be identified between data sources, data collection methods, and analysis methods.
2. Evaluation Report as per the proposed structure in the ILO evaluation guidelines:
  - Cover page with key project and evaluation data
  - Executive Summary
  - Acronyms
  - Description of the project
  - Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation
  - Methodology
  - Review of implementation
  - Clearly identified findings for each criterion
  - Conclusions
  - Recommendations (Including to whom they are addressed to)
  - Lessons learned and good practices
  - Annexes
3. **Evaluation summary (as per ILO standard format)**
4. A **PowerPoint presentation with the key findings and recommendations** to be shared with ILO and key stakeholders, possibly through a stakeholder workshop, or virtually.
5. **Project scoring matrix** (to provide scoring of the project based on ILO evaluation matrix)

The evaluator should plan for a critical reflection process and quality communication and reporting of evaluation outcomes (which may include: debriefing of Project Manager, Regional Migration Specialist, Country Director, donor, key stakeholders, etc)

The evaluation reports and its contents are the property of the ILO. All draft and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided in electronic version compatible with Word for Windows.

## G. Management arrangements, work plan, formatting requirements and time frame

### Management Arrangements

As per the ILO's evaluation policy guidelines, for internal independent evaluations, National Project Coordinator (NPC) will act as an Evaluation Manager to manage an entire evaluation process. The evaluation focal points in the region provide the evaluation manager with advice on evaluation policies, ethics and procedures, as well as the necessary guidance to conduct the evaluation process. The Evaluation Manager will be responsible for the following:

- a) Planning the evaluation and finalizing the ToR: The evaluation manager communicates with project staff, key stakeholders on evaluation parameters and helps finalize ToR based on the substantive inputs from the Chief Technical Advisor and other project staff; circulates the ToR for comments and finalizes the ToR.
- b) Selecting and contracting consultants: The evaluation manager prepares the Expression of Interest text; Conducts due diligence checking references; Gets approval on consultant from EVAL focal point; Agrees with consultant on terms and conditions as per ToR and arranges for the contract to be issued with relevant ILO Offices.:
- c) Managing the consultant: The evaluation manager provides a briefing to the consultant; Participates in the review of the inception report, if relevant; Ensures that project staff are providing adequate access to documents and interviews; Conducts checks on the consultant work plan and time line; Working with project staff, the evaluation manager may request that project staff undertake a quick 1-2 day review of any extremely sensitive issues in the draft report before submission to stakeholders; and Ensures that the draft report and its formatting adhere to the ToR.
- d) Finalizing the evaluation: The evaluation manager circulates the draft report for comments to the identified stakeholders; Consolidates stakeholder comments and returns them to the evaluation consultant.
- e) Approving the evaluation: Once the consultant submits a revised draft of the report and relevant annexes to the evaluation manager, the report must be checked for adherence to the requirements of the ToR and ILO content and formatting. The evaluation manager sends the revised draft around to the REO or DEFP and EVAL for another quality check. Once it has been completed, the REO or EFP fills in the EVAL Submission Form and sends all the relevant documents to EVAL in HQ for final approval.
- f) Dissemination of the Report: Once notified of approval by EVAL HQ, the evaluation manager can approve the consultant's final payment and then disseminate the report to all key stakeholders, including to PARDEV for submission to the donor.

### **Quality assurance & formatting requirements**

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

The evaluator should refer to **ILO's Policy Guideline for Evaluation** and may include the following criteria for drafting quality recommendations in evaluation reports:

- (1) recommendations are based on findings and conclusions of the report,
- (2) recommendations are clear, concise, constructive and of relevance to the intended user(s),
- (3) recommendations are realistic and actionable (including who is called upon to act and recommended timeframe).

In addition to The ILO Guidelines, provides formatting requirements for evaluation Reports, establishing the following criteria for the drafting of recommendations:

- (1) actionable and time-bound with clear indication of whom the recommendation is addressed to,
- (2) written in two to three sentences of concise text,
- (3) numbered (no bullet points) and (4) no more than twelve.

Recommendations must be:

- (5) presented at the end of the body of the main report, and the concise statement should be

(6) copied over into the Executive Summary and the Evaluation Summary (that is, the concise statements of recommendations should be verbatim identical in the recommendation section of the main body of the report, the Executive Summary, and the Evaluation Summary).

### Proposed Work plan and time frame

**Time line:** The work on the **evaluation** should begin by November, 2020 and final report to be submitted latest by end of January, 2021. The total effort is expected to be **25 person days for the international consultant** to complete the full assignment. The number of days of engagement for a national consultant is expected to be of **15 days** distributed across relevant tasks/activities mentioned below.

Phase	Responsible Person	Tasks /Activities	Days Proposed (W/Days)
1	Consultant / evaluation manager	Brief by evaluation manager, project staff and ILO Country office Desk Review of project – related documents	5
2	Consultant	Submission of Inception Report	2
3	Consultant	• Consultation with project team in Nepal	2
		• Consultation with project partners and other stakeholders	5
		• Prepare report of findings	4
		• Prepare draft report and power point presentation	2
		• Present findings and recommendations to key stakeholder group	1
	Consultant	• Incorporate comments from stakeholder presentation	2
4	Evaluation Manager	• Circulation of draft report to key stakeholders	0
	Consultant	• Finalize the report with comments from stakeholders and management responses	2
<b>Total</b>			<b>25 days</b>

### Consultancy Fee or Financial Proposal

The consultant is expected to mention the per day consultancy fee for engaging in this initiative while submitting the Expression of Interest (EoI). Claim of such fee should be provided with proper evidence i.e. contract or payment made by other company or organizations. If the consultant have worked with ILO or any other UN organizations, such evidence are preferred for this purpose.

ILO hold its right to negotiate on the proposed consultancy fee or financial proposal submitted by the consultant considering the qualifications, experience and market factors.

As international consultant is the lead for this MTE so it is expected that selection and mobilization of national consultant would be the sole responsibility of the international consultant. Both the consultant needs to work as a team so it will be much appropriate for international consultant to use the national consultant with whom they might have already worked with or familiar with. The fee of the national consultant should be negotiated and agreed by the international consultant. In the EOI/proposal, international consultant needs to propose per day fee of the national consultant as well. The minimum requirement for the national consultant is provided below (Section H).

In case, if the international consultant doesn't have any contacts with such potential national consultants, ILO can provide name and contacts of few potential candidates from its roster on the request.

### **Payment Modality**

The payment of consultancy fee based on per day rate and total days of engagement will be paid as follows.

- 20% of the total consultancy fee after the submission of Inception Report
- Remaining 80% after the fulfillment of the tasks and submission of deliveries mentioned under SECTION F above subject to the acceptance of the deliveries as mentioned above.
- Cost related with travel (airfare and DSA as per ILO rules), if required any for completion of this assignment, will be reimbursed based on the actual expenses during the final settlement. Consultant require to submit original invoices/bills and other supporting documents (i.e. air ticket, boarding pass, invoice of hotel) for such claims.

### **Submission of the EOI/Proposal**

The deadline for submission of the EOI/Proposal is **30 October 2020**. The EOI/Proposal should be submitted along with following documents:

- Updated CVs of both international and national consultant
- Evidence of similar kind of work/assignment
- Evidence to support/justify the proposed consultancy fee proposed (for international consultant this is must and preferred for national consultant)
- Workplan for carrying out MTE

Any queries in relation to this assignment can be sent to [karki@ilo.org](mailto:karki@ilo.org) latest by 25 October 2020.

## **H. Requirements/Qualifications for Consultants**

### **Minimum Requirements/Qualification for International Consultant**

- Minimum Master's degree in related fields, PhD preferred.
- Minimum 10 years of experience in the field of monitoring, evaluation, research with specific experience of leading evaluation of complex development projects.
- Excellent understanding of labour migration issues, related policies, laws and functioning of different institutions in labour source countries; know-how of same in Nepal will be an added advantage. Proven

experience in designing, developing and leading monitoring, assessments and evaluation of similar nature of projects.

- Proven experience in collecting, analyzing and interpreting secondary data and information, particularly qualitative analysis and interpretation.
- Experienced and well versed with various evaluation and assessment tools, methodologies and processes.
- Experience of conducting similar labour migration related projects/interventions particularly from source countries is highly preferred.
- Good conceptualizing, analyzing and logical sequencing skills.

### Minimum Requirements/Qualification for National Consultant

- Minimum Master’s degree in related fields.
- Minimum 5 years of experience in the field of monitoring, evaluation, research with specific experience of engagement in evaluation of complex development projects.
- Excellent understanding of labour migration issues, related policies, laws and functioning of different institutions in Nepal.
- Proven experience of supporting in designing, developing and facilitating monitoring, assessments and evaluation of similar nature of projects.
- Proven experience in collecting, analyzing and interpreting secondary data and information, particularly qualitative analysis and interpretation.
- Experienced and well versed with various evaluation and assessment tools, methodologies and processes.
- Engaged as key team member in the assessment or evaluation of similar labour migration related projects/interventions is highly preferred.
- Proven experience in coordinating, collaborating and facilitating the process and tasks of similar assessment/evaluation for lead international consultant.

### I. Attestation for having adequate medical and accident insurance:

<b>Insurance</b>	<p>Do you have Medical and Accident Insurance? YES NO</p> <p>If YES, provide the document</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If NO, please be aware that the ILO accepts no liability in the event of death, injury, or illness of the External Collaborator. The External Collaborator attests that he/she is adequately covered by insurance for these risks. In no circumstances shall the External Collaborator be covered by any ILO insurance. It is the external collaborator’s own responsibility to take out, at their own expense, any personal insurance policies that are considered necessary, including a civil liability insurance policy.</li> </ul>
------------------	--

<b>Security</b>	<p>Have you done the Security Trainings?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- BSITF, YES, NO</li><li>- ASITF, YES, NO</li><li>- External collaborators whose tasks entail travel must comply with all applicable ILO security procedures and rules, notably those governing security clearance and training. External collaborators benefit from the security arrangements and protection provided by the United Nations Security Management Network (UNSMN) at duty stations which are either not under a security level or up to security level four. If travel entails, you are required to obtain security clearance through the UN TRIP System before your travel.</li></ul>
-----------------	--

## Appendix 2: List of persons and organisations interviewed

ILO & Project staff		
	Mr. Richard Howard Mr. Basanta Kumar Karki Mr. Prakash Sharma Mr. Shabarinath Nair Ms. Neha Choudhary Ms. Sandhya Basini Sitoula Ms. Bina Thapa Kunwar	ILO Country Office Nepal, Director MIRIDEW, National Project Coordinator SEP, National Project Coordinator ILO/DWT-New Delhi, Regional Migration Specialist FAIR, National Project Coordinator WIF, National Project Coordinator ILO Country Office, Migration Focal Point
Government		
	Mr. Umesh Dhungana  Mr. Harish Chandra Ghimire Mr. Ram Kumar Phuyal Mr. Bhisma Kumar Bhusal  Mr. Raju Shrestha  Mr. Dilip Kumar Paudel  Mr. Moti Bahadur Shrees  Mr. Deepak Dhakal	Ministry of Labour, Employment and Social Security (MoLESS), ex-Joint Secretary Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MOFA), Joint Secretary National Planning Commission (NPC), Member Department of Foreign Employment (DOFE), Joint Secretary  Department of Foreign Employment (DOFE), member of MoFA working team Embassy of Nepal in Saudi Arabia, Minister Counsellor Embassy of Nepal in Malaysia, Deputy Chief of Mission Embassy of Nepal in Malaysia, Counsellor-Labour
Donors		
	Ms. Petra Sigrist Ms. Sangita Yadav Mr. Rob Clark	SDC, Programme Manager SDC, Programme Officer FCDO, Private Sector Development Advisor
Project partners & Others		
	Mr. Badri K.C. Mr. Rajendra Kumar Raut  Mr. Bidur Karki Mr. Som Prasad Lamichhane Ms. Ekata Sharma Mr. Nilambar Badal Mr. Kamal Thapa Chhetri  Mr. Hom Karki Ms. Suswopna Rimal Mr. Jeevan Baniya Mr. Keshab Bashyal Ms. Upasana Khadka Mr. Andrea Salvini Mr. Rishi Raj Adhikari  Ms. Sita Ghimire	NRNA, Vice-President COVID Response to Nepali Migrant workers (NRNA), Project Manager GEFONT, Vice-President PNCC, Director PNCC, Programme Coordinator LAPSOJ, Project Coordinator National Human Rights Commission (NHRC), Migrants Focal Person Kantipur National Daily, Journalist The Asia Foundation (TAF), Programme Officer Social Science Baha (SCB), Assistant Director Migration Expert Consultant for MIRIDEW Technical Expert for MIRIDEW Former Ambassador of Nepal in Malaysia, Consultant for MIRIDEW SaMi Project, Team Leader

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

- Terms of Reference for the Evaluation
- ILO-SDC Project Document MIRIDEW
- ILO Project Proposal for SEP
  
- MIRIDEW Work Plan October – December 2018
- MIRIDEW Work Plan 2019
- MIRIDEW Work Plan 2020
  
- MIRIDEW Progress Report October – December 2018
- MIRIDEW Annual Report January-December 2019
- MIRIDEW Progress Report January – June 2020
- Progress Update on support provided for safe repatriation and return of Nepali migrant workers affected by COVID-19 in major countries of destinations and in Nepal (July – November 2020)
  
- MIRIDEW Outcome Monitoring Summary Report October 2018 – July 2019
- MIRIDEW Outcome Monitoring Summary Report August 2019 – July 2020
  
- MIRIDEW Financial Status Report as of 30 September 2020
  
- All products/outputs by project, including capacity gap assessment, anything available on SDG reporting/monitoring, classification of occupations, etc.
  
- Terms of Reference for Outreach activities
- Proposal for the reprogramming of the MIRIDEW project activities in response to COVID-19
- Concept proposal for additional funding
  
- ILO-SEP Annual Report 2017-2018
- ILO-SEP Annual Report 2018-2019
- ILO-SEP Annual Report 2019-2020
  
- Nepal Labour Migration Report 2020
- Nepal Foreign Employment Act 2064 (2007)
- Nepal Foreign Employment Policy 2068
  
- ILO Decent Work Country Project 2018-2022 for Nepal
- United Nations Development Assistance Framework for Nepal 2018-2022
  
- Information available on ILO web site:  
[https://www.ilo.org/kathmandu/whatwedo/projects/WCMS\\_676254/lang--en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/kathmandu/whatwedo/projects/WCMS_676254/lang--en/index.htm)

**ILO Policy Guidelines for Results-based Evaluations and Support Guidance Documentation** (4<sup>th</sup> edition – 2020) including checklists and templates.

**Implications of COVID-19 on evaluations in the ILO – Practical tips on adapting to the situation** (March-April 2020 / Operating procedures nr. 1)

**UNEG Ethical guidelines for evaluations**

## Appendix 4: Lessons learned

### ILO Lesson Learned 1

Project Title: “Mid-Term Evaluation of the Migrants Rights and Decent Work (MIRIDEW) Project combined with labour migration related components under Skills for Employment Project (SEP)”  
Project TC/SYMBOL: NPL/18/01/CHE and NPL/17/01/GBR

Name of Evaluator: Pierre Mahy

Date: 01/2021

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

LL Element	Text
<b>Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)</b>	<p><b>Assumptions and Risks of any intervention need to be better analysed at the design stage.</b></p> <p>ILO and the donor have been working in Nepal for many years and both have a good understanding of how the government operates. It could therefore be expected that risks and assumptions for the intervention could have been better assessed.</p> <p>This was not done in the project document in which Outputs and Outcomes however were defined with the assumption that the project would benefit from full cooperation of the government. This has proven to be erroneously taken for granted.</p> <p>A clear risks and assumptions analysis could have been made for this project in order to define the possible outcomes in a less ambitious way.</p>
<b>Context and any related preconditions</b>	Nepal’s political system is complex and volatile. The government faces multiple challenges and external intervention is not always well understood.
<b>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</b>	ILO, donors
<b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>	The hesitant attitude of the government to fully engage with the project on all activities has made it particularly challenging for the project to achieve all of its ambitious goals
<b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>	n/a
<b>ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)</b>	n/a

## ILO Lesson Learned 2

**Project Title: “Mid-Term Evaluation of the Migrants Rights and Decent Work (MIRIDEW) Project combined with labour migration related components under Skills for Employment Project (SEP)”**  
**Project TC/SYMBOL: NPL/18/01/CHE and NPL/17/01/GBR**

**Name of Evaluator: Pierre Mahy**

**Date: 01/2021**

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

LL Element	Text
<b>Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)</b>	<p><b>Proper calculation of time is required to achieve the results in relation to engagement with government authorities and on policy issues as these needs considerable time to build the momentum and get the right opportunity.</b></p> <p>In line with Lessons Learned 1, it was to be expected that the government, in particular the Ministry of Foreign Affairs not used to directly work with the ILO, would need time to engage with the project. Building trust and confidence has been part of the way in which the project has progressively involved the Ministry.</p>
<b>Context and any related preconditions</b>	Changes in political leadership often imply that a working relationship with the government has to be restarted.
<b>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</b>	ILO, donors
<b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>	The time needed by the government to fully engage with the project on all activities has made it particularly challenging for the project to achieve all of its ambitious goals
<b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>	n/a
<b>ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)</b>	n/a

### ILO Lesson Learned 3

**Project Title: “Mid-Term Evaluation of the Migrants Rights and Decent Work (MIRIDEW) Project combined with labour migration related components under Skills for Employment Project (SEP)”**  
**Project TC/SYMBOL: NPL/18/01/CHE and NPL/17/01/GBR**

**Name of Evaluator: Pierre Mahy**

**Date: 01/2021**

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

LL Element	Text
<b>Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)</b>	<p><b>The commitment of all partners is central to achieve sizeable results for the benefit of migrant workers. Mobilizing public authorities at all levels to engage in a project is a challenge.</b></p> <p>In order to achieve its ambitious goal to better protect migrant workers the project works with several ministries, other government agencies and range of other actors which all have a role to play in labour migration. Without the commitment of all stakeholders involved at national and local level, little progress can be achieved to improve the institutional and operational framework supporting labour migration.</p>
<b>Context and any related preconditions</b>	<p>After the 2017 elections state restructuring has taken place creating key challenges including the need to clarify the functions and accountabilities of the federal, state, and local governments. The state restructuring is expected to result in improved outreach and service delivery but will likely take time before it becomes fully operational</p>
<b>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</b>	<p>ILO project teams, Government authorities, tripartite plus constituents, and other stakeholders</p>
<b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>	<p>The project encountered several situations in which the government’s lack of commitment to support activities affected their implementation. This was for example the case for outreach activities in destination countries, where a formal cooperation with the diplomatic missions could not be launched in absence of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs’ endorsement, forcing the NGO assigned to the task to seek informal cooperation of the diplomatic missions.</p>
<b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>	<p>n/a</p>
<b>ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)</b>	<p>n/a</p>

## Appendix 5: Good practices

### ILO Emerging Good Practice 1

Project Title: “Mid-Term Evaluation of the Migrants Rights and Decent Work (MIRIDEW) Project combined with labour migration related components under Skills for Employment Project (SEP)”

Project TC/SYMBOL: NPL/18/01/CHE and NPL/17/01/GBR

Name of Evaluator: Pierre Mahy

Date: 01/2021

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

GP Element	Text
<b>Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)</b>	<p><b>The coordination within the ILO Country Office of labour migration related projects to promote synergies and interlinkages while avoiding overlaps.</b></p> <p>The ILO Nepal Country Office implements four projects related to labour migration (MIRIDEW, SEP, WIF and FAIR) which all aim at improving the state of affairs of migrant workers. Opportunities for synergies therefore exist and have been adequately applied in promoting cooperation on several activities (e.g. in joint lobbying activities, in providing inputs in new labour agreements, etc.)</p> <p>Rather than working in isolation, the four projects are part of an integrated approach of the ILO on labour migration, which is recognized by the donors (e.g. SDC considers the MIRIDEW project as a contribution to this ILO global approach).</p>
<b>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</b>	No limitation – this can be replicated in every country
<b>Establish a clear cause-effect relationship</b>	Synergies are being developed and overlaps between projects avoided
<b>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</b>	Migrant workers who are the ultimate beneficiaries can only benefit from this integrated approach which aims at improving their working conditions and provide better protection both domestically and in the destination countries.
<b>Potential for replication and by whom</b>	Fully replicable by ILO offices in other countries
<b>Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO’s Strategic Programme Framework)</b>	Besides promoting coordination and synergies among projects, internal coordination committees offer the possibility to align projects to DWCPs.
<b>Other documents or relevant comments</b>	n/a

### ILO Emerging Good Practice 2

Project Title: “Mid-Term Evaluation of the Migrants Rights and Decent Work (MIRIDEW) Project combined with labour migration related components under Skills for Employment Project (SEP)”

Project TC/SYMBOL: NPL/18/01/CHE and NPL/17/01/GBR

Name of Evaluator: Pierre Mahy

Date: 01/2021

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

GP Element	Text
<b>Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)</b>	<p><b>Combining policy with an improvement of operational efficiency of the government is a well-founded approach to promote better protection of the migrant workers.</b></p> <p>The overall approach of the project aiming at addressing the migrant workers’ problems in the destination countries comprehends i) developing and/or strengthening policies at federal and state level, ii) strengthening bilateral and regional mechanisms to improve working conditions in destination countries, iii) reinforce the services provided by diplomatic missions abroad and iv) support the government in engaging more effectively in regional and global policy dialogues.</p> <p>This approach is coherent and covers all aspects of labour migration.</p>
<b>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</b>	No limitation – this can be replicated in every country
<b>Establish a clear cause-effect relationship</b>	Improving the institutional framework needs to be supported by operational efficiency
<b>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</b>	Migrant workers who are the ultimate beneficiaries benefit from this approach which aims at improving their working conditions and provide better protection both domestically and in the destination countries.
<b>Potential for replication and by whom</b>	Fully replicable by ILO offices in other countries from where migrant workers originate
<b>Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO’s Strategic Programme Framework)</b>	The DWCP for Nepal identified the role of the ILO to support the GoN, including the diplomatic missions, and social partners at the central and sub-national levels to effectively implement governance frameworks which result in fair labour migration practices and protection of the rights of migrant workers.
<b>Other documents or relevant comments</b>	n/a

### ILO Emerging Good Practice 3

**Project Title: “Mid-Term Evaluation of the Migrants Rights and Decent Work (MIRIDEW) Project combined with labour migration related components under Skills for Employment Project (SEP)”**  
**Project TC/SYMBOL: NPL/18/01/CHE and NPL/17/01/GBR**

**Name of Evaluator: Pierre Mahy**

**Date: 01/2021**

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

GP Element	Text
<b>Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)</b>	<p><b>The flexibility of the project to adapt to unexpected events</b></p> <p>The most unexpected event during implementation obviously was the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic which stalled most of the planned activities, but also more dramatically affected the Nepali migrant workers in destination countries.</p> <p>The MIRIDEW project responded to this disastrous situation in rearranging the budget and the activities to support Nepali migrant workers affected by COVID-19 in major destination countries. The donor approved a budget realignment and also approved the COVID-19 response to be implemented in Malaysia, Saudi Arabia, Qatar and United Arab Emirates (UAE) which are the top four major destinations for Nepali workers. Subsequently SDC allocated additional funds to the COVID-19 response which was furthermore topped up from ILO’s regular budget.</p>
<b>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</b>	There are no limitations to replicate a realignment of activities in emergency conditions which directly affect the life of human beings.
<b>Establish a clear cause-effect relationship</b>	The COVID-19 response of the project aimed at immediately addressing the needs of migrant workers in danger
<b>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</b>	The COVID-19 response which reached out to thousands of migrant workers has contributed to saving lives of many Nepali workers
<b>Potential for replication and by whom</b>	Emergency responses are always replicable
<b>Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO’s Strategic Programme Framework)</b>	n/a
<b>Other documents or relevant comments</b>	

## Appendix 6: SDC Assessment Grid

Key aspects based on DAC Criteria	Score (put only integers: 0; 1; 2; 3; 4)	Justification (please provide a short explanation for your score or why a criterion was not assessed)
<b>Relevance</b>  <b>Note:</b> the assessment here captures the relevance of objectives and design <i>at the time of evaluation</i> . In the evaluation report, both relevance at the design stage as well as relevance at the time of evaluation should be discussed.		
1. The extent to which the objectives of the intervention respond to the needs and priorities of the target group.	1	The ultimate beneficiaries of the intervention are the migrant workers for which the intervention aims at enhancing their protection by democratic institutions and ensuring decent work conditions abroad.
2. The extent to which the objectives of the intervention respond to the needs and priorities of indirectly affected stakeholders (not included in target group, e.g. government, civil society, etc.) in the country of the intervention.	1	The intervention contributes to the improvement of the legal framework governing labour migration in supporting the government institutions to strengthen bilateral and regional mechanisms to improve working conditions in destination countries, reinforce the services provided by diplomatic missions abroad and support the government in engaging more effectively in regional and global policy dialogue
3. The extent to which core design elements of the intervention (such as the theory of change, structure of the project components, choice of services and intervention partners) adequately reflect the needs and priorities of the target group.	1	Integrated approach through 4 outcomes combining policy support with operational efficiency
<b>Coherence</b>		
4. Internal coherence: the extent to which the intervention is compatible with other interventions of Swiss development cooperation in the same country and thematic field (consistency, complementarity and synergies).	1	The project is consistent with the Safer Migration Project (SaMi) implemented by HELVETAS. The overall goal of SaMi is that migrants & their families are better protected by concerned Nepali institutions and benefit from decent work conditions abroad
5. External coherence: the extent to which the intervention is compatible with interventions of other actors in the country and thematic field (complementarity and synergies).	1	MIRIDEW is complementary to the three other labour migration projects implemented by the ILO, i.e. SEP, WIF and FAIR
<b>Effectiveness</b>		
6. The extent to which approaches/strategies during implementation are adequate to achieve the intended results.	1	As per above, integrated approach at policy level and operational efficiency is adequate

7. The extent to which the intervention achieved or is expected to achieve its intended objectives (outputs and outcomes).	2	Up to 30/09/2020, MIRIDEW has been able to implement a remarkable number of activities despite a certain reluctance of the government to fully engage with the project in all actions, and also considering the emergence of the COVID-19 outbreak. A significant number of outputs have been delivered, some of which already have allowed to partially achieve outcome indicators. Several other important outputs prepared by the project are ready for further processing and approval by the government.
8. The extent to which the intervention achieved or is expected to achieve its intended results related to transversal themes.	2	Gender issues have been taken into consideration. The workplan 2019 states that due attention would be given to the issue of female migrant workers while conducting the capacity gap assessment of diplomatic missions in destination countries. Gender issues also have been considered during Nepal's engagement in regional and global dialogues.
<b>Efficiency</b>		
9. The extent to which the intervention delivers the results (outputs, outcomes) cost-effectively.	2	Spending and/or engagement is in accordance to proposed budget lines.
10. The extent to which the intervention delivers the results (outputs, outcome) in a timely manner (within the intended timeframe or reasonably adjusted timeframe).	1	Activities have been delayed due to COVID-19 situation and time taken for ensuring ownership of government entities, so to overcome the delays in deliveries extension in time is necessary
11. The extent to which management, monitoring and steering mechanisms support efficient implementation.	2	Management and monitoring has been adequately done by the ILO. The absence of a Project Steering Committee has not affected the implementation of the project but would have been of added value to enhance government engagement with the support of SDC
<b>Impact</b>		
12. The extent to which the intervention generated or is expected to generate 'higher-level effects' as defined in the design document of the intervention.  <b>Note:</b> when assessing this criterion, the primary focus is the intended 'higher-level effects'. In the event that <i>significant</i> unintended negative or positive effects can be discerned, they must be specified in the justification column, especially if they influence the score.	2	Impact at policy level which is the higher level effect will only emerge once the Monitoring and Reporting Framework is finalized, approved and operational, and when revised and/or new policies to which the project has contributed are enacted by the government
<b>Sustainability</b>		
13. The extent to which partners are capable and motivated (technical capacity, ownership) to continue activities contributing to achieving the outcomes.	2	Impact and sustainability depend on the government's choices on how to proceed to maintain the benefits of the intervention. The level of interest and ownership among the key partners of the project is different

		from one ministry to another and from one activity to another, and as stated by different informants, the government's priorities seem right now to have shifted more towards promoting decent work within the country rather than abroad. MoFA, key partner of the project, is keen to further collaborate with the project to implement recommendations of the capacity gap assessment report.
14. The extent to which partners have the financial resources to continue activities contributing to achieving the outcomes.	0	Assessment of Nepal's financial resources not part of the evaluation
15. The extent to which contextual factors (e.g. legislation, politics, economic situation, social demands) are conducive to continuing activities leading to outcomes.	0	The recent political developments are likely to affect the sustainability of the outcomes.

- 0 = not assessed
- 1 = highly satisfactory
- 2 = satisfactory
- 3 = unsatisfactory
- 4 = highly unsatisfactory

Additional information (if needed): The presentation of this Assessment Grid is not part of the Terms of Reference of the evaluation

Title of the intervention: Migrants Rights and Decent Work (MIRIDEW)

Assessor(s): Pierre Mahy

Date: 20/01/2021