



## Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia: Regional programme on labour migration in the fishing sector– Independent Midterm evaluation

ILO DC/SYMBOL: RAS/20/01/EUR

Type of Evaluation: Project

Evaluation timing: Mid-term

Evaluation nature: Independent

Project countries: Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam

P&B Outcome(s): Outcome 7: Adequate and effective protection at work for all

SDG(s): 8 and 10

Date when the evaluation was completed by the evaluator: 20 February 2023

Date when evaluation was approved by EVAL: [Click here to enter a date.](#)

ILO Administrative Office: ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP)

ILO Technical Office(s): ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP)

Joint evaluation agencies: IOM & UNDP

Project duration: August 2020-Jul 2024

Donor and budget: European Union, \$11,557,239

Name of consultant(s): Chris Morris

Name of Evaluation Manager: Narendra Nadh Choudary, Bollepalli

Evaluation Office oversight: Craig Russon

Evaluation budget: \$37,680

**Key Words:** [Forced labour](#), [trafficking](#), [labour inspection](#), [migrant worker](#), [fisher](#), [fisheries](#), [fishing](#)

This evaluation has been conducted according to ILO's evaluation policies and procedures. It has not been professionally edited, but has undergone quality control by the ILO Evaluation Office.

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	1
Acknowledgements.....	2
List of Acronyms.....	3
Executive Summary.....	4
<b>1. Background and Project Description .....</b>	<b>10</b>
1.1 Background.....	10
<b>2. Evaluation Background .....</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1 Purpose, Scope, and Clients of the Evaluation .....	13
2.2 Evaluation Criteria and Questions .....	14
2.3 Methodology .....	16
2.4 Norms, standards and ethical safeguards .....	20
2.5 Limitations and Potential Sources of Bias.....	21
<b>3. Findings.....</b>	<b>21</b>
3.1 Relevance and Strategic Fit .....	21
3.2 Validity of Design.....	28
3.3 Intervention Progress and Effectiveness .....	33
3.4 Efficiency of Resource Use .....	42
3.5 Effectiveness of Management Arrangements .....	44
3.6 Impact Orientation and Sustainability .....	48
3.7 Gender Equality.....	53
3.8 Country Specific Findings.....	55
<b>4. Conclusions, Recommendations, Lessons Learned and Emergent Good Practices.....</b>	<b>59</b>
4.1 Conclusions.....	59
4.2 Recommendations.....	60
4.3 Lessons Learned .....	66
4.4 Emerging Good Practices.....	67
4.5 Case Studies .....	67
<b>Annex 1: Evaluation TOR.....</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix.....</b>	<b>88</b>
<b>Annex 3: List of Interviews Conducted .....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>Annex 4: List of documents consulted.....</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Annex 5: Lessons learnt and Good practices.....</b>	<b>100</b>

## Acknowledgements

I would like to express sincere gratitude to all the stakeholders who participated in the evaluation including migrant workers, government officials, representatives of employers', workers', and civil society organisations, representatives of academic institutions, and ILO, IOM, and UNDP programme staff, technical back-stoppers, and country offices. Their viewpoints, stories, recommendations were of vital importance to the understanding the programme and I thank them for sharing their experiences with the evaluation team.

I am also appreciative of the support of the Evaluation Manager, Narendra Nadh Choudary, Bollepalli and Pamornrat Pringsulaka, Regional Evaluation Officer for their feedback and guidance at all stages of the evaluation. The support of the Ship To Shore regional programme team, including the Chief Technical Officer, Mi Zhou, the Technical Officer, Ben Harkins, the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, Phumphet Chetiyononth (Pop), and the Administrative Assistant, Issaree Sukpornsintham, and the National Project Coordinators and Senior Project Assistant, Anonglack Phaniphong, Sambo Sok, Albert Bonasahat, Yazar Win, Hussein Macarambon, Anyamanee Tabtimsri, Nguyen Thi Mai Thuy, in arranging contacting stakeholders, coordinating the evaluation interview schedule, and supporting the data collection mission was very helpful for the overall smooth implementation of the evaluation.

Chris Morris

[chrisjohnmorris@gmail.com](mailto:chrisjohnmorris@gmail.com)

## List of Acronyms

CENTRAL:	Center for Alliance of Labor and Human Rights
CLC:	Cambodian Labour Confederation
CREST:	Corporate Responsibility in Eliminating Slavery and Trafficking
CSO:	Civil Society Organisation
CTA:	Chief Technical Advisor
DLPW:	Department of Labour Protection and Welfare
EU:	European Union
FED:	Foundation for Education and Development
FGD:	Focus Group Discussion
FRN:	Fishers' Rights Network
GCM:	Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration
GLP:	Good Labour Practices
HRDF:	Human Rights and Development Foundation
ILO:	International Labour Organization
IOM:	International Organization for Migration
KII:	Key Informant Interview
M&E:	Monitoring and Evaluation
MRC:	Migrant Worker Resource Centre
NDC:	Non-Disclosure Agreement
NPAC:	National Programme Advisory Committee
NPC:	National Project Coordinator
OSH:	Occupations Health and Safety
P&B:	Programme and Budget
PIPO:	Port-in Port-out
PRODOC:	Project Document (proposal document)
PSC:	Programme Steering Committee
ROAP:	Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
SBMI:	Indonesian Migrant Workers Union
SDL:	Support for Designing Logframes and Monitoring Systems
SDG:	Sustainable Development Goals
TO:	Technical Officer
TFFA:	Thai Frozen Foods Association
TOC:	Theory of Change
TOR:	Terms of Reference
TTIA:	Thai Tuna Industry Association
UN:	United Nations
UNDP:	United Nations Development Programme
USDOL:	United States Department of Labour

## Executive Summary

### Programme Background

The Ship to Shore programme is funded by the European Commission and is implemented in seven countries, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand, Vietnam. It is jointly implemented by the International Labour Organisation (ILO), the International Organisation for Migration (IOM), and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). It is funding for 48 months from August 2020 until July 2024, with a budget of ten million EURO.

The programme delivers technical assistance and support, with the overall objective of promoting regular and safe labour migration among South-East Asian countries by addressing the specific characteristics of work in the fishing and seafood processing sectors as well as the barriers and risks present in the labour mobility system, which can lead to unsafe migration, decent work deficits, labour rights abuses and forced labour.

In August 2022, the International Labour Organization (ILO) commissioned a mid-term evaluation of the Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia, Regional Programme on labour migration in the fishing sector. This document serves as the final report of the mid-term evaluation.

### Programme Description

The Ship to Shore programme has the overall impact goal of:

Expanded opportunities for safe and regular migration into decent work in South East Asian countries, particularly for women and men in the fishing and seafood processing sectors.

To achieve this, there are three outcomes:

#### **Outcome 1: Strengthened legal, policy and regulatory frameworks related to labour migration and employment for women and men migrant workers in the fishing and seafood processing sectors.**

Output 1.1: Improved understanding and knowledge on the drivers, outcomes and dynamics of labour migration and human trafficking for women and men migrant workers in South East Asia to promote knowledge and evidence-based policies and practices.

Output 1.2: Increased opportunities for regional and cross-border cooperation created to support bilateral and multilateral policies on safe, orderly and regular labour migration for women and men.

Output 1.3: Strengthened capacities of governments to develop and promote rights-based policies and implement legislative reforms in favour of women and men migrant workers, particularly in the fishing and seafood processing sectors.

#### **Outcome 2: Increased protection of labour rights and safe and secure working environments for migrant women and men workers in the fishing and seafood processing sectors.**

Output 2.1: Strengthened capacities for labour inspectorates and law enforcement institutions to enforce labour rights, human rights and gender equality in the fishing and seafood processing sectors.

Output 2.2: Strengthened capacities of labour inspectors, law enforcement authorities and social partners to fight trafficking and unacceptable forms of work for women and men in the fishing and seafood processing sectors.

Output 2.3: Strengthened capacity of recruitment agencies and employers (including vessel owners) in the fishing and seafood processing sectors to protect labour rights, ensure good labour practices and work towards gender equality.

**Outcome 3: Women and men migrant workers, their families, organizations and communities in the fishing and seafood processing sectors are empowered to exercise their rights.**

Output 3.1: Increased availability of accurate information and support on migration and labour rights to women and men migrants, their families and communities throughout the migration process.

Output 3.2: Increased opportunities for women and men migrant workers in the fishing and seafood processing sectors to develop skills, organise, obtain peer support, receive assistance from workers' organizations, and engage with governments and employers to claim their rights.

The results framework, which was refined following the appointment of the M&E team during the inception period, and the evaluability review and support for designing logframes and monitoring systems (SDL) exercise also includes indicators, definitions of the indicators, baseline figures, mid-term and endline targets, how they will be calculated and disaggregated, and the frequency of collection of data.

The outcomes can be more informally seen as working at the policy level in outcome 1, system level changes in outcome 2, and direct support to migrants and their representative groups in outcome 3.

**Main Findings**

The Ship to Shore programme has made a strong start towards achievement of its outcomes and outputs despite operating at a time of significant disruption globally from the COVID-19 pandemic and regionally as a result of the 2021 Myanmar coup. The programme successfully established a full and coherent programme team and developed working modalities between its three implementing agencies. Important decisions will need to be taken to ensure continued momentum, catch-up where there have been delays, and reallocate resources if necessary, but the programme should be able to achieve most of its planned results by the end of the funding cycle.

- Relevance

The programme responds to the major vulnerabilities of migrant workers and their families in the seafood processing and fishing sectors through addressing issues at the policy, sectoral, and migrant worker level. The programme takes an asymmetric approach to design which allows it to respond to the different challenges of the fishing and seafood processing sector in each country and respond to the needs of the tripartite constituents and workers in those industries. This strengthens relevance by ensuring responses are tailored to the specific context.

The programme aligns with many national, regional, and global frameworks, including the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration (GCM), and several ILO conventions on migration, fishing, decent work, and gender equality. Stakeholders have been given good opportunities to co-design activities, receive information on the programme, and give feedback to shape the direction at the national level.

There were minor challenges to relevance. These were linked to the difficulties in identifying migrants working in the fishing and seafood processing sectors in Lao PDR in particular, and the geographical scope of the programme meaning that in some countries migrants only receive support at one end of the migration corridor.

In terms of cross-cutting issues, the programme has a strong approach to gender equality and the application of international labour standards and social dialogue. The design has only limited focus on environmental sustainability and marine conservation, and currently no focus on disability inclusion, with the exception of supporting access to compensation for workplace accidents which may lead to disability.

- Validity of design

The programme is ambitious in its number of outputs and the range of countries involved in the programme. This ambition is even more challenging given the context of the COVID-19 pandemic and the military coup in Myanmar. Given some of the activities are delayed, the programme team will need to reflect on what can be achieved in the remainder of the programme, and if necessary, reallocate resources to activities or positions which will have more impact. The programme's lengthy inception period supported a strong start to the programme by giving space to allow for the recruitment of staff, development of working modalities between the three UN agencies, and the workplan for the programme. The programme has developed a series of tools to support implementation. These are useful for implementation but in some cases have only recently been finished and continued orientation to the National Project Coordinators (NPCs) is needed to ensure maximum benefit. Thinking ahead to positioning the programme for future interventions, it would be of benefit to conduct the review of the theory of change which is proposed in the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) manual. This would support reflections on how deeply how the different components of the programme fit together, how effectively the pathways of change are working, as well as allowing for review of how ILO, IOM, and UNDP's activities combine to support the overall goal of the programme. The programme has been successful in applying an evidence-based approach to implementation. Learning from previous programmes, regular team meetings, and various studies have been used to influence programme direction.

- Intervention progress and effectiveness

The programme has made positive progress in achieving the outputs of the results framework, and in many cases has already achieved the target indicator for the end of the programme. Nine output indicators had achieved or over-achieved on the mid-term target, with two indicators behind target. To date, in outcome 1, five knowledge products have been disseminated, eleven major policies amended or adopted, and over 1.6 million people reached through social media campaigns. Additionally, seven countries had tripartite delegations at the Fair Seas Labour Conference. In outcome 2, 1,404 stakeholders have been trained on labour and anti-trafficking laws, six tools for use by law enforcement or labour inspectorates operationalised, and fifty-five companies regularly audited for good labour practices. In outcome 3, 271 survivors of trafficking have received support, 1,807 migrant workers have attended pre-orientation department seminars, 23,564 migrant workers and their families have received support, 33,026 migrant workers and their families have received Covid-19 relief packages. Within the overall finding of effective implementation, there are a couple of areas for attention. For certain indicators, planned contributions from certain countries have not yet been achieved, pending the development of implementation agreements. This is mainly a reflection of the programme wanting to ensure good quality proposals are developed by partners, but attention to ensuring delivery in these areas in the second half of the programme is needed. There are a small number of indicators behind the mid-term target, although the programme should be able to achieve the endline targets in most if not all of these.

External stakeholders expressed considerable satisfaction with the programme, with a few caveats, including confusion among some between the roles of different ILO migration programmes and

concern over the short-term nature of implementation agreements. There has been significant interaction between Ship to Shore and other programmes in the region, most notably TRIANGLE and Safe and Fair, as well as national level projects. The programme also provided good support to the Covid-19 pandemic response, complementing the work of other programmes and responders. Stakeholders and recipients of relief support suggested it was both timely and contributed to meeting emerging needs.

- Efficiency of resource use

The programme has made effective use of the budget and managed to leverage good collaboration with other programmes focused on migration. However, the programme has split its budget across a regional team, seven countries, and the three agencies which means the budget is spread quite thin. Some additional funding and in-kind support has been obtained from ILO, other UN sources, and tripartite constituents. A total cost-sharing of \$783,032, as of the mid-point of the agreement, was reported by the programme. However, the resources for the programme are still limited, particularly at the regional level and stakeholders did note at times this affects the timeliness of support or response. While the quality of technical support and the fact that the support is always given eventually is appreciated, the delays do have the potential to impact the long-term delivery. Potential trade-offs in the use of resources in certain countries to support additional regional positions (such as a communications officer) should be considered by ILO for the remainder of the programme.

- Effectiveness of management arrangements

The programme has implemented an effective management system which provides support to NPCs and ensures the programme goes beyond the reporting requirements of the EU. There was some suggestion from all agencies that the communication process between ILO, IOM, and UNDP could be improved. The external communications strategy is challenged by limited human resources. The programme has an impressive array of communication channels available through its website and other resources but lacks a dedicated person to manage this on a day-to-day basis. Overall, despite some communication challenges, the inclusion of the three UN agencies provides a strong value add for Ship to Shore, particularly through the technical support each agency can give to the others in their activities.

The monitoring and evaluation system is effective at measuring progress towards outputs. Following the evaluability review, monitoring of risks to the programme is done on a much more timely basis. Attention does need to be given to the endline survey and ensuring the change the programme is hopefully achieving is actually captured. Ensuring migrants who received information and support from the programme are included in the sample would help achieve this. Additionally, increasing the volume of qualitative data collection by the MRC partners would provide more detailed examples of how migrants use the information they receive and what change this makes to them. This would help monitor change in the programme more effectively.

- Impact Orientation and Sustainability

The mid-stage of the programme makes identifying impact and sustainability difficult, and this is a limitation of the evaluation. An interim review of the progress towards outcome indicators was conducted though. The indicators in outcome 1 may be achievable but will depend on government willingness to enact the necessary policies to align with international labour standards. This may be achieved in Lao PDR and Cambodia, whose governments have signalled a willingness to respond to have tripartite dialogue to align with various articles of ILO conventions. Advocacy with the



Governments to Indonesia and the Philippines to move towards ratification of the Work in Fishing Convention (C.188). has also been undertaken.

Achieving the indicator targets for outcome 2 will be challenging. The target of 10% of labour inspections in the fishing sectors that lead to enforcement actions is very ambitious given that to date this indicator in Thailand has moved from 1% to 2%. While progress is being made, the target was probably just too ambitious considering the long-term needs for changing mind-sets and approaches in the labour inspectorates. Due to COVID-19, the Good Labour Practices (GLP) programme has not been able to attract additional enterprises and achieving the target for this indicator may be challenging.

Targets in outcome 3 should be achievable, but as noted above, it is important to review the endline methodology to ensure the change which occurs as a result of the work with the MRCs, such as the target for the percentage of migrants organising in their workplaces, is captured.

Sustainability for the programme can be achieved through the work done on supporting policy amendments. Supporting governments to ensure these are fully implemented will help solidify this. In many cases, the programme has taken steps to enhance sustainability in the work it does with MRCs through the entities it works with, the indications of sustainability do vary from country to country. Ensuring outstanding implementation agreements progress soon to allow for as much time as possible to support partners with implementation will also enhance sustainability.

- Gender Equality

The gender equality and empowerment strategy has only recently been finalised and training is planned on it in December 2022. The strategy makes some solid recommendations on how to address gendered issues in the fishing and seafood processing sectors. Many of these have been implemented already and if the programme can implement the others, this will increase its opportunity to be gender responsive and potentially gender transformative. In addition to the output indicators, the programme set a target of 25% of programme budget spent on activities that support gender equality and women's empowerment. The programme reported for year two that 23% of the budget was spent on such activities. The process of building the recommendations into the annual action plans was ongoing as the evaluation was being conducted. It would be expected that the percentage of the annual budget spent on gender equality and women's empowerment will increase as these are implemented. There were mixed indications from stakeholders on the understanding of gendered differences facing migrants and no reflection on the challenges of problematic behaviour of men onboard fishing vessels. This demonstrates the relevance of the gender equality and empowerment strategy.

### **Recommendations**

1. Various recommendations on the MRCs were identified including:
  - Ensure training on MRC manual is given as early as possible in the implementation stage.
  - Set up a coordination structure between the implementing partners, including exchange visits to learn best practices from each other.
  - Provide training to strengthen awareness of protection risks to migrants who file complaints, try to unionise, ask for pay increase etc.
2. Ensure the recommendations of the Gender and Women's Empowerment Strategy are incorporated into the annual work plans and work planning with partners.

3. Consider options for how to expand work with the industry association and employers to other parts of the supply chain including the smaller factories and the sub-contractors. Identify where IOM and ILO's work is mutually reinforcing.
4. Review country by country, the activities which are still pending, to ensure consider what the long-term expectations are and what can be achieved by the end of the programme and potentially reallocate funds if necessary.
5. Ensuring work on trafficking is constantly adapting to new challenges and the frameworks are flexible enough to adapt to these.
6. Draft sustainability plans for regional forums and processes.
7. Conduct research on experiences of persons with disabilities at different stages of migration cycle.
8. Consider reallocating funds to allow for the recruitment of a Communications Officer.
9. Continue to strengthen communication between ILO, UNDP, and IOM, and jointly towards external stakeholders.
10. Review the theory of change to support design of continuing work on programme outcomes in future funding. consider how the different outcomes build on each other.
11. Conduct an assessment of the MRCs, their modality, and impact, across ILO (and IOM) programmes
12. Ensure the endline survey can measure the impact of the programme on migrant and country of origin workers who utilised the programme's services by ensuring they are included in the endline sample.

### **Lessons Learned**

1. Including both countries in a migrant corridor in a programme ensures easier collaboration between stakeholders.
2. Training of labour inspectors is not sufficient on its own. It requires political will to empower labour inspections to enforce regulations and address violations. Encouraging interaction with NGOs would be strongly recommended.
3. Regional programmes are successful in broadening the scope of a programme and building on momentum but require sufficient resources in each country to ensure ongoing progress.
4. The harmonisation of laws and operating procedures between ministries is a challenging but necessary requirement for supporting the integration of multi-ministries working on a particular area of the enforcement of workers' rights and decent working conditions.
5. The engagement of NGOs, CSOs and workers' organisations remains a key tool in ensuring better response to working condition violations, improved access to justice, and the provision of better response services for survivors of trafficking.

### **Emerging Good Practices**

1. Quick assessment and design of reprogramming in Myanmar allowed for the programme to continue in some form.
2. Using different providers for MRCs increasing learning opportunities and encourages different approaches.
3. Ensuring deliverables are clear in implementation agreements is critical for strong delivery, even if this delays implementation of the programme's activities.

## 1. Background and Project Description

### 1.1 Background

#### a. Introduction

In August 2022, the International Labour Organization (ILO) commissioned a mid-term evaluation of the Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia, Regional Programme on labour migration in the fishing sector. This document serves as the final report of the mid-term evaluation. The report provides details of the background of the context the intervention was delivered under, a description of the programme, the purpose and scope of the evaluation and the methodology used during the evaluation. It then lays out details of the findings under each of the evaluation criterion, and provides conclusions, recommendations, lessons learned, and emerging good practices.

#### b. Understanding of the Context

Labour migration is a complex global phenomenon with a myriad of interlinking issues impacting its governance at multiple levels. While migration has provided substantial benefits to regions, countries, communities, and individuals, and is an important part of global development, it has also led to serious concerns about the protection of human and labour rights of migrant workers, particularly those with limited agency and precarious status due to their heightened vulnerability.

Labour migration supports economic growth and social development in countries of destination. It also reduces unemployment concerns in source countries and remittances sent home by migrant workers are often an important part of family income. For many migrants it provides the opportunity to obtain better paying jobs and develop new skills which support financial security, resilience, and independence.

However, migrants are at risk of being subjected to poor working conditions, sexual and physical violence, exploitation, and discrimination. Fishing is recognised as one of the most hazardous occupations globally. Dangerous weather conditions, hazardous marine environments, and long hours contribute to the dangers fishers face. They are often at sea for lengthy periods, living in confined spaces, and under the control of the ship's skipper. For migrants, particularly those with irregular status, these challenges can be even more acute. They are often recruited outside of migration regulatory frameworks and national legislation in many countries in South East Asia remains inconsistent with international labour standards. Recruitment fees are often charged to migrant workers, and some are asked to pay deposits which are forfeited if they end their contract early.

Forced labour and human trafficking remain a problem in the fishing sector in South East Asia which has received increased attention from donor states and the media in recent years. There are various reasons for the vulnerability of fishers to forced labour and human trafficking. ILO's webpage on forced labour and human trafficking in fisheries identifies them as 'Recent trends within the fisheries sector, such as overfishing, illegal fishing, and a shift in sourcing the workforce from high-income to middle- and low income countries mean that more relatively low cost migrant workers are employed by the fisheries sector. Lack of training, inadequate language skills, and lack of enforcement of safety and labour standards make these fishers particularly vulnerable to forced labour and human trafficking.'<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/forced-labour/policy-areas/fisheries/lang--en/index.htm>

The land-based supply chain related to the fishing industry such as fish processing and loading and unloading ships face challenges more similar to other land-based industries. However, there are many workers, particularly migrants, who work in the informal sector in these industries, which brings particular challenges linked to decent work, agency, and exploitation.

Fishing is a highly gendered profession, with nearly all fishers being men, but a much more significant proportion of land-based workers in processing plants being women. Women migrants face particular challenges which increase their vulnerability to exploitation and abuse. South East Asian women already experience a vast range of unequal socio-economic determinates and often discrimination in their home countries including a lack of agency for decision making, discriminatory gender norms in the family and the community, and a lack of access to financial inclusion. These are often predictors for unsafe migration. Additionally, several countries in South East Asia have protectionist bans and restrictions on women's migration, which can lead to women migrating through irregular channels, thus heightening the protection concerns they face.

There are a number of international frameworks which recognise the challenges faced in the fishing sector. Globally two key frameworks recognise the importance of gender responsive migration governance, namely the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly, and Regular Migration (GCM). Additionally, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) also includes a specific recommendation (General Recommendation 26) on implementing CEDAW through the lens of the lived experiences of migrant women. Various SDG goals include targets related to safe and orderly migration, decent work, and gender equality, which are all relevant to the fishing industry. The GCM recognises the importance of rights-based approaches, international cooperation, and the rule of law and access to justice in migration governance and is designed to be gender responsive and provide a framework for governments to ensure national level policies and management are aligned with international normative standards. Various ILO conventions, protocols, and recommendations<sup>2</sup> are relevant to the fishing industry, including the eight fundamental conventions, as well as technical conventions related to migration such as the Migration for Employment Convention (Revised), 1949 (C.97), the Migrant Workers (Supplementary Provisions) Convention, 1975 (C.143) and Migrant Workers Recommendation, 1975 (C.151);, the fishing industry such as the Work in Fishing Convention 2007 (C.188) and Work in Fishing Recommendation, 2007 (R.199), the Labour Inspection Convention, C81, Forced Labour Convention, 1930 (C.29), and the Forced Labour (Supplementary Measures) Recommendation (No.203), the Private Employment Agencies Convention (C.181), and the Violence and Harassment Convention, 2019 (C.190). ILO's General principles and operational guidelines for

---

<sup>2</sup> Conventions (or Protocols) are legally binding international treaties that may be ratified by member states. Recommendations serve as non-binding guidelines. "In many cases, a Convention lays down the basic principles to be implemented by ratifying countries, while a related Recommendation supplements the Convention by providing more detailed guidelines on how it could be applied."

<https://www.ilo.org/global/standards/introduction-to-international-labour-standards/conventions-and-recommendations/lang--en/index.htm>

"A Protocol is a procedural device for adding extra flexibility to a Convention or for extending a Convention's obligations. Protocols are also international treaties, but which, in the ILO context, do not exist independently since they are always linked to a Convention... Protocols are particularly appropriate where the aim is to keep intact a Convention which has already been ratified and which may receive further ratifications, while amending or adding to certain provisions on specific points."

<https://www.ilo.org/dyn/normlex/en/f?p=NORMLEXPUB:71:0::NO::#:~:text=A%20Protocol%20is%20a%20procedural,always%20linked%20to%20a%20Convention.>

fair recruitment and definition of recruitment fees and related costs, is also relevant to the problems which migrants face during recruitment for work in the fishing industry.

## 1.2 Programme Description

The Ship to Shore programme has the overall impact goal of:

- Expanded opportunities for safe and regular migration into decent work in South East Asian countries, particularly for women and men in the fishing and seafood processing sectors.

To achieve this, there are three outcomes:

- Outcome 1: Strengthened legal, policy and regulatory frameworks related to labour migration and employment for women and men migrant workers in the fishing and seafood processing sectors.
- Outcome 2: Increased protection of labour rights and safe and secure working environments for migrant women and men workers in the fishing and seafood processing sectors.
- Outcome 3: Women and men migrant workers, their families, organizations and communities in the fishing and seafood processing sectors are empowered to exercise their rights.

Within each outcome, a series of outputs are developed to contribute to the outcome. The results framework, which was refined following the evaluability review in 2021, also includes indicators, definitions of the indicators, baseline figures, mid-term and endline targets, how they will be calculated and disaggregated, and the frequency of collection of data.

The three outcomes could be more informally seen as working at the policy level in outcome 1, system level changes in outcome 2, and direct support to migrants and their representative groups in outcome 3.

The programme has developed an overall theory of change. This is in diagrammatic form which shows the links between the outputs and the outcomes and include the assumptions underpinning the results framework. The M&E plan includes a brief overview of the theory of change working at three different levels (policy, systems, and household levels, but does not go into deeper narrative detail on the pathways of change. There is also a brief narrative on the theory of change in the PRODOC<sup>3</sup>

‘The theory of change underlying the Action is that strengthened legislative and policy frameworks can be effectively implemented when they are formulated with the participation of empowered migrant workers and workers; organizations, supported by relevant stakeholders (particularly economic stakeholders such as employers and workers, enterprise and public authorities), and when grounded in a sound evidence base and international standards.’ (p.16 PRODOC)

The programme thus aims to empower migrants and their families to be better aware of their rights and equipped with the necessary information to undertake safe and regular migration. This will be achieved if services offering information to migrants are improved, migrants are given opportunities to enhance their skills, and the right to organise is available. However, to have a meaningful impact,

---

<sup>3</sup> The pro-doc is the project document. For the EU Delegation the PRODOC corresponds to “Annex 1 – description of the action” of the Contribution agreement signed between the EU Delegation to Thailand and the ILLI

systematic and policy level changes are needed and must be conducted with the meaningful participation of migrants, their families, and their representative organisations. At the system level, change will happen if employers and recruiters are more aware of and ensure the implementation of decent work and international labour standards. At the policy level, expanded research can lead to enhanced knowledge base and research, which in turn ensures the improvement of evidence-based policies, frameworks, and migration governance.

The programme's theory of change includes a series of assumptions which underpin the programme:

- 1) Sustained political will from governments to improve migration governance;
- 2) Acceptance of the principle of gender equality among stakeholders;
- 3) Adequate investment in human resources and institutional capacity to support enforcement;
- 4) Acknowledgement of the contribution of migrant workers in countries of origin and destination;
- 5) Capable and committed workers' and civil society organizations engaged with migration issues;
- 6) Consumer demand for ethically produced seafood products;
- 7) Effective collaboration between diverse stakeholders on protection of migrants' labour rights;
- 8) Containment of the COVID-19 pandemic and re-opening of borders for labour migration.

## 2. Evaluation Background

### 2.1 Purpose, Scope, and Clients of the Evaluation

#### **Purpose and Objectives**

As a mid-term exercise, the evaluation was formative in nature with a focus on lesson learning. The evaluation analysed the achievements of the project to date, provided recommendations for adjustments to the programme strategy that will improve results moving forward, and presented lessons learned and emerging good practices to support organisational learning.

The objectives of the evaluation set out in the TOR were:

- To determine the progress achieved to date in achieving in reaching the three programme outcomes.
- To provide recommendations for adjustments to the programme strategy that will improve results moving forward.
- To identify lessons learned and good practices that will support organizational learning and knowledge sharing for the ILO and other key stakeholders.

The objectives were reviewed by the evaluator during the inception period. An inception report was developed which set out the proposed methodology for the evaluation and included an evaluation matrix which listed the approaches to answering each evaluation question. The matrix can be found at annex 2 of this report.

#### **Scope**

The evaluation covered the period of implementation from the inception of the programme in August 2020 up to the status of the programme in October 2022 at the time of the data collection. The evaluation focused on all aspects of the programme including design, progress and achievements. It covered implementation in all target countries of the programme, namely

Cambodia, Lao PDR, Indonesia, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam. Cambodia, Indonesia, and Thailand were chosen for the in-person data collection missions of the evaluation, with data collection for the other four countries being conducted remotely. The justification for this is set out in the sampling section of the methodology.

The evaluation also covered cross-cutting themes, in particular gender equality, the promotion of international labour standards and enhancement of social dialogue, environmental sustainability, the contribution made to the SDGs, the inclusion of persons with disabilities and the response to the COVID-19 pandemic.

### **Evaluation Clients/Users**

The main primary clients of the evaluation are the management/programme team of the Ship to Shore programme, technical back-stoppers involved in the programme, both at headquarters and in the regional office (ROAP), the ILO technical unit at headquarters (MIGRANT), ILO's Country Offices in the countries of implementation, the regional offices of IOM and UNDP, the Programme Steering Committee and the National Programme Advisory Committees, and the donor (European Union Delegations).

Secondary users include programme stakeholders such as tripartite constituents and civil society organizations, as well as other agencies working on labour migration and human trafficking at national and regional levels.

### **Evaluation Management**

The evaluation was overseen by an Evaluation Manager. ILO's evaluation policies require an Evaluation Manager to oversee the evaluation. The Evaluation Manager has been certified by ILO's EVAL to manage evaluations and must be independent of the programme team. The Evaluation Manager helps to ensure independence of the evaluation is maintained and helps resolve any challenges or roadblocks which occur during the evaluation between the Evaluator and the Programme Team. The Evaluation Manager developed the TOR, selected the evaluator, and was involved in the initial briefings. He was responsible for disseminating the inception report and final report to the evaluation stakeholders, reviewing these products for accuracy and completeness, consolidating feedback comments, and signing off the outputs, in collaboration with the programme team. The Regional Evaluation Officer for ROAP, also provided quality assurance and support to the Evaluation Manager.

The Ship to Shore programme team provided the evaluator with programme documentation made introductions to programme stakeholders, coordinated with stakeholders to arrange the interview schedule for both the remote and in-person interviews, obtained government permission for interviews where relevant, and provided logistical support in arranging transport and interpreters. The programme team also made a significant contribution to the evaluation as key informants who participated in interviews and feedback sessions. The programme team provided feedback on the inception report and final report, and will, as per ILO's evaluation guidelines, provide a management response to the final recommendations of the evaluation.

### **2.2 Evaluation Criteria and Questions**

The criteria for the evaluation were identified in the original TOR developed by the evaluation manager. The criteria were based on the OECD-DAC criteria for evaluation with some amendments. The criteria for the evaluation were relevance and strategic fit, validity of design, intervention progress and effectiveness, efficiency of resource use, effectiveness of management arrangements,

impact orientation and sustainability, and gender equality. Initial questions were proposed in the TOR. These were reviewed and adjusted where relevant by the evaluator in agreement with the evaluation manager.

#### **1. Relevance and Strategic Fit**

- Does the programme address the major causes of vulnerability and respond to the most urgent needs of migrant workers in the fishing and seafood processing sectors in South East Asia?
- Are the activities aligned with national, regional and global policy frameworks on labour migration/work in the fishing and seafood processing sectors?
- Are the governance structures participatory in approach, providing for the inclusion of the perspective of governments, social partners, civil society and women and men migrant workers?

#### **2. Validity of Design**

- Is the scope of the interventions realistic given the time and resources available?
- Have the design and strategic planning documents developed proven useful in implementing the programme? (Description of the Action, M&E Plan, Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment Strategy, etc.)
- Does the intervention's Theory of Change clearly articulate assumptions, provide logical pathways of change between different levels of results and align with the ILO's strategic objectives and outcomes at the regional and global levels, as well as with the relevant SDGs and related targets?
- Has the programme applied an evidence-based approach in formulating and implementing the activities?

#### **3. Intervention Progress and Effectiveness**

- What amount of progress has been made in achieving the programme's eight outputs? (Applying a scale of minor, moderate or major progress, with justification).
- To what extent are tripartite constituents and other key stakeholders satisfied with and/or benefitting from the outputs produced?
- How effective are the individual partnerships/relationships with tripartite constituents, civil society and the private sector. Are there partnerships showing particular promise for achieving programme results?
- How effective has the collaboration and coordination been with other projects working on labour migration issues/fishing sector in maximizing synergies and eliminating duplication? (e.g., ASEAN-ACT, CREST, TRIANGLE in ASEAN, Safe and Fair, etc.)
- How effective was the programme in responding to the impact of COVID-19 on migrant workers?

#### **4. Efficiency of Resource Use**

- Has the allocation of resources been optimal for achieving the programme's outcomes? (financial, human, institutional and technical, etc.)
- Are the programme activities current being implemented on-time/according to work plans?
- Has the programme been able to leverage cost-sharing or in-kind contributions to complement its resources? (e.g., from other ILO projects, slippage funds, inter-agency collaborations and private sector contributions)

#### **5. Effectiveness of Management Arrangements**

- How effective is the internal management of the programme? (including staffing arrangements and capacities, governance and oversight, work planning, etc.,)
- Has the communications and visibility strategy been effective in raising the profile of the programme within the target countries and at regional level?



- Has the monitoring and evaluation system supported results-based management of the programme?
- Have programmatic, contextual and institutional risks been managed effectively by the programme?
- What value added has the UN inter-agency model brought to the programme?

#### **6. Impact Orientation and Sustainability**

- What initial influence has the programme had on the development of policies and practices at national and regional levels? What is the potential to achieve change by the end of the project?
- What strategies have been applied to ensure the achievement of lasting results after the completion of the programme?
- What are the programme's most significant contributions to date to an enhanced knowledge base on labour migration in the fishing and seafood processing sectors within the target countries and region likely to be? Assess to what extent the practical tools developed by the programme (e.g., Policy briefs, training materials, Codes of conduct) are likely to produce a direct impact if their use is extensively promoted, or even better enforced?
- Have there been any unintended or negative impacts of the programme for women and men migrant workers in fishing and seafood processing sectors?

#### **7. Gender equality**

- What progress has been made towards key results on gender equality and women's empowerment by the programme?
- Are resources allocated sufficiently so the programme may achieve the expected results on gender equality and women's empowerment activities?
- Is the M&E system sufficient to allow for the adequate gathering of disaggregated data by sex to determine ongoing and endline differences in the programme results for women and men?

#### **2.3 Methodology**

The evaluation was conducted between September 2022 and February 2023. The inception period took place in September and October 2022, remote and in-person data collection was conducted in October and November 2022, and reporting and feedback undertaken between November 2022 and February 2023. The evaluation focused primarily on qualitative methods but incorporated quantitative data collected by the programme. The evaluation was framed within the principles of democratic evaluation, utilisation-focused evaluation, and theory-based evaluation<sup>4</sup>. The evaluation also ensured the integration of gender equality into the methodology and analysis of findings. The evaluation included stakeholders who have been involved in the implementation of the programme to date or will be involved in implementing elements of the programme in the remainder of the programme. This included government officials, employer and workers' representatives, civil society groups, academics, and consultants. Additionally, programme staff and technical back-stoppers from ILO, IOM, and UNDP were interviewed during the evaluation. The evaluator reviewed the proposed

---

<sup>4</sup> Democratic evaluation is an approach where the aim of the evaluation is to foster participation and transparency and serve the whole community. The role of the evaluator is to act as a facilitator, tasked with ensuring the voice of all stakeholders is included in the evaluation. Utilisation focused evaluation is based on the premise that the evaluation should be judged on its usefulness to intended users and developed in a way which enhances the potential for the findings to be used by the users. Theory-based evaluation seems to understand if the theory behind the programme is valid and if there are breakdowns in the programme to understand if this is as a result of a problem in the theory of the programme or application in reality. The evaluator applied parts of these approaches rather than one approach in full.

stakeholder list with the programme team during the inception period, analysed it, and made suggestions to ensure the evaluation included relevant groups of stakeholders.

## Methods

### Desk Review

- Secondary document and data review

During the inception period programme documentation was shared with the evaluator. This included documents related to strategy and design, programme reports, governance and management meetings, research reports, communication outputs, operational tools, and key interventions. Within these categories, key documents such as the PRODOC, M&E plan, gender equality and women's empowerment strategy, steering committee minutes, and research products were reviewed. The programme team shared various documents related to the programme during the inception period and on an ongoing basis during the evaluation. Additional documents such as various international framework documents were also reviewed to serve as reference points throughout the evaluation. These documents have served both as a basis to introduce the evaluator to the programme and helped the design of the evaluation but were also a data source for triangulated against findings from evaluation data collection. As such the documents were revisited regularly during the data collection period.

- Inception period briefings with key programme staff

During the inception phase the evaluator spoke to the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), the Technical Officer (TO), and the M&E Officer. This allowed an opportunity for the programme to be introduced and the evaluator to gain a broader understanding of the documents. The Evaluator Manager also participated in some of these calls for oversight of the evaluation. Following the submission of the first draft of the inception report, the evaluator spoke to the programme's NPCs and key personnel from UNDP and IOM to further understanding of the programme and support the refinement of the data collection tools, and the evaluation plan.

- Development of Inception Report

This inception report was developed during the inception phase of the evaluation to form a basis of understanding between the evaluator, the programme team, and the Evaluator Manager on the scope, purpose, and approach of the evaluation. Evaluation questions proposed in the TOR were reviewed and refined where necessary and an evaluation matrix developed which details lines of enquiry and indicators, sources of data, and approaches for each question. Evaluation tools including interview guides were developed at this time.

- Data collection period

The evaluation used both in-person and remote data collection approaches. During the data collection period, the following data collection techniques were employed:

- Remote Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)

As it was not possible to visit all seven countries of implementation of S2S, the evaluator conducted a series of remote semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders in Lao PDR, Myanmar, the Philippines, and Vietnam. The stakeholders included government officials, employers' representatives, workers' representatives, staff of NGOs and consultants who had worked with the programme. Interviews were conducted over Zoom. The interviews were semi-structured using

open ended questions to allow for follow-up of emerging points of interest during the conversation. Interview guides were adapted slightly during the data collection process to follow up on emerging themes.

- **Data collection Mission**

A data collection mission was conducted in Indonesia, Cambodia, and Thailand. This selection was based on the quantity and type of programme activities in these countries. The programme is built upon two previous programmes, the Ship to Shore I Project which focused on Thailand, and the Sea Fisheries: Strengthened Coordination to Combat Labour Exploitation and Trafficking in Fisheries in Southeast Asia project which was run from the Indonesia country office. This has supported the programme making the most progress in these two countries to date. Additionally, a significant volume of activities have taken place in Cambodia. The highest bulk of activities with migrants themselves have to date taken place in these three countries, with the exception of Myanmar which could not be included for an in-person visit due to the current political situation. As such, it was justified for the field visit to focus on these three countries.

A schedule for the data collection mission was agreed with the National Project Coordinators (NPCs) and the Regional Programme Team. KIIs and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) were conducted during the mission. KIIs (including group interviews) were held with government officials, workers’ and employers’ representatives, staff of Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), and ILO staff. FGDs were held with users of the Migrant Worker Resource Centres (MRCs), staff and community volunteers of the MRCs, fishers, seafood processing factory workers, and labour inspectors. A hybrid debrief with ILO, UNDP, and IOM staff was held at the end of the data collection mission to discuss initial findings and recommendations.

### **Sampling**

Sampling was purposive, covering the main stakeholders who have been involved in the programme. The rationale for the sampling was to focus on those who have given a significant contribution to the activities to date, have participated in NPAC activities or will be undertaking significant activities in the coming months. A small amount of snowball sampling was used, based on suggestions given during interviews with NPCs and IOM and UNDP staff.

The tables below shows KIIs and FGDs which took place. Of the proposed interviews, only one interview could not be conducted due to scheduling issues. There was a higher proportion of men than women in the sample which is a reflection of the bias towards men in key positions in different entities.

<b>Category</b>	<b>Women</b>	<b>Men</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Number of KIIs/FGDs</b>
<b>Remote Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)</b>				
Government Officials	2	4	6	5
Employer Representatives	0	2	2	2
Workers Representatives	1	1	2	2
CSO staff	5	3	8	5

Category	Women	Men	Total	Number of KIIs/FGDs
ILO, IOM, and UNDP staff	6	8	14	14
<b>Total Remote</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>In-Person Key Informant Interviews (KIIs)</b>				
Government Officials	19	15	34	12
Employer Representatives	2	5	7	2
Workers Representatives	1	11	12	4
CSO staff	6	5	11	5
ILO, IOM, and UNDP staff	6	4	10	8
Donor	1	0	1	1
<b>Total In Person KIIs</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>In Person Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)</b>				
Potential Migrants	3	2	5	1
Former Fishers	0	3	3	1
MRC Staff	3	8	11	2
Fishers	0	7	7	1
Sea Food Processing Factory Workers	8	0	8	1
<b>Total FGDs</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>66</b>

- Documentation of Case Studies

Using the emerging findings from the data collection, the evaluator developed two case studies highlighting progress to date, lessons learned, and implications for the rest of the programme. The topics were chosen during the inception period via a review of the programme documentation and in coordination with the programme team. The selected topics were:

- Participation of workers' and civil society organisations: An assumption of the theory of change is: 'Capable and committed workers' and civil society organizations engaged with migration issues'. The case study looks at the participation of workers' and civil society organisations in the programme to date. What are the key experiences and what lessons can be learned so far from the participation of workers' and civil society organisations in the programme? Are these feeding into changes (at the outcome level) vis a vis the expected outcome?
- Capacity building in the labour inspectorate: The first Ship to Shore project placed considerable emphasis on enhancing the quality and integrated nature of labour inspections in PIPO

settings, including stressing the importance of quality of assessment as opposed to quantitative volume of inspections. The case study will look at how the lessons learned and evaluations recommendations identified in the last programme have been actioned in the current programme.

- Findings and Data Analysis Workshops

At the end of the data collection mission, a hybrid debriefing workshop was held with programme staff from ILO, IOM, and UNDP. The workshop included conducting a SWOT analysis of the programme with the participants, the evaluator presenting initial findings and recommendations, and programme team discussing the findings and certain discussion topics.

Following the submission of the draft report, a workshop will be held with the PSC, with external stakeholders invited, to present the evaluation findings. It is expected that the NPCs will present the findings of the evaluation to national stakeholders at the next NPAC meetings.

Data was analysed using thematic analysis of interview data and qualitative content analysis of relevant programme and external documents. Interview data was coded for particular themes which emerged during the data collection and blended where relevant with data from the desk review of documents. As a democratic evaluation, attention paid to traditional power imbalances and emphasis was placed on ensuring the participation and views of all stakeholders was given due weight, which in this programme focused on ensuring all tripartite plus constituents and where possible migrant workers opinions were included in the evaluation.

#### 2.4 Norms, standards and ethical safeguards

The evaluation was conducted in line with ILO's Policy Guidelines for Results-Based Evaluation: Principles, Rationale, Planning, and Managing for Evaluations (2020). As previously noted, the evaluation covered the cross-cutting themes required for evaluations which are set out in ILO's guidelines.

The evaluation adhered to the UN Norms and Standards (2016), paying attention to the 10 norms laid out in the guidance. The evaluation was conducted independently with impartiality ensured by recruiting an evaluator not previously involved with the programme. It was designed to focus on both utility and credibility of the findings. The use of a democratic evaluation approach supported transparency by ensuring the voices of a broad range of stakeholders, regardless of power, influenced the findings.

Informed consent was obtained from all KII and FGD participants verbally prior to the interviews commencing, with an explanation of the purpose of the evaluation and reason for the interviews. Anonymity of responses was promised to respondents and ensured during the report development.

Risks to participants from participating in the evaluation were considered low. The main risk was concern from men and women workers (perceived or real) over future access to services from ILO's, IOMs or UNDP's partners providing services linked to the programme. The informed consent process and assurances of confidentiality helped mitigate this concern. For FGD participants, there was an additional concern of the confidentiality of responses being damaged by other participants in the FGD sharing a participant's response. The introduction to the FGDs included a strong request for

maintaining confidentiality, and ILO and their partners were asked to reinforce this when inviting participants to the FGDs.

## 2.5 Limitations and Potential Sources of Bias

The evaluator made every effort to mitigate the limitations of the evaluation. The limitations and mitigation strategies included the following:

It was not possible to visit all implementation countries. The evaluation used a hybrid approach to data collection, visiting three of the countries of implementation and conducting remote data collection in the other four. The time available for the evaluation and some other issues, such as the context related to the military coup d'état in Myanmar, meant it was not possible to visit all seven. The selection of the three countries is justifiable based on the status of implementation of the programme to date, but this still does mean remote data collection was needed in four countries. This leaves the potential for bias towards the findings in the three countries where in-persons data collection was possible.

During remote interviewing, there is the potential for a loss of nuance or understanding as a result of non-verbal cues being missed. However, the evaluator is experienced in remote data collection and was able to use his skills in remote interviewing to mitigate this problem as much as possible. The broad range of stakeholders involved in the evaluation also allowed for the triangulation of data to further help mitigate this concern.

Similar concerns of loss of understanding can occur when interviews are conducted through an interpreter. The majority of external interviews during the evaluation were conducted with interpretation support. ILO arranged highly experienced and good quality interpreters for the evaluation, and the evaluator worked closely with them to ensure questions were understood, and where necessary reframed. This helped mitigate potential concerns over messages being lost. Additionally, for a number of interviews, the interviewee understood English, and the questions did not need interpretation but preferred to answer in their native language. In these interviews, the English ability of the interviewee provided an additional level of confirmation over the quality of interpretation provided.

The TOR set significant questions on impact and sustainability for the evaluation to answer. As a mid-term evaluation, the evidence to answer these questions is still very preliminary and often based on initial impressions and suggestions of the trajectory of the programme. The findings for this criterion need to be considered in this regard.

## 3. Findings

### 3.1 Relevance and Strategic Fit

#### **Does the programme address the major causes of vulnerability and respond to the most urgent needs of migrant workers in the fishing and seafood processing sectors in South East Asia?**

The programme addresses major causes of vulnerability and responses to the needs of migrant workers in the fishing and seafood processing sectors. The programme also supports adherence to decent work and international labour standards in general in some of the countries of implementation and thus non-migrant workers in some of the countries of implementation. Relevance of the sectoral approach for migrants addressed varies from country to country and also internally between different locations in implementation countries.

The PRODOC notes that the programme will take an asymmetric approach to implementation, attempting to respond to different challenges in different countries. There is not a uniform approach from country to country and this strengthens the relevance of the programme to workers and tripartite plus constituents as it prevents a one-size fits all approach. To take one example it is an approach which sees the main focus of interventions in Cambodia to be migrant workers migrating to work in the fishing sector but the main focus in Indonesia be focused on fishers working in their country of origin, where the limited number of migrants in the domestic fishing sector would thus have made interventions mainly focused on migrants of less relevance. Applying the asymmetric approach thus helps strengthen the overall relevance of the programmes to key stakeholders.

### **Workers and their Families**

The PRODOC refers to key challenges in its problem statement, identifying costs and debt bondage from recruitment and other fees charged to workers, working conditions, lack of freedom of association rights, and limited safety and risks awareness training as being major problems faced by fishers in particular and also seafood processing workers.

During the evaluation, the evaluator spoke to potential migrants, returnee migrants, families in countries of origin, and current migrants in Cambodia and Thailand, as well as organisations which work with migrant and non-migrant workers. During these interviews, information was obtained on the major challenges and needs migrants and other workers face. These matched those laid out in the PRODOC. The major areas raised by the respondents, aligned with the main themes of the programme. Workers shared their main concerns as being access to information and channels for redress, withholding of documentation, difficulties in organising, challenges with being heard by authorities, aspects of forced labour, and threats from employers. Potential migrants and family members who remained in the country of origin indicated there was a lack of available information for them on both the process of migration and what to do should they encounter difficulties in the destination country. In Thailand, migrant fishers and seafood processing workers shared stories of serious challenges and violations they face which match those indicated in the PRODOC. It was clear from the interviews, abuses and poor working conditions remains a serious challenge in both industries:

[“You could fill a book with the challenges we face as fishers” \(Migrant Fisher- Thailand\)](#)

There are some challenges to the relevance of the project for workers, most notably the limited numbers of fishers and sea food process factory workers who can be identified in some locations. Respondents in both Lao PDR and Cambodia shared with the evaluator that the MRCs they worked with had very few interactions with either intended or returning migrants in these industries, and the services provided by the MRCs was information given to migrants in general. In Lao PDR, it does appear that the numbers of migrants who work in these sectors is particularly limited. This has the potential to affect the relevance of the information for migrants, although general information on migration and reintegration is still of use to migrant workers in other sectors. In Cambodia, there are a number of migrants who do work in this sector, and there are certain explanations for the limited interactions reported by the MRC staff. Most migrants from Cambodia who end up in the fishing industry were from one of two categories. One was those who have family members or friends already in the industry who recruit them either directly or through brokers and in this scenario, they tend to leave Cambodia fairly quickly. As such, it is hard for the MRCs to access them. A second issue was a suggestion that the majority of individuals who end up in the fishing sector in Thailand, don't intend to become fishers when they migrate, but due to lack of other opportunities, deception practices and a lack of awareness of the working conditions they will face, end up in the fishing sector. The lack of a sector-specific MOU on fishing between Thailand Cambodia also reduces opportunities for regular migration and thus the ability to identify those who end up in the sector. In Cambodia therefore, sector-specific information combined with general information can remain

relevant to these workers, and if the programme is able to strengthen its monitoring of the users of the MRCs to understand more about the sectors they end up working in, this may help strengthen targeting and thus relevance further in the future.

The programme goes beyond supporting migrant workers, to also responding to the needs and vulnerabilities of others as well. The programme focuses on the needs of workers in general through its attention to decent work. This is particularly relevant for workers in the seafood processing factories in Philippines and Indonesia which are largely staffed by national workers, the fishing sector in Indonesia for domestic fishing, and the seafood processing sector in Thailand, where there is a mix of migrant and domestic workers in the industry. The programme also responds to the needs of families remaining in the country or origin for information and support when their migrant family member faces challenges in another country. The PRODOC refers to the fact that when migrant fishers are trafficked, it is often family members in their country of origin who first raise the alarm. Family members also often try to support migrant family members on other issues as well including forced labour and other workplace violations. Many of the individuals attending information sessions given by the MRCs, are not potential migrants, but come to get information so they know how to seek help if their relatives need it when they are in another country.

The sectors the programme works in are quite gendered. The vast majority of fishers are male. In the seafood processing sector, women are the majority of floor workers, but the management positions tend to be more dominated by men. The programme has recently developed a gender strategy with a number of recommendations on programme tools which are being rolled out. The programme has acted on a number of these already, such as instituting a gender budgeting process and establishing a gender taskforce, which had met three times at the point of data collection for the evaluation. The TOR for this evaluation also included a review of the implementation of the gender equality and women's empowerment strategy as an evaluation question, as per the review's recommendations. Other recommendations, such as inviting gender specialists to the annual reflection retreats are dependent on an activity taking place so are currently pending. The review also includes a number of recommendations for activities in each outcome. Work on implementing these is ongoing and the programme team has indicated that building these activities into upcoming workplans will be undertaken. These would strengthen the relevance of the work to the different needs of men and women. The evaluation found a mixed awareness of gender issues among programme stakeholders. Some were aware of different needs and tailored their work accordingly. Some of the stakeholders linked to the MRCs described how they try to provide different information on the risks of migration to men and women.

*“There are different features between men and women working abroad... We provide the different counselling to them. We discuss with men and women differently on what they should prepare if they want to work abroad, how to earn money, how to be financially stable when they return etc”. (Government Stakeholder)*

Other stakeholders were less aware of the gendered differences in migration, suggesting some of the activities planned in the gender strategy are timely.

*“There aren't many differences between the problems men and women face” (Government Stakeholder)*

*“We don't see differences, women don't seem to show different needs.” (Government Stakeholder)*

A common response when asked about the fishing sector was to point out that most of the fishers are men but not consider particular gendered issues they may face. None of the external stakeholders mentioned the problems of problematic behaviour of men or sexual assault aboard ships, suggesting this is an area the programme could look to strengthen in future.

One of the gaps in the programme which has impact on migrants and governments, is that the



corridors of migration for the fishing industry are not fully covered in all countries. Migrants from Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Cambodia mainly migrate to Thailand in this sector, and thus the programme is able to cover both the sending and receiving countries. This has allowed for the support of cross-border collaboration between both governments and CSOs and workers' representatives. However, in Vietnam and the Philippines, and to a certain extent in Indonesia, migrant fishers are mainly going to Japan, Taiwan, China, and South Korea. There are severe limitations on what the UN agencies can do in Taiwan and China which limits the possibilities for extending the work to this corridor and the UN agencies' footprint in South Korea and Japan is naturally much less than some of the other countries of destination for migrants. The funding structure of the EU for this programme also limits the target areas to South East Asia. The baseline research did cover these corridors, however, government stakeholders in particular referenced the need to support engagement in the receiving countries as well as working in their own countries, which is something that the programme does not have the potential to do as the scope of the programme is South East Asia.

### **System level change**

Addressing the urgent needs and vulnerabilities of fishers and workers in the seafood also requires the regulatory and enforcement bodies which govern their employment and immigration status to be responsive to the problems migrant workers face. The programme takes a multi-pronged approach, working at the policy and the systems levels, as well as directly engaging migrant workers. This supports addressing the key needs of fishers and sea food processing workers as enforcement of labour rights is often weak and, in many countries, discriminatory or inconsistent policy frameworks make it harder for workers to access decent work and labour rights.

The programme is designed to address issues of compliance through working to strengthen the labour inspection system. As noted in the PRODOC, 'Labour administrations are often unfamiliar with fishing vessels and the nature of work in fishing and do not have access to fishing vessels which are docked in ports. Even when labour inspections do take place on fishing vessels, the power to detain vessels or require corrective action of vessel owners tend to lie with other authorities. Conversely, maritime, transport or port authorities do not have expertise on labour protection.' The first phase of the Sea to Shore programme in Thailand worked to strengthen the capacity of inspectors working in the PIPO centres on the multi-disciplinary inspection teams to check for labour abuses and take corrective action. A training curriculum was designed by ILO to be used to train current and new inspectors. Despite the gains of the first phase, significant challenges in enforcement remain. The baseline for this phase of the programme found that only 1% of labour inspections in the fishing sectors lead to enforcement actions. The need to continue to work to strengthen the enforcement of labour inspection is thus important to ensuring decent work for migrants in the fishing sector, and thus relevant to the design of the programme.

This need was validated from discussions with migrant fishers who emphasised a number of challenges they face including lack of access to statutory requirements of their work such as payment via bank transfer and receiving contracts in both Thai and Burmese (or other languages of origin), even though these are requirements under relevant Thai laws on the regulation of fishing. Other challenges faced include the deduction of wages for registration fees, lack of clarity over who was responsible for paying such fees, refusal of employers to return Certificate of Identify (CI) books, and threat of or actual violence if they make complaints. The relevance of the Ship to Shore programme to the fishers is though linked to the readiness of the labour inspectorate to make necessary changes to ensure compliance and enforcement actions are prioritised in their inspections. This is discussed in more detail in the effectiveness and sustainability sections of the report.

The model of Thailand's multi-disciplinary inspections provides a roadmap for addressing similar concerns in other countries. In Indonesia, the Ministry of Manpower, the Coordinating Ministry of

Maritime Affairs and Investments, and the Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries are working to develop a system where labour inspection of vessels is under the umbrella of one ministry. The programme is working both to develop this at the national level, and also pilot at the local level. The final system or pilot have not been finalised yet. In the Philippines, the activities with the labour inspectorate have not been started yet due to the reorganisation of government ministries.

Work with employers has been limited to date in the programme, and has mainly been in Thailand through the Seafood Good Labour Practices (GLP) programme and through the work IOM is doing to assess workplace conditions, understand recruitment processes, and map supply chains through engaging with employers and CSOs in Indonesia, Thailand, and Cambodia. ILO also worked with the Lao National Chamber of Commerce and Industry to host an employment expo in Lao PDR. The programme does not engage with employer organisations in Myanmar as a result of the coup and the connection of the organisations to the military junta. As noted above, issues of decent work and working conditions are relevant to migrant and non-migrant workers in this sector. Additionally, the industry associations who participated in the evaluation believed the GLP addressed important issues to improved industrial relations and working conditions both improve productivity and enhance Thailand's credibility to their suppliers. Work with recruitment agencies has been quite limited so far, but activities are planned in many countries, particularly in Lao PDR, Cambodia, and Vietnam, and there has already been joint work with the Safe and Fair project on recruitment agencies in the Philippines. If the programme is able to move forward with this work, this has the potential to be relevant to the key needs of migrant workers and sending countries. A number of stakeholders, particularly CSOs and Government Officials reference the importance of regulating recruitment fees more clearly.

#### **Are the activities aligned with national, regional and global policy frameworks on labour migration/work in the fishing and seafood processing sectors?**

The programme aligns with various national, regional, and global frameworks on fishing, migration, and decent work. The first phase of the programme made a significant contribution towards Thailand's ratification of P.29 (Protocol of 2014 to the Forced Labour Convention) and C.188 (Work in Fishing Convention). The programme has identified the lack of ratification of C.188 in other South East Asian countries as a key need, as well as the ratification of P29 and C181 in some countries, and either supports governments preparing for ratification, such as in Indonesia, or where there is not the current political will to ratify, supports the development and revision of national policies which would align with key areas of C.188 anyway.

The programme also aligns with other key ILO conventions including C.81 on labour inspection through working with labour inspectorates on the inspection of fishing vessels, C.181 (Private Employment Agencies Convention) and the General principles and operational guidelines for fair recruitment by work on private recruitment agencies including supporting the Lao PDR Government with a gap analysis of the legal framework on recruitment agencies. Other key ILO conventions which underpin the programme are the conventions related to migration such as C.97 (Migration for Employment Convention), C.143 (Migrant Workers Supplementary Provisions Convention), and Migrant Workers Recommendation R.151, and through the gender equality strategy and partnerships with the Safe and Fair programme, C.190 (Violence and Harassment Convention).

The programme aligns with various of the Programme and Budget (P&B) outputs for 2022-23<sup>5</sup>. Ship to Shore's work aligns with a number of outputs in Outcome 1 of the P&B, 'Strong tripartite constituents and influential and inclusive social dialogue'. Output 1.2 targets increased institutional capacity of trade unions which Ship to Shore focuses on this in outcome 3 of the programme. Outcome 2 of the Ship to Shore programme supports the achievement of output 1.3 of the P&B, the

---

<sup>5</sup> [https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/how-the-ilo-works/departments-and-offices/program/WCMS\\_831162/lang-en/index.htm](https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/how-the-ilo-works/departments-and-offices/program/WCMS_831162/lang-en/index.htm)

strengthening of labour administration systems, and output 1.4 of the P&B which focuses on improving labour relations is supported through the attention to collective bargaining in some of the agreements with workers' organisations. All outputs of Outcome 2, 'International labour standards and authoritative and effective supervision' of the P&B are supported through Ship to Shore, most notably the increased ability of member states to apply sectoral standards (output 2.4). The introduction to Outcome 2 of the P&B explicitly references fishing as an area for giving increased support on the ratification and application of sectoral standards. Should the programme successfully implement many of the recommendations of the Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment Strategy, then it will also contribute to Outcome 6, 'Gender equality and equal opportunities and treatment in the world of work', notably output 6.3 of increased capacity of member States to develop gender-responsive legislation, policies and measures for a world of work free from violence and harassment. Output 7.5, increased capacity of Member States to develop fair and effective labour migration frameworks, institutions and services to protect migrant workers, is also extremely relevant to the programme's focus on the governance systems for migration regulation.

The outcomes of the programme align with various sustainable development goals' (SDGs) outcomes, most notably outcome 8 on decent work, particularly target 8.7 to eradicate forced labour and human trafficking, and 8.8 to protect labour rights for all including migrant workers, as well as target 10.7 of facilitating safe and orderly migration. The programme also has connections to other outcomes, including 14.4 linked to illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing (IUU), 16.2 on ending trafficking and exploitation, 16.b on promoting non-discriminatory laws, and outcome 5 through the gender strategy which was recently developed.

The programme also aligns to other key normative frameworks such as the Global Compact for Safe Orderly and Regularly Migration (GCM). This includes the work done through the MRCs, which supports objective 3 of the GCM of providing timely and accurate information, objective 16 of empowering migrants and societies to realise full inclusion, and objective 21 on sustainable reintegration. The programme's focus on supporting bilateral agreements, such as the priority of the Cambodian and Thai Governments on signing a sector specific MOU on regulating Cambodian fishers migrating to Thailand, aligns with objective 5 of the GCM. IOM and UNDP's work on national and trans-national referral mechanisms on trafficking support the achievement of objectives 8, 9, and 10, on saving lives, reducing smuggling, and eradicating trafficking in persons. The expansion in the second phase to a regional programme, also enhances alignment with objective 23 on strengthening international cooperation.

Addressing IUU fishing has been a priority for the EU in recent years. The first phase of the Ship to Shore programme was linked to the need of Thailand to respond to the issuing of the yellow card to their fishing industry. The new European Consensus on Development<sup>6</sup> argues that well-managed migration can contribute significantly to global development and identifies addressing the root causes of irregular migration and ensuring the successful reintegration of migrants into their countries of origin as an important element of migration governance, and as such the programme's work, particularly in outcome 3 aligns with this priority. The Consensus also includes a commitment of the EU and its member states to apply a rights-based approach to migration, including ensuring decent work for migrants. Additionally, there is a recognition of the risks of migrants being subject to trafficking and forced labour, and the importance of well-managed migration policies to help address this, and as such, the work done by IOM and UNDP on trafficking referral mechanisms, and ILO's focus on forced labour, also aligns with EU policy.

The programme also focuses both on bilateral cooperation, such as the previously mentioned MOU between Cambodia and Thailand, and support in drafting, redesigning, and implementing national

---

<sup>6</sup> [https://international-partnerships.ec.europa.eu/policies/european-development-policy/european-consensus-development\\_en](https://international-partnerships.ec.europa.eu/policies/european-development-policy/european-consensus-development_en)

laws and policies which promote decent work and orderly migration. An example at the national level is the programme, along with other ILO programmes, has given significant input into the new law on Contract-Based Vietnamese Workers Overseas in Vietnam and the Party's Central Committee Directive (no. 20) on sending Vietnamese workers abroad. Further work at the regional cooperation level includes the organising of Fair Seas Labour Conference in Bali in September 2022, and a declaration on work in fishing with ASEAN.

**Are the governance structures participatory in approach, providing for the inclusion of the perspective of governments, social partners, civil society and women and men migrant workers?**

The evaluation found that key partners of the programme have had the chance to give significant input into the development of agreements to implement activities under Ship to Shore. The initial design of the programme was focused on an overall framework with indications of how the programme would work to meet its objectives, but not prescribing every single activity which would take place. More focused design of the programme was conducted during the inception period, and the specific implementation agreements with partners have been agreed (or in some cases are still being agreed) as the implementation of the programme has gone on. While, given the broad scale of the programme, a micro-level of consultation with all partners was not feasible during the design, the structure of the programme has allowed for significant input from key stakeholders into their particular elements of the programme. Stakeholders who spoke with the evaluator confirmed their satisfaction with the input they have been able to give into the design of activities they will undertake.

*"I was involved with Ship to Shore before the agreement was signed. I gave feedback and participated in the PSC. Then we had discussions on what we could do. The development of the agreement was consultative, participated, and with equal opportunity... I appreciate that ILO came and asked us how Ship to Shore could align with their strategy." (CSO Representative- Cambodia)*

The programme has set up a Programme Steering Committee (PSC) and National Programme Advisory Committees (NPACs). The PSC is designed as a coordination committee between the EU, ILO, IOM, and UNDP. The NPACs provide a mechanism for presenting progress of the programme in each country, reviewing and approving the annual workplan, and giving feedback and input into the programme. Attendance at the NPACs extends beyond the tripartite constituents to include other partners working on the programme as well as other key stakeholders with an interest in the fishing and seafood process sector. The NPACs are designed to be held biannually or annually dependent on the country, although due to delays in setting up some of the NPACs, 2022 was the first year they were held in a number of countries. The programme also conducted consultative dialogues in all the countries of intervention which facilitated input from stakeholders representing governments, employers, and workers.

Inputs from a migrant worker perspective come through their interaction with groups representing migrants, as well as through some direct input into the programme's knowledge products. Input from migrant workers has been included in some of the documents which informed the design of the PRODOC and the studies the programme has undertaken. The evaluation of the first phase of the Ship to Shore programme included FGDs with fishers, and this current evaluation included FGDs with users of the MRCs, fishers, and seafood processing workers. Migrant workers were also interviewed as part of the scoping study of Lao Migrant Workers, the study on recruitment practices for foreign flagged vessels, case study in Thailand of the political economy analysis of impediments to effective labour governance, and the review of the GLP, as well as for the preparation of the gender equality and women's empowerment strategy. Migrant workers have also had their stories collected in monitoring exercises including the baseline survey and the outcome harvesting exercise.

**Cross Cutting Issues**

ILO's policy guidelines for results-based evaluation include a number of cross-cutting themes which should be considered in an evaluation. These include gender equality, disability inclusion, environmental sustainability, and attention to international labour standards. More recently, ILO's contribution to the COVID-19 response has also been a cross-cutting theme of its evaluations. International labour standards are covered above, gender equality is discussed throughout the report, and the COVID-19 response is discussed in the effectiveness section.

The programme has not paid particular attention to disability inclusion and the situation of persons with disabilities throughout the migration cycle. This gap is not limited to this programme, there is a dearth of information about disability and migration<sup>7</sup>. Areas particularly relevant to the Ship to Shore sectors where more research or programming could be done include the response to acquired disability on the job and reintegration in the social safety net upon return, as well as more general issues such as the barriers persons with disabilities face in migration and the impacts of migration on family members and their carers who have disabilities. Currently, without data it is difficult for inclusive programming to be developed, and opportunities do exist for reducing this gap. ILO has referenced that Ship to Shore, TRIANGLE and Safe and Fair are starting to work with the ASEAN Disability Forum to try to expand referrals from their networks to the MRCs and vice versa, particularly linked to legal assistance, and thus this may provide a good entry point to work on disability inclusion in the second half of the programme.

Marine resource conservation and sustainability is one of the cross-cutting issues which the programme has raised in the theory of change. This has though been fairly limited to date within Ship to Shore. Interventions are though designed to not have negative impacts on marine resource conservation and sustainability. For example, in some countries, such as the Philippines, employers advocate for less stringent conservation measures and longer fishing seasons (shorter closed seasons) and link it to social protection and wages, with the idea that closed seasons mean no wages for fishers and canning industry workers. S2SR does not support this position, as it would have negative consequences on conservation and sustainability. The most direct focus on this issue is the study, "Inclusive Pathways to Sustainable Fishing and Seafood Processing in Thailand", which UNDP is undertaking. This research has been delayed due to procurement issues in finding a consultancy company with sufficient expertise in this area to conduct the work. It was also never expected that marine conservation would be a major area of emphasis in the programme, although it is worth noting that marine conservation is, among other factors, an issue which will impact labour issues if the current trajectory of lack of marine conservation is not addressed properly.

## 3.2 Validity of Design

### **Is the scope of the interventions realistic given the time and resources available?**

Ship to Shore is an ambitious programme. In this phase it has expanded from one country to seven. It encompasses work on three levels; policy, systems, and directly with migrants. It also does not purely work on migration, but addresses decent work for both national and migrant workers were relevant in some of the countries it operates in.

Ship to Shore has also been impacted by significant context changes. The programme has also been implemented during the COVID-19 pandemic, an unprecedented crisis for modern times, which has disrupted both the context in which the programme is implemented and the ability of the programme to operate smoothly. Although the agreement with the EU was signed after the start of the pandemic, much of the planning and design was conducted before the pandemic. Even by the time of the programme beginning in September 2020, the trajectory of the crisis was not clear and the lengthy waves of new variants which have delayed a return to normality was not widely

---

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.migrationdataportal.org/blog/disability-inclusive-data-migration-how-far-have-we-come>

predicted. A further significant context change was the military coup in Myanmar in February 2021. The programme has adhered to the UN Principles of Engagement in Myanmar, which in practical terms has seen the programme implemented only through non-state actors. Engagement with the government is avoided, and given the connections between the government and employers, the non-engagement has extended to the employers' federation. The operating context for workers' organisations is very risky currently. The NGOs, which ILO, UNDP, and IOM partner with, do try to engage workers organisations where feasible, but in a very discreet manner. The ambitions of the programme need to be assessed with these external events in mind.

The programme had a long nine-month inception period. This allowed for recruitment of staff at a regional and national level, the development of the monitoring and evaluation system and refinement of the results framework, the development of the governance system through the PSC, and discussion of partnership modalities with other regional and national programmes. The revision of the engagement in Myanmar was also possible during the inception period, although as it could not have been predicted, was not part of the decision-making process for having a lengthy inception period. While the inception period was quite lengthy by usual standards and does reduce the period of time for implementation, the general belief of stakeholders was that the inception period was important for the programme. As noted, the programme is broad in scope, covering seven countries, and also includes three UN agencies. By nature, this creates a more complex structure of implementation and management than a single country project implemented by one agency. Ensuring the recruitment of key staff and the development of clear work plans and the results framework has been critical in ensuring programme progress since the end of the inception period.

The inception period also allowed for the inter-agency model of cooperation to be developed and agreement reached over expected outputs from each agency. As a result of the programme evolving from the original Ship to Shore programme, IOM and UNDP were brought into the design of the programme later in the process. The inception period thus allowed for agreements to be reached prior to the implementation of the programme.

Although the inception period allowed for the design of many of the key programme tools, not all were finished during this period. The programme's baseline was not conducted until 2022 as a result of delays due to the pandemic and a decision to wait for the evaluability review's reflections on indicators before undertaking the baseline. The gender equality and women's empowerment strategy report and the gender budgeting guidelines were also finalised in mid 2022, with training on the gender strategy to be conducted in December 2022. As such some of the tools of the programme are not yet fully operationalised.

The work on three levels, policy, system, and directly with migrants gives the programme a solid depth. The programme is able to engage with a wide number of stakeholders, particularly government, workers' organisations and CSOs, and address key issues at the different levels of the intervention. This links closely to the theory of change behind the programme. While, consideration of individual activities and their feasibility should be an ongoing process, especially considering the delays to the programme, mainly as a result of COVID-19 and the coup in Myanmar, the scope of the programme from the point of view of maintaining the different levels should be maintained.

**Have the design and strategic planning documents developed proven useful in implementing the programme? (Description of the Action, M&E Plan, Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment Strategy, etc.)**

The programme has conducted a series of studies and developed tools to support the management of the programme. Studies and tools include the baseline, evaluability review, and the gender

equality and women's empowerment strategy report, the M&E plan, and the gender budgeting guidelines. The EU also conducted a Support for Designing Logframes and Monitoring Systems (SDL) exercise in May 2021. The baseline, gender equality and women's empowerment strategy, and the gender budgeting guidelines have only recently been completed, and thus offer more potential for future than actual use to date. The M&E plan, which includes a theory of change and the results framework, and the evaluability review offer more examples of planning documents which have proved useful to date.

The evaluability review was conducted by an external consultant in mid 2021. The review produced nine recommendations. The findings of the evaluability review were reported to the PSC, and the presentation included the programme team's response and the actions taken or proposed to the recommendations. Many actions had already been accomplished by the time of the PSC, and others which were reliant on waiting for a particular moment in the programme, such as implementing the recommendations of the Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment Strategy once it had been finalised, have been completed in the past year. The review suggested revising some of the indicators of the results framework, of which many but not all of the suggested changes were made. Qualitative data collection approaches were also added to the results framework following the recommendations. The programme has strengthened its approach to risk management since the review, including adding guidelines for maintaining the risk register into the M&E guidelines and ensuring regular reporting of risks and mitigation strategies into the quarterly report process, and a more comprehensive risk register is included in annual reports.

The SDL exercise was conducted by a consultant contracted by the EU Delegation. The exercise was initiated to support the reduction of the number and type of the indicators before officially registering the results framework in the EU's database and contract management system (OPSYS). The SDL exercise recommended revision of some indicators, the formulation of results statements at the output level, the proposal of assumptions at the outcome level and formulation by the UN agencies at the output level, and the adding of sources of verification. Gender equity issues were given more prominence and the disaggregation of data by sex and other criteria recommended. The UN agencies were tasked with identifying baselines and targets, which was done using the baseline study as a guide.

The programme developed an M&E plan which was refined further following recommendations from the evaluability review. The M&E plan provides a basis for ensuring coordinated monitoring and reporting of programme progress towards achieving its outputs. The M&E system appears to be understood by the NPCs. The one missing element of the M&E manual are detailed definitions of the indicators to bolster the brief description in the results framework. This would help in ensuring consistency of collection of indicators across countries, particularly once more data is collected by the programme's partners.

There are some actions which are important to complete to ensure effective management of the remainder of the programme. The strategy includes recommendations at both the programme implementation level per every output and also at the programme management level for the programme tools. Training on the gender equality and women's empowerment strategy is planned for December 2022. Developing an action plan, including what mentoring and monitoring is needed by programme partners, at the training to ensure the recommendations are implemented would enhance the effective use of the strategy.

The baseline survey was conducted in June 2022 and the final report is still being finalised. The baseline survey was conducted with fishers who have returned from migration in Cambodia, Indonesia, Myanmar, and Vietnam. The survey is intended to provide a baseline against which

progress towards impact level indicators can be measured at the end of the programme. The programme intends to conduct a quasi-experimental study to support difference-in-difference analysis. Given the lengthy time it takes for developing TORs, identifying consultants, and then conducting endline studies, preparatory work on the study would need to begin by mid 2023. Ensuring comparison groups of those who used the services of the programme and those who did not would help identify the immediate changes the programme has brought about in working towards the overall impact goals.

**Does the intervention’s Theory of Change clearly articulate assumptions, provide logical pathways of change between different levels of results and align with the ILO’s strategic objectives and outcomes at the regional and global levels, as well as with the relevant SDGs and related targets?**

The M&E plan includes a diagrammatic theory of change, which lists the outputs of the programme and through arrows shows some system to connection of individual outputs to the different outcomes. It also lists the assumptions, cross-cutting issues, and implementation strategies. As noted in the background section, there is a brief overview in the M&E plan of how the theory of change works at the different levels. The M&E plan envisages the theory of change being used to support continuous improvement in the understanding of the linkages of the programme and that ‘review and adaptation of the theory of change will be completed during annual reflection retreats among the programme staff.’ This has not yet happened to date.

The theory of change does not go into depth on the pathways of change between the different levels of results nor link particular assumptions to individual elements of the intervention. There are also areas where more detail could be considered to strengthen the theory of change. As a multi-country programme, the intervention includes both sending and receiving countries for migration. Separating the different pathways of change between countries could help focus the individual approaches used in each country. Additionally, while output 1.2 refers to increasing opportunities for regional and cross border cooperation, identifying more clearly the links between national, bilateral, and regional cooperation would help express more clearly the interaction between these parts of the programme. Given the trade-off between implementing the programme activities and utilising staff and external stakeholder time to develop specific country theories of change, the more country specific work on the theory of change may be more effectively implemented during the design of the next phase of the programme.

Theories of change provide useful planning and monitoring tools for interventions when they are used as living documents to be revisited as the programme progresses. This has not been done yet, but opportunity arising from this evaluation and the planning and coordination activities planned for 2023, offer an opportunity to do this. While this is not exhaustive, the following more specific reflections on the theory of change were identified during the evaluation. It should be noted that the purpose of this suggestion is not that the programme should be revised, but that an exercise be undertaken to more clearly map out the links between outcomes and that the process of reviewing and adapting the theory of change as envisaged in the M&E manual be undertaken to allow minor tweaks to the programme if necessary.

- The theory of change does not clearly identify how the work of ILO, IOM, and UNDP interacts to strengthen the intervention. Working on this could also strengthen the interaction between the three agencies.
- The links between outputs are not defined in the theory of change, just where an output links to different outcomes. The outputs though will often link together to produce change. For example, work on output 3.2 on increasing organising capacities and opportunities



through the cross-border cooperation between workers' organisations can provide inputs into output 1.2's work on supporting bilateral and multilateral policies. Output 2.1's work on strengthening the capacities of labour inspectorates links to the work to enhance partnerships to fight trafficking and unacceptable forms of work for women.

- Two of the assumptions of the programme seem to be more problems which the intervention is trying to solve or outcomes to the programme is working towards than assumptions. These are 'Acknowledgement of the contribution of migrant workers in countries of origin and destination' and 'Effective collaboration between diverse stakeholders on protection of migrants' labour rights'. Moving these into a problem statement could effectively address this point.
- Reflection on the differences in how influencing governments can take place between the countries where the full corridor is covered, and the countries where only the sending country is part of the intervention would be a useful addition to the theory of change.

### **Has the programme applied an evidence-based approach in formulating and implementing the activities?**

The programme has a significant learning and research element. The results framework targets five knowledge products to be produced during this funding phase. Five have already been published, with ten more either in draft form or in the process of being researched, and as such the programme will significantly overachieve on its output target. The goal of these is to increase the knowledge base to promote evidence-based practice and policies. Feedback from evaluation participants suggested they were appreciative of the studies the three agencies produced as they addressed gaps in data and knowledge needed to make policy or conduct advocacy. This was seen as a comparative strength of the UN agencies, which stakeholders believed was based on their ability to mobilise multiple stakeholders and in particular coordinate across borders.

There is evidence the studies which have been produced have been used to influence activities and learning. For example, the report on the future of the GLP, was presented to the Thai Frozen Foods Association (TFFA) and the Thai Tuna Industry Association (TTIA) in November 2021 and commitments on areas which needed attention were agreed. A number of government officials who were interviewed for the evaluation referred to the importance of the gap analyses which are due to be published to help shape the approach to policy reform, most notably in Lao PDR and Cambodia. 'Riding out the Storm', the programme's research product on the resilience of trade unions and CSOs in Myanmar has also proved useful in mobilising support for CSO partners, has been used for advocacy purposes, and has increased media attention to the issue. The programme also appears to have utilised learning from previous interventions in the development of this programme. Many of the evaluation recommendations from the previous Ship to Shore programme were incorporated into the design of the current phase.

There is a tension between the timeliness of the programme and the evidence-based approach. A number of the studies have only recently been completed, such as the Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment Strategy or are still ongoing, such as UNDP's research to understand politico-economic impediments to effective labour governance in Southeast Asian fishing and seafood processing or the gap analyses in Lao PDR and Cambodia. As a result, the actions the programme can take to respond to the findings of the research can only be undertaken in the second half of the programme. This challenge has been exacerbated by the delays to some of the research as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. However, while this may provide a short-term challenge, if viewed through the logic of the programme contributing to a longer-term trajectory of improvements to the sector through building the knowledge base for key stakeholders working on

these issues in the region and beyond, then the importance of ensuring good quality and accurate research outweighs shorter-term concerns.

### 3.3 Intervention Progress and Effectiveness

**What amount of progress has been made in achieving the programme’s eight outputs? (Applying a scale of minor, moderate or major progress, with justification).**

The programme has made solid progress towards achieving the programme’s eight outputs. The programme has eleven indicators as targets to measure progress towards achieving the outputs. The results framework includes a baseline from the previous Ship to Shore project (for some of the indicators), a mid-term target at the end of year two and a final target. By the end of year two in August 2022, the programme was ahead or on-target on all of the indicators for outcome 1, ahead on two indicators and behind on one indicator for outcome 2, and ahead on three indicators and behind on one indicator for outcome 3.

#	Description	Mid-Term Target (Aug 2022) <sup>8</sup>	Final target (Aug 2024)	Actual (End 2022)	Rating of progress <sup>9</sup>	Comment/ Justification
<b>Output 1.1: Improved understanding and knowledge on the drivers, outcomes and dynamics of labour migration and human trafficking for women and men migrant workers in South East Asia to promote knowledge and evidence-based policies and practices.</b>						
1.1.1	# of knowledge products published and disseminated to key government, social partner and civil society stakeholders.	2	5	5	Major	Already met the targets for the whole programme
<b>Output 1.2: Increased opportunities for regional and cross-border cooperation created to support bilateral and multilateral policies on safe, orderly and regular labour migration for women and men.</b>						
1.2.1	# of ASEAN countries represented by a tripartite delegation at ILO-supported regional coordination mechanisms on the fishing sector.	7 ASEAN countries represented by tripartite delegations	9	7	Major	On-target for mid-term of the programme
<b>Output 1.3: Strengthened capacities of governments to develop and promote rights-based policies and implement legislative reforms in favour of women and men migrant workers, particularly in the fishing and seafood processing sectors.</b>						
1.3.1	# of policies and laws adopted or amended with technical support from the Action.	3	6	11	Major	Already met the targets for the whole programme

<sup>8</sup> The target for this phase of the programme. Does not include achievements from the previous programme.

<sup>9</sup> Where the total indicator is being achieved but the achievement comes in overachievement from either just one or two countries and there are country specific sub-indicators in the results framework, then the progress has been assessed as moderate rather than major. It is noted that the programme takes an asymmetric approach to implementation and so different levels of results are expected in different countries. This point reflects where country specific sub-targets have been included in results framework and progress in certain countries is yet to be achieved.

#	Description	Mid-Term Target (Aug 2022) <sup>8</sup>	Final target (Aug 2024)	Actual (End 2022)	Rating of progress <sup>9</sup>	Comment/Justification
1.3.2	# of women and men reached by communications campaigns and products	1,216,000	1,433,000	1,664,919	Major	Total number has met the target for the whole programme
<b>Output 2.1: Strengthened capacities for labour inspectorates and law enforcement institutions to enforce labour rights, human rights and gender equality in the fishing and seafood processing sectors.</b>						
2.1.1	# of stakeholders trained on enforcement of labour and anti-trafficking laws and application of fair recruitment and good industry practices in the fishing and seafood processing sectors (cross-cuts outputs 2.1-2.3).	714	1,414	1,404 (54% women)	Moderate	Overachievement of mid-term targets but significant bias in numbers towards Thailand. Attention needed to other countries
<b>Output 2.2: Strengthened capacities of labour inspectors, law enforcement authorities and social partners to fight trafficking and unacceptable forms of work for women and men in the fishing and seafood processing sectors.</b>						
2.2.1	# of operational tools institutionalized by labour inspectorates and law enforcement officials (cross-cuts outputs 2.1-2.2).	2	4	6	Major	Have achieved target for whole programme, although defining what institutionalisation would be helpful
<b>Output 2.3: Strengthened capacity of recruitment agencies and employers (including vessel owners) in the fishing and seafood processing sectors to protect labour rights, ensure good labour practices and work towards gender equality.</b>						
2.3.1	# of private sector enterprises whose compliance with ethical codes of conduct related to recruitment and employment practices in the fishing and seafood processing sectors is regularly assessed.	75	100	55	Minor	Behind target for the mid-term (COVID-19 particularly affected this indicator)
<b>Output 3.1: Increased availability of accurate information and support on migration and labour rights to women and men migrants, their families and communities throughout the migration process.</b>						
3.1.1	# of women and men survivors of trafficking in the fishing and seafood processing sectors who receive assistance for their return and reintegration.	160	320	271 (15% women)	Major	Overachievement of mid-term target

#	Description	Mid-Term Target (Aug 2022) <sup>8</sup>	Final target (Aug 2024)	Actual (End 2022)	Rating of progress <sup>9</sup>	Comment/ Justification
3.1.2	# of women and men migrant workers who participate in sector-specific and gender-responsive pre-departure orientation seminars for the fishing and seafood processing sectors.	600	1,200	1,807 (43% women)	Moderate	Considerable over-achievement of total targets but this is limited to two countries so far
<b>Output 3.2: Increased opportunities for women and men migrant workers in the fishing and seafood processing sectors to develop skills, organise, obtain peer support, receive assistance from workers' organizations, and engage with governments and employers to claim their rights.</b>						
3.2.1	# of women and men migrant workers and members or their families provided with support services.	34,352	71,352	23,564 (39% women)	Moderate	The programme is below target for the mid-term for this indicator
3.2.2	# of women and men migrant workers and members of their families provided with COVID-19 response services.	5,000	10,000	33,026 (47% women)	Major	Considerable overachievement of target

Outcome 1 has four indicators. Indicator 1.1.1 has a target of an additional 2 knowledge products being published by 2022 and 5 by the end of the programme<sup>10</sup> (responsibility of ILO, IOM, and UNDP). By the end of year two, 5 knowledge products had already been produced with a number more in the planning phase. These cover both regional topics such as the “Rough seas: the impact of COVID-19 on fishing workers in South-East Asia” as well as national specific, including a review of future of the GLP and a product identifying how trade unions and CSOs are responding to the military coup in Myanmar. Other products are very close to being finalised such as gap analyses of legal frameworks linked to the programme’s themes in Lao PDR and Cambodia. The programme has also managed to combine a programme tool and a knowledge product through the Gender and Women’s Empowerment Strategy which includes both a gender analysis of the fishing and seafood processing sectors and recommendations for the programme itself.

Indicator 1.2.1 (ILO) focuses on the implementation of the Fair Seas Labour Conference. Whilst this indicator was technically delayed, the holding of the conference in Bali was only a month later than the end of year 2, and more importantly, the targeted number of tripartite delegations was achieved.

Output 1.3’s indicator 1.3.1 (ILO) focuses on the number of laws or policies adopted by the end of the programme. The programme has targeted the adoption of 6 additional laws and policies to be

<sup>10</sup> The results framework targets include the baseline numbers produced during the first phase of Ship to Shore. For example, indicator 1.1.1 has a baseline of 5 knowledge products and a target of 10, meaning that the actual target for this programme is 5 additional products. Throughout the report, reference is made to the target for this phase of the programme to help better reflect what the progress has been made during this funding cycle.

adopted or amended by the end of the programme, with 3 being achieved by the mid-stage of the programme. Eleven laws and policies have been reported on by the end of year 2, and thus the programme is significantly ahead on this indicator. This output also has an indicator, 1.3.2 on the number of women and men reached by communication campaigns and products (ILO and IOM). The programme is being successful in this output, particularly in the number of Facebook followers, mainly through the BBC Media campaign in Myanmar, although has overachieved in every form of outreach except the IOM X video which has yet to be launched. The programme has also been featured in a significant number of media stories, which is not actually an indicator in the results framework, but contributes to the achievement of this output.

Outcome 2 has three output indicators. Training of stakeholders on labour and anti-trafficking laws under indicator 2.1.1 (ILO, IOM) is currently overachieving the mid-term target. This target includes labour inspectors and law enforcement officers, as well as other stakeholders cross-cutting through this objective. It should be noted though that this is mainly due to having trained significantly more than planned stakeholders in Thailand. In all other countries, the programme will need to train more to reach 2.1.1's endline target, particularly in the Philippines, Lao PDR, and Vietnam. In Indonesia, training of labour inspectors has recently been conducted by the 8.7 Accelerator Lab project, and as such Ship to Shore has worked at the policy level with the inspectorate rather than providing training to avoid duplication. IOM has been successful in ensuring standard screening forms and operating procedures for victims of trafficking have been adopted in Cambodia, Indonesia, Thailand, and Myanmar, ensuring the programme is slightly over-achieving its target in indicator 2.2.1 (IOM and UNDP) of four operational tools have been institutionalised, although monitoring will be needed to ensure the long-term institutionalisation and use of these.

Indicator 2.3.1 (ILO) targets companies being regularly audited under the GLP. The target for the midway point of the programme is 75 enterprises. To date, the programme is reporting 55 enterprises have been audited, 25 in 2021 and 30 in 2022, so the programme is behind on this indicator. This indicator is solely focused on Thailand. The COVID-19 pandemic has had an impact on the ability of the industry associations to implement the inspections and ensure members participate in the GLP.

Outcome 3 focuses on the empowerment of migrants and their families to exercise their rights. In output 3.1, the programme has overachieved on indicator 3.1.2 (ILO, IOM, UNDP), in supporting survivors of trafficking, with the majority of survivors being from Myanmar. The programme has also provided support to migrants through the MRCs and through CSOs in outputs 3.1 and 3.2 (ILO, IOM). Indicator 3.1.2 targets 1,200 migrant workers to be provided with pre-departure orientation by the end of the programme. Already, the programme is reporting 1,807 workers (43% women) have been provided with sector-specific pre-departure orientation. To date this has mainly been achieved through Myanmar with additional input from Cambodia. No orientation has yet been reported for Lao PDR, Indonesia, the Philippines, or Vietnam. Indicator 3.2.1, the of women and men migrant workers and members or their families provided with support services, is behind on its mid-term targets. This is linked to some of the MRCs only just becoming operational by the end of year two and into year three. Additionally, for many which begun implementation in year two, inception and introductory activities justifiably were important, and the numbers of users should increase in year three. The evaluation used the annual report of year two for review of indicators and it is acknowledged that more MRCs are now operational than by July 2022. For example, the Quang Ngai MRC in Vietnam finalised the implementation agreement in August 2022, and by the time of publishing of the evaluation report, will have contributed to indicator 3.2.1, but exact numbers have not yet been validated by the regional team.

Outcome 3 also has an indicator, 3.2.2, for the number of women and men provided with support services and women and men provided with COVID-19 relief support. The programme is currently behind target by about 15% on providing support services, but significantly overachieved in providing COVID-19 response services. 32,026 migrant workers (47% women) had received COVID-19 support by the end of year 2.

There are some indicators which would benefit from greater clarity in definitions of how they should be counted, for example, defining what counts as institutionalised tools in indicator 2.2.1. (IOM and UNDP). Additionally, a definition of who is counted for sector specific pre-departure orientation and what level of orientation they need to receive would also be helpful to understand the achievement of indicator 3.1.2 and reasonable consistency and quality control between MRCs (ILO).

There is one output where an indicator is missing in terms of connecting to the outputs and outcomes. In outcome 2, output 2.3 refers to the strengthened capacities of recruitment agencies and employers. However, the indicator for the output is focused on the employers through the enterprises who are members of the GLP. Adding an additional indicator on recruitment agencies would ensure a clear link between the outputs and the outcomes (ILO and IOM).

### **To what extent are tripartite constituents and other key stakeholders satisfied with and/or benefiting from the outputs produced?**

The evaluation found a significantly high level of satisfaction among stakeholders in all countries and from all branches of the tripartite plus community. Stakeholders felt the intervention was timely and addressed a key issue. Other areas of satisfaction which were identified by stakeholders included the level of technical support which ILO, IOM, and UNDP offer, the flexibility and level of involvement towards partners which ILO has shown in negotiating the partnership agreements, and the role which ILO, IOM and UNDP have played in facilitating multi-ministry and cross border discussions and facilitating access for trade unions and CSOs to government discussions.

With the caveat that there is a high level of satisfaction with the programme, there were some recurrent issues which were raised by stakeholders. Confusion over the roles of different ILO programmes on migration and fishing were highlighted by some stakeholders. This was particularly in Indonesia where there are currently three national projects linked to the fishing sector. Awareness of the programme was also a challenge among some stakeholders, most notably those who work closely with IOM and UNDP who did not connect the work done on the national and transnational referral systems with Ship to Shore. However, it should be noted that at times the lack of visibility to the programme is intentional. This is particularly the case with Myanmar's involvement in the UNDP COMMIT process, which is demanded by member states, but given the UN's limited engagement in Myanmar, it was decided not to highlight the link to the programme. The limited human resources available in each country was also highlighted as a concern by stakeholders, noting that only two ILO staff were dedicated to each country (and one in Lao PDR). The limited length of many of the implementation agreements was also highlighted as a concern. These challenges are raised in more detail elsewhere in the report.

### **How effective are the individual partnerships/relationships with tripartite constituents, civil society and the private sector? Are there partnerships showing particular promise for achieving programme results?**

Many of the partnerships of the programme are either still being finalised or have only just been agreed, and as such it is difficult to assess these. The final evaluation would be able to undertake a more detailed analysis. The programme includes a number of significant partnerships, particularly with government agencies, trade unions, and CSOs. The broad range of partners involved in the

programme who bring a variety of different skills and experiences is a key strength of Ship to Shore. Many of the partners have close links to the target communities of the programme and have often worked with these communities for a number of years. This is a key strength of the programme and links closely to the findings on the relevance of the programme for migrant and non-migrant workers in the fishing and seafood processing sectors.

Ship to Shore has adopted the MRC methodology which has been utilised by ILO and others including IOM across for the region in recent years. The most active work with MRCs has been in Thailand, Vietnam, Myanmar, Lao PDR, and Cambodia. MRCs in Indonesia and the Philippines are yet to be established. In Thailand, the partnership has been with Fishers Rights Network (FRN) who have existing structures and the support of ILO is both for strategic partnership and to allow an extension of the work they already do. This nature of FRN's MRCs are also different from those in Vietnam, Myanmar, Lao PDR, and Cambodia, in that they are designed to support migrants in the destination countries compared to supporting migrants intended to migrate, their families during migration, and the reintegration of migrants on return. FRN's work is also more directly linked to organising than the work of the other MRCs, apart from CLC's MRC. The work with FRN appears to be effective. By partnering with a now well-established worker organisation<sup>11</sup> which is supported by its global union partner (the International Transport Workers Federation), the programme is able to work towards one of the outcome indicators of Outcome 3. The partnership has the potential to offer cross-border support through supporting connections with Cambodian Labour Confederation (CLC) and also potentially other MRCs.

Ship to Shore received praise from partners in Myanmar in helping to navigate the challenging context CSOs and workers' organisations have faced since the coup. The programme developed a reprogramming memo, which approved by the EU, which lays out how the work will be done differently in each output for each of the three UN agencies.

*"We are really happy to collaborate with ILO. We have a monthly meeting with the partner MRC and we get the chance to coordinate every month. There are limitations, we are illegal according to the military regime. We cannot operate as freely as before, and some of the activities we implement are late as a result. We have managed to get solutions from Yazar (the NPC). We are not happy for the project 100% because we are not free to conduct as we have before. We they need to take into account the safety of the participants as much as before." (CSO Official, Myanmar)*

The one area which was raised as a challenge by one stakeholder in Myanmar was over the non-engagement with government officials when handling trafficking cases. This was raised as a concern as to resolve trafficking cases and provide the necessary support it was felt that sometimes necessary to interact with specific government officials. There was a request for ILO to provide more guidance on this issue. The evaluation is not in a position to reach a judgement on this or make a recommendation, as this links directly to the non-engagement policy of the UN. It is merely reported here for information purposes for ILO, IOM, and UNDP.

The approach in Cambodia of using different types of services providers to implement MRCs offers potential for learning if a system to capture feedback and lessons is implemented. The MRC implemented by CENTRAL, a CSO, has made the most progress to date with considerable pro-activeness being shown in setting up the MRC. This has required a new office and staff to run the

---

<sup>11</sup> Due to the legal framework in Thailand preventing migrants from forming unions, FRN is not able to register as a trade union. As such FRN is not officially a union but is working to organise migrant fishers.

centre to be identified. Despite this, the MRC has already reported some results and has tapped into CENTRAL's system of Safe Migration Ambassadors, as well as making connections with local government and trade unions. The MRCs run by the CLC and the National Employment Agency are only just becoming functional, with the implementation agreements signed later. The National Employment Agency's MRC though does build on existing experience of running MRCs with Safe and Fair and TRIANGLE, and utilise existing government offices and structures. There is considerable potential to learn from each other and all three implementers expressed an interest in exposure visits to the other MRCs and a coordination mechanism in Phnom Penh to share lessons learned and discuss emerging challenges. One of the challenges of the different speeds of progress in signing the implementation agreement was that the CENTRAL MRC has been operation for a number of months, and the MRC Coordinator is still waiting to receive training on the MRC operations manual which will be conducted in one go with all implementers. Currently the CENTRAL, which has considerable experience in safe migration work, has trained the MRC Coordinator itself using the ILO manual.

The work with the MRCs in Lao PDR has been ongoing for some months. The MRCs are implemented by both government agencies and CSOs. One of the challenges identified by MRC implementers in Lao PDR was the lack of migrants going to work in the fishing and seafood processing sector. The evaluation found most issues on the sustainability of the centres in Lao PDR with concerns from stakeholders that they would not be able to continue implementing the centres without financial support from the programme. However, one of the partners, Village Focus International, were probably the most pro-active of any partner in following up with users of the MRC on their experiences, through conducting monthly follow ups by Facebook, WhatsApp, and Messenger.

There has been limited involvement with the private sector to date. Implementation agreements are proposed with employers' federation in Indonesia and the Philippines, but have yet to be confirmed. The programme is planning to engagement on the issue of recruitment agencies in Lao PDR, but this is also yet to be finalised, although an Employment Expo was organised in 2022 which interviewed stakeholders reported to have been successful. The main interaction with employers to date by ILO has been on the GLP. A report detailing recommendations to strengthen the GLP in the future was produced by ILO and presented to stakeholders who made a series of commitments to strengthen the programme, of which progress to date is ongoing. The two associations involved in the GLP reported improvements in worker-manager relationships and the inclusion of migrant workers onto welfare committees, which although self-reported, provides a basis for improvements in working conditions. The two associations are both keen for greater international recognition of the GLP and it being expanded to other countries in the region and felt these were something ILO could provide support on:

*"ILO promised to help promote worldwide which as yet hasn't happened and we hope to see fulfilled." (Employer Association Representative)*

*We used to hear ILO mention the GLP would be implemented in the ASEAN region to be fair to everyone. There hasn't been answer from them about an expansion. It wasn't seriously mentioned in Bali" (Employer Association Representative)*

It has been noted than one of the weaker areas of the GLP is the public reporting of its work and Ship to Shore is exploring ways to support this, as well as being in discussion with industry associations in Indonesia and the Philippines to look into expanding the programme there.



Other important issues such as increasing communication with CSOs who support migrant workers and working to address decent work and forced labour issues throughout the supply chain were also raised as important:

“We need to extend the activities to the supply chain level. This is a challenge because in the supply chain, they need to create understanding at all levels such as can producers, paper carton producers, oil suppliers etc” (Employer Association Representative)

This has been a challenge, as until recently the industry was reluctant to bring in CSOs and only acknowledged the importance of this in 2022. The change of attitude represents an opportunity Ship to Shore may be able to leverage moving forward for the rest of the programme.

The other main engagement of employers has been through IOM who are working with private sector to assess workplace conditions in which workers were recruited, including recruitment fees. This work is limited to Cambodia, Indonesia, and Thailand. IOM has worked both with employers and trade unions to implement this work. The evaluation was not able to speak with any of the employers IOM work with, so assessing this aspect of the programme is difficult. There is also considerable overlap with other IOM programmes such as CREST, and distinguishing between the different interventions when discussing the programme with stakeholders was also a challenge. CREST also works under non-disclosure agreements with companies which means UN partners are not notified of the work or findings. In Indonesia, a migrant workers organisation that works with both IOM and ILO shared details of the reintegration programme for trafficking survivors which IOM runs and is connected to the organisation’s economic empowerment programme. This work appears to successfully build on a methodology developed prior to the programme and offers economic opportunity on reintegration. Although the evaluation did not speak to individual users of the project, it was reported by the organisation that there is high satisfaction with the project among service users.

**How effective has the collaboration and coordination been with other projects working on labour migration issues/fishing sector in maximizing synergies and eliminating duplication? (e.g., ASEAN-ACT, CREST, TRIANGLE in ASEAN, Safe and Fair, etc.)**

There has been a significant volume of work carried out by UN agencies on migration in South East Asia in recent years. Regionally, the Safe and Fair Programme conducted by ILO and UN Women, and TRIANGLE implemented by ILO are large scale and long-running programmes on migration. These programmes were regularly referred to by programme stakeholders and there is considerable evidence there has been good collaboration and leveraging of synergies among the programmes. ILO’s CTAs and TOs for the programmes are all based on the same floor in the office in Bangkok and coordinate formally and informally on a regular basis. A number of the technical back-stoppers are also involved in more than one programme. The NPCs of the regional migration programmes also interact formally and informally with each other on a regular basis. One immediate advantage of this, which was raised through conversations with stakeholders, is that it has allowed for the continuation of partnerships and relationships which have been developed in previous programmes. A number of the stakeholders referenced having been involved in previous programmes and this allowed a smooth transition into this programme. While hard to quantify, the continued involvement of the regional team and a number of the NPCs who have worked with many of the stakeholders previously, does appear to have strengthened the relationships in this programme as a strong level of trust has already been developed.

There was evidence of resource sharing as well which benefit more than one programme. In Indonesia, there are three programmes working on fishing, and examples of the joint use (actual and planned) of resources was shared with the evaluation. For example, the field guide for the inspection of fishing vessels and the gap analysis on C.188 will be used by the Accelerator Lab programme to refine the content of the work this programme does with the ministries. The USDOL project is developing a national profile on OSH, which can be used by the Ship to Shore programme.

In Vietnam, the Ship to Shore programme has been hampered by the lack of approval for the programme by the Government of Vietnam. The existence of the [Safe and Fair](#)<sup>12</sup> and [TRIANGLE](#)<sup>13</sup> programmes has though allowed activities to be implemented. All three programmes, along with the Law 72 programme, contributed to the development of subordinate laws for the Law on Contract-Based Overseas Vietnamese Workers (Law 69). Training for recruitment agencies was also undertaken in collaboration with TRIANGLE and the Department of Labour, and workshops on the dissemination of the new legislative framework were undertaken. The programme has also been able to support three MRCs which have already been established by TRIANGLE in Vietnam, which operate in the provinces with a significant population of fishers and fishing vessels.

The programme has also utilised significant existing resources on the implementation of MRCs which ILO has developed in recent years, most notably through TRIANGLE and Safe and Fair. For example, the guide on the implementation the MRCs which is given to implementers and used as the basis for capacity building was developed under the TRIANGLE programme. It is planned that information developed through Ship to Shore, which is specific to the fishing and seafood processing sectors, will be distributed in MRCs run by other programmes. The programme also supports two MRCs in Myanmar with partners who set them up in a previous ILO's project.

Some examples shared, showed the programme building on previous work which has been implemented by previous programmes. The FAIR programme worked closely with the media in the Philippines to improve the quality of reporting on migration related issues, and Ship to Shore is building on this previous work through a partnership with the Asian Institute of Journalism and Communication. In Thailand, the programme has a very natural continuation of the first phase of Ship to Shore, and is seeking to build on the policies and laws which were implemented during this phase, only with capacity building of the labour inspectorate, and the development of the GLP.

### **How effective was the programme in responding to the impact of COVID-19 on migrant workers?**

Migrant workers who received COVID-19 relief packages and organisations ILO had partnered with to response to the COVID-19 pandemic were satisfied with the support they had received, believing the programme had been effective in meeting at least some of the considerable needs migrant workers faced during this period. Migrant workers were keen to stress though that they still felt the impact of the pandemic and challenges in terms of changing government regulations, reductions in

---

<sup>12</sup> Safe and Fair: Realizing women migrant workers' rights and opportunities in the ASEAN region, is a project which is part of the EU-UN Spotlight Initiative to eliminate violence against women and girls, a global, multi-year initiative between the European Union and United Nations. Safe and Fair is implemented through a partnership between the ILO and UN Women, in collaboration with UNODC, with the overriding objective of ensuring that labour migration is safe and fair for all women in the ASEAN region.

<sup>13</sup> TRIANGLE in ASEAN delivers technical assistance and support with the overall goal of maximizing the contribution of labour migration to equitable, inclusive and stable growth in ASEAN. TRIANGLE is funded by the Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade and Global Affairs Canada

work hours, and employers trying to reduce wages remained, and would need continuous attention from the international community.

There have been some delays to the programme. Virtual meetings were accepted as the only option but are not considered as effective by stakeholders, particularly government stakeholders. This has led to some delays in implementation and also provides challenges in terms of quality and impact of virtual gatherings. Faced with no choice though, this was the best approach for the programme during 2020, 2021, and the first half of 2022. Consideration of what can be done virtually now (and thus more environmentally friendly) and what really in-person work would help for capitalising the lessons of the pandemic.

### 3.4 Efficiency of Resource Use

#### **Has the allocation of resources been optimal for achieving the programme's outcomes? (financial, human, institutional and technical, etc.)**

The programme has a budget of just over US\$ 11.5 million, of which 72.4% is allocated to ILO, 20.2% is allocated to IOM, and 7.3% is allocated to UNDP. During the development of the programme, the initial budget was expected to be around 15 million Euros, but this was reduced due to budget cuts and the number of countries included in the intervention remained the same.

The effect of having a regional programme with a number of countries involved, means the budget is stretched quite thin. Each country only has 2 dedicated staff members, a NPC and a Finance and Admin Assistant, and in Lao PDR, there is only one member of staff. As previously noted, a number of stakeholders identified the lack of staff as being a challenge in terms of the timeliness of follow up on requests. While there were not complaints made about the quality of support provided, it was indicated that with greater financial resources, the programme might flow more quickly.

*"It has been 3 weeks since we held a meeting. We came up with identified steps they could take to move forward on areas of agreement. ILO was supposed to summarise this in an email for us to review but we still have not received this." (CSO Partner)*

The regional resources of the programme are also quite limited. Normally for a programme of this size, ILO would allocate three international positions. In Ship to Shore, there are two such technical positions at the regional level plus M&E and administration support. This also leads to the technical support for the programme being stretched as well and contributes to longer lead times at the national level.

The programme has been able to leverage technical back-stopper support in Bangkok. Back-stoppers from various units including MIGRANT, LABADMIN, and FUNDMENTALS provide support to the programme. However, while this is useful for Ship to Shore, it does not reduce the impact of the limited programme specific regional staff numbers.

The limited funding for countries means that moving forward trade-offs on efficiencies will need to be considered by ILO. The section on the effectiveness of management arrangements describes some of the challenges linked to communication, many of which occur due to the lack of a dedicated individual to conduct day to day follow up on the communication tools and materials the programme has. Funding this position would only be possible if savings were made in other areas of the programme. The locations where opportunity potential exists to make savings are in Lao PDR and Vietnam. The programme is yet to receive approval from the Government in Vietnam and while the programme has managed to make progress on certain activities, many others remain on hold until approval is granted. Given the programme has about one and a half years left in the funding cycle, a critical review of how possible it is to achieve all the expected results in Vietnam and which

activities are more likely to achieve results in the timeframe and thus be prioritised, should be undertaken by the ILO team. In Lao PDR, the programme has faced challenges because there are very limited numbers of migrants going to work in the fishing industry. As such, the programme is more generally focused on migration than sector specific. Consideration could also be given to whether all the funds in Lao PDR are relevant for the programme, or if some could be redirected to support communication efforts.

**Are the programme activities current being implemented on-time/according to work plans?**

While the programme has made significant progress in achieving the output indicators of the results framework, where starting on the ground activities later in the programme means there is less time for implementation. Implementation agreements with a number of partners have only just been signed or are still in the process of negotiation, which reduces time available for implementation, support, and monitoring. This partly speaks to the ambition of the programme. For example, it has established 15 MRCs in the first two years of the programme which is a significant amount. Beyond this, reasons also include the COVID-19 pandemic, the lengthy bureaucratic processes within ILO for finalising contracts, and delays from partners in responding to requests for information and providing detailed proposals on the purpose of the activities they propose to undertake. However, a further reason, which must be seen as a positive of the Ship to Shore programme, is the insistence of the programme team on ensuring implementation agreements are well structured and clearly define the outcomes of the agreements. A number of stakeholders commented that there had been a lot of back and forth on agreements, with ILO encouraging them to be clearer in what they hoped to achieve. While this may impact the immediate timeliness of the programme, it is positive for the effectiveness and corresponding long-term efficiency of the agreements by improving the quality of the agreements.

A further reflection shared by stakeholders about the programme agreements was that in most cases they were limited to one year. Stakeholder felt this limited the potential impact of the agreement and created greater uncertainty about the long-term funding structure, thus harming sustainability. It is understood that in many cases, this is linked to the agreements being the first agreement in particular areas ILO has made with these entities, and thus is initially done as a trial pilot period. However, longer term efficiency would be improved if ILO could give more concrete funding guarantees for the remainder of the programme for a number of partners.

**Has the programme been able to leverage cost-sharing or in-kind contributions to complement its resources? (e.g., from other ILO projects, slippage funds, inter-agency collaborations and private sector contributions?)**

As previously noted, the programme has been able to identify strong synergies with other programmes, particularly Safe and Fair and TRIANGLE. Cost sharing has been possible in certain areas through the joint use of resources and holding of joint events. There was evidence that Ship to Shore had both gained from the leveraging of joint resources, both internally within ILO, IOM, and UNDP, and externally from the Governments of Indonesia and Lao PDR. To support the evaluation, the programme conducted an analysis of the cost-sharing from these sources, and calculated that \$783,032 had been leveraged to date for various activities. The programme has leveraged resources in every country for at least one activity. Additionally, the programme has also contributed to other programmes through the sharing of its resources. For example, the partnership with BBC Media Action is part of a larger programme which is co-funded through other sources and has allowed a far greater reach of the programme than would otherwise have been the case. Contributions for the baseline survey were also leveraged through all three organisations which allowed for a larger survey to be conducted. The programme has also been able to leverage slippage funding at the end

of 2021 for CENTRAL and FRN to implement additional activities. CENTRAL distributed 584 COVID-19 relief packages and used this a vehicle for conducting safe migration information sessions and data collection. FRN conducted health and safety training for 1,340 migrant fishers.

There are some examples of partners contributing other sources of revenue to support the programme. All three MRC implementers in Cambodia indicated the funds allocated for one year were not sufficient to run the centres in the manner they wished to, and they were prepared to commit their own budget to cover some costs, particularly management oversight themselves. In Thailand, the partnering with established entities, both worker organisations such as FRN, and employer associations, such as TTFA and TTIA, means that the programme's resources are used to provide additional funding or technical support, but administrative and logistical costs and in-kind contributions such as building expenses or management oversight, is provided by the organisation. It is difficult for ILO to track these types of contributions, so it is not possible to know the value of these contributions, however, it was clear from discussions with stakeholders that meaningful contributions were being made.

### 3.5 Effectiveness of Management Arrangements

#### **How effective is the internal management of the programme? (including staffing arrangements and capacities, governance and oversight, work planning, etc.,)**

##### **Internal Management**

A strong internal management system has been developed for the programme. This includes strong internal ILO support to the NPCs from the CTA and TO, as well as inputs from the technical back-stoppers and interest from the Country Directors, as well as functioning oversight committees at the regional and national level, and detailed work planning. Communication between ILO, IOM, and UNDP is addressed in the section below on the value add of the UN agencies.

The programming reporting system goes beyond what is required by the EU. The contribution agreement requires an annual narrative and financial report, which is consolidated by ILO. This includes updated figures on progress towards the outcome and output indicator targets (impact indicators will be measured by the endline study). The programme team also produce quarterly and monthly reports which are submitted to the EU, as well as the ILO Country Offices, which detail activities undertaken regionally and in every country.

Workplans are developed annually for every country and agreed with the NPACs. NPCs reported that they had regular meetings with either the CTA or the TO to review progress on the workplans and agree responses to any challenges which arose. Every NPC voiced satisfaction with the level of support they receive from the regional team

The main caveat to the strong internal management system for ILO is linked to the concern raised in the efficiency section of the report about the level of staffing for the programme. The regional team is limited to two international positions. While the NPCs are experienced in certain aspects of the work, having experience in migration and fishing was understandably not present for every NPC, and support has been needed to raise capacities where there were gaps in experience. While this has been ongoing, only having two regional technical positions, and not having day to day interaction by being based in the country the NPC is limiting to a degree.

#### **Has the communications and visibility strategy been effective in raising the profile of the programme within the target countries and at regional level?**

The programme has developed a series of communication tools. These include a website for the programme and also a website for the Fair Seas Conference. The programme website includes updated news items, the latest Tweets from the CTA, links to various publications including research reports, newsletters, and videos. The newsletters, which are published every few months include details of latest programme activities, such as the opening of MRCs or advocacy meetings with government officials. The website also includes links on some of the resources which the programme has developed including in the language of the migrants the programme is working with, and links to organisations working on migration and fishing sector issues in the region. The Fair Seas Conference website includes the history of the conference, the TOR for the most recent conference, and the agreed plenary resolution.

There has been a significant level of media attention in the programme. The 2021-22 annual report lists 90 links to media articles. There has been coverage in all seven of the countries of implementation, as well as regional coverage. This engagement has been supported through press releases and an op-ed from the programme team.

The programme also produces other communication materials. These include a summary of the first year of the programme, and 'outcome harvesting' stories which give voice to the experiences of migrant workers and are collected to mark International Migrants Day. A photo exhibit was also produced. IEC materials and knowledge products have been translated into national languages, which supports further dissemination. Social media has also been used by the programme and its partners, particularly Facebook in Myanmar through the BBC Media Action's Yar Kyi Yar campaign, which has had considerable reach and provided referrals for the programme.

Although the programme has an impressive website and strong collection of communication materials, there are areas where there are gaps in the communication. The website does not contain links to general technical resources from IOM or UNDP, unlike the links the website has for global ILO resources, although IOM and UNDP do submit news updates for the website. Ensuring their resources are included would strengthen the website. Additionally, there is not a communications plan for the programme, beyond a short table of responsibilities in the team manual and an initial description in the PRODOC of an overall communication strategy. The annual workplan could offer an option for developing an active communications plan which could be reviewed and updated regularly. The budget is also not sufficient to allow for a dedicated communications officer, which the size of the programme would justify, and trade-offs in other areas of spending would be needed in order to recruit such a position.

In addition to the above concerns, a few stakeholders shared with the evaluator, some confusion about the programme. It should be noted that in these cases came from a minority of stakeholders. This included external stakeholders being unclear as to who within ILO was responsible for what activities where there were multiple projects in the country, such as in Indonesia, government officials who work with IOM on the national trafficking referral mechanisms and UNDP on the COMMIT process not being aware that the activities were part of the Ship to Shore programme, a lack of explanation to some stakeholders as to how the COMMIT process works, and in some cases with partners some confusion over what outputs were expected in agreements. Overall, most stakeholders were pleased with the transparency and openness of ILO, IOM, and UNDP. These examples though do demonstrate that awareness of the programme can be strengthened.

**Has the monitoring and evaluation system supported results-based management of the programme?**

The programme has a number of M&E different tools and studies which support the results-based management of the programme. A baseline survey was recently finalised which provides a basis for measuring change at the end of the programme. In 2021, the programme undertook an evaluability study and the EU initiated the SDL exercise, both of which made several recommendations and led to changes in the results framework, particularly the indicators and means of verifications, and other amendments to the M&E system. This evaluation was commissioned as a learning exercise to help develop an action plan for the remainder of the programme.

The day-to-day management of the M&E system is overseen by a national M&E Officer based in the regional office in Bangkok. The M&E Officer manages the collection and compilation of data from the individual countries which is then used to support the compilation of the annual reports. The programme has a guiding M&E manual, which was revised after the evaluability review. The NPCs and their IOM and UNDP counterparts are responsible for collecting country-level information and reporting this to the M&E Officer. The management structure of the programme also supports the M&E system through the regular meetings held by the CTA and TO with the NPCs, including review of progress of annual workplans. The TO has a background in M&E and provides support in designing the M&E system and providing oversight to its implementation.

To date, training on the M&E manual has been piloted in Lao PDR, but has not been rolled out to the other countries. As such partners in 6 of the 7 countries have not received training on the M&E system, although it should be noted that a number of partners have worked on activities such as MRCs or other interventions with ILO in the past. As such for many partners, the M&E processes are not new. As there are a number of different techniques being proposed for data collection including quantitative data collection where definitions need to be standardised, and qualitative techniques such as most significant change and outcome harvesting, undertaking this training as soon as possible is recommended, particularly those who have not conducted similar work before.

Currently, monitoring of the work of the MRCs is focused mainly, but not exclusively, on the outputs of the MRCs. These include recording the numbers of people who receive information materials on safe migration, those who receive pre-departure training, and those using social media for information. There are also targets on the numbers of migrant workers who receive counselling, the numbers referred for complaint cases, and the receiving vocational training and financial support for income generating activities. Some outcome level monitoring is undertaken, specifically programme partners are also asked to collect a small number of outcome harvesting stories (usually 2 men and 2 women per MRC), the value of compensation awarded in complaint cases is recorded, and the number of migrants who find employment after vocational training is obtained through follow-up phone calls. Programme partners running the MRCs shared some had ad hoc systems for following up on the use of the information which is shared by them, but this mainly relies on migrants themselves getting in touch via social media to share their stories. More extensive follow up of users of the MRCs is not conducted, although one partner in Lao PDR did describe a system they have for collecting such data. Strengthening the M&E system to monitor the changes the programme's activities have on migrant women and men and their families, by for example collecting more outcome harvesting stories or MSC stories or ensuring a sampling in the endline survey explicitly follows users of the MRC, would help increase the strength of the results-based monitoring management system.

**Have programmatic, contextual and institutional risks been managed effectively by the programme?**

One of the recommendations of the evaluability review was to prepare guidelines for risk analysis and the development of mitigation measures. The review noted:

“The current version of the M&E plan does not include analysis of risks and mitigation strategies. Such an analysis is also missing in the Action Document, though it been provided in reporting. Clear guidelines should be outlined in the M&E plan of the programme’s approach to risk management.” (Ship to Shore Evaluability Review)

Since the evaluability review, a section on risk management strategy has been added to the M&E plan. This includes outlining the risk management process, defines how the risk register will be managed, and details the communication structure for discussing and sharing risks. The M&E plan also includes the risk register as an annex.

The quarterly and annual reports include a table at the end detailing any additions or amendments to the risk register. The reports also include a situation analysis in the introduction which helps frame the overall context changes and supports the identification of risks. Regular team meetings support the identification and analysis of risks and agreements on mitigation measures.

### **What value added has the UN inter-agency model brought to the programme?**

Internal stakeholders who participated in the evaluation identified some clear value adds of the three UN agencies working together on the programme, but areas for improvement are also apparent. The strongest benefit felt by the programme was identified as the different technical inputs which each agency can give to Ship to Shore’s outputs. This allowed new perspectives to be considered when developing knowledge products which may not be the case if the programme were being implemented individually. The three agencies have also developed different partnerships and connections in the region and are able to bring these to the programme. As a result, a broader range of parties are involved in the programme.

Awareness among stakeholders about the role of all three agencies was limited though. As previously noted, in many cases, the stakeholders the evaluator spoke to about UNDP’s and IOM’s work were confused about why an evaluator from Ship to Shore was meeting them, not being aware that the work on the national and trans-national referral systems was part of the Ship to Shore programme. A similar confusion was seen on very limited occasions with stakeholders who were not clear the national work ILO was doing was part of the same regional programme or if the national activities were separate and distinct Ship to Shore projects. While this confusion does not significantly impact the individual activities being undertaken by the programme, it does demonstrate that the communication of each agency about the programme, particularly IOM and UNDP to their partners about being part of the programme, and ILO about the role of the national actions within the regional programme, could be improved, even if the internal technical support given between the three organisations is strong. As noted in the validity of design section of the report, the theory of change does not currently particularly demonstrate how the work of the three agencies interacts to achieve the impact goal of the programme.

There were mixed findings on the internal communication with the three agencies. While all partners felt a strong relationship had developed as a result of the partnership, recommendations for improvements in communication were given. It was noted that communication on programme activities was often shared quite late, making planning or attendance quite difficult. Communication within countries was mixed as well. There was clearly a strong collaboration between all three agencies in Cambodia who reported coordinating regularly on the programme. In other countries, with the exception of Thailand, NPCs indicated that even in countries where IOM or UNDP have staff



working on the Ship to Shore programme, they had very limited interaction with UNDP or IOM as this was left to the regional team.

### 3.6 Impact Orientation and Sustainability

#### **What initial influence has the programme had on the development of policies and practices at national and regional levels? What is the potential to achieve change by the end of the project?**

As this is the mid-stage of the programme, the achievement of outcomes would be expected to be less advanced. However, it was possible for the evaluation to identify progress towards achieving some of the outcomes. Outcome 1 specifically focuses on the alignment of legal, policy and regulatory frameworks with international labour standards. Outcome 2 focuses on systematic change to ensure laws and policies are implemented effectively by duty-bearers including government officials and employers. Outcome 3 focuses on practices at the migrant worker level, seeking to empower migrants to organise and exercise their rights. It is possible to reflect on the progress in each of these outcomes.

Outcome 1's target is two changes in adherence to international labour standards of legal, policy, and regulatory frameworks. None have been achieved to date, but stakeholders did indicate that achievement of this target was possible. Government representatives from Lao PDR indicated they hoped to work on new policies once the gap analysis was complete. ILO is also advocating for Indonesia and the Philippines to ratify Convention 188. It is unclear if this can be achieved by the end of the programme. ILO could consider what intermediate benchmarks could be used to monitor progress towards ratification could be identified to demonstrate impact even if the final ratification has not been concluded by the end of the programme.

The programme is unlikely to achieve some of the outcome targets in Outcome 2. Indicator 2.1 focuses on the percentage of inspections which lead to enforcement actions in Thailand, Indonesia, and the Philippines. Work with the labour inspectors has not yet started in Indonesia and the Philippines, and thus it is optimistic to think the targets of 10% in fishing will be reached in either country. In Thailand, the enforcement rate did increase from 1% to 2% by the end of year 2 with the enforcement rate in the seafood processing sector remaining the same as the baseline. There was a significant disconnect between the challenges and problems migrant fishers and seafood processing sector workers shared with the evaluator and the understanding of the situation by the labour inspectors. During the FGD, the labour inspectors and interpreters suggested that there were minimal issues faced by fishers, and that concerns such as not receiving contracts in Thai and their own language, having documents confiscated by owners, not being paid through the banks, and being physically threatened were very rare. This was contradicted by both fishers and seafood processing workers (who shared both their challenges and those of their husbands who were fishers). None of the fishers the evaluation spoke to had a copy of their contract in Burmese or were paid through electronic transfer. A number of other issues including threats of, and actual violence were also shared. Without a significant culture shift within the labour inspectorate to recognise these concerns more and identify ways to offer a safe platform for challenges to be shared, it would seem unlikely that the enforcement rate will rise to the current target. This is not a reflection that the programme has not made progress with the labour inspectorate. The work in both the previous and current programme has led to incremental improvements, but the overall target within the results framework was over ambitious given the challenges which exist to effective inspection.

The programme is also behind in the number of transnational referrals made for the protection of trafficking survivors. Outcome indicator 2.2 has a target of 175 was made for the end of year 2, with

62 referrals actually being made with the support of IOM and ILO. Challenges in the identification of trafficking were shared by stakeholders in the evaluation. Progress will also need to be made on the COMMIT process to help achieve this indicator. The final indicator in this outcome, the significance of changes made by private enterprises in the seafood processing sector to ensure gender equality in compliance with ethical standards, will be measured through the collection of most significant change stories in the final year of the programme. TTIA has documented some changes in their reports, and more detailed documentation of the changes through working with TTIA and TTFA should be available for the final evaluation to review. The gender and women empowerment strategy does provide a solid tool to help work towards this target as well

Progress on outcome indicators in outcome 3 is more substantial than outcome 2. The programme has already overachieved on indicator 3.1 for the amount of money awarded to women and men migrant workers to resolve legal cases. However, this is mainly linked to just one country, Vietnam, and the working to ensure awards are spread across all countries would enhance the actual impact of this outcome. Given the engagement of legal aid CSOs in a number of countries recently, a broader spread would be expected by the end of the programme. Indicator 3.2 measures the rate of migrant men and women who are organised into worker organisations. While this did not have a midline target and will be measured in the endline survey, the programme has supported FRN to recruit almost 650 fishers to organising efforts and cross-border engagement between FRN and CLC has also been supported. Work with trade unions in Indonesia and the Philippines is also just beginning so may contribute to this effort by the end of the programme. However, it is very possible that significant progress will be made but not picked up in the endline survey if it uses the same methodology as the baseline. This is because much of the organising efforts are currently in Thailand, and the baseline only looked at returning migrants, which may well not cover those reached by the programme.

The final indicator for outcome 3 is the extent to which support services contribute to the empowerment of migrant women and men, which will be measured through the collection of outcome harvesting stories. Five of these stories have already been collected.

The role of the UN agencies in facilitating communication cross-regionally between stakeholders in different countries, as well as different levels of stakeholders within a country was highlighted as one of the significant value-adds of the programme and a level where significant impact can occur as a result.

### **What strategies have been applied to ensure the achievement of lasting results after the completion of the programme?**

Given the broad nature of the programme, and that in except Thailand, the programme is new to the country, there are challenges in ensuring sustainability of the actions beyond the programme, although these are not insurmountable. Institutionalising changes takes time and often requires support beyond the life cycle of a programme. Ship to Shore has used certain strategies to help strengthen the long-term sustainability of its work.

The focus on supporting the development of legal, policy, and regulatory frameworks in Outcome 1, can help ensure the sustainability of the results of the programme through institutionalising changes within government. The key to sustainability of both the outputs and any potential outcomes is to ensure the changes are not only developed and approved but are implemented in practice. The challenges in ensuring greater enforcement of actions for labour standards infractions in the fishing sector by labour inspectors even after law changes and training, demonstrate this process can be lengthy and require ongoing support and interventions.

Linked to the issue of ensuring the need to ensure long-term plans are developed with governments for completing work on policies which are not complete by the end of the programme. there is support given for finishing off those which start but aren't complete by the end of the programme. For example, it is possible to envisage a scenario where considerable progress has been made in preparing the groundwork for a country to ratify C.188, but the process of ratification has not been finalised. Sustainability could be strengthened in two ways in this eventuality. This would include planning how to include support on this work in other ILO programmes. For example, in Indonesia, there are two other projects working on the fishing sector which could take this work forward. For other actions, ensuring they are either part of the next phase of Ship to Shore if there is one, or included in regional or national interventions will be important. Mapping these out and ensuring close coordination with country offices would support this. Additionally, specifically to C.188, ILO could consider making a greater global push through a campaign for the ratification of C.188.

The programme supports two significant regional programmes, the COMMIT process through UNDP and the Fair Seas Labour Conference through ILO. The COMMIT process is considerably more established than the Fair Seas Labour Conference. It does though have the challenge, that many trans-national mechanisms have, of whether the process can operate without a UN agency acting as Secretariat and funding the process. In the case of the COMMIT process this has two distinct elements. The issue of the Secretariat has been previously discussed, including having a revolving chair by member states, but member states believe the neutrality of UNDP plays a valuable role. The second element of funding had made more progress prior to the COVID-19 pandemic as UNDP had been able to engage with member states on developing a self-funding structure. However, since the pandemic and the ensuing pressure on government budgets, this discussion has been sidelined.

Focusing more specifically on the activities linked to the COMMIT process at this juncture, the approach of combining attempts to build a trans-national referral process with the work by IOM to encourage states to develop national referral structures appears sound from the standpoint of strengthening the impact and sustainability of the work, so long as it is possible to get both systems operational by the end of the programme.

The Fair Seas Labour Conference is a much newer initiative, spearheaded by ILO. One conference was held in the previous phase of the programme. A second conference was held in Bali in September 2022. This was generally praised as successful by external stakeholders who believed it strengthened their opportunities to network and learn from other countries working on similar issues and ensuring interaction between the social partners for the different countries. From a sustainability point of view, it would be unlikely that the Conference will be able to operate independently of ILO by the end of this programme. Although discussion was held on where the Conference could be housed in future, with one possible option being within ASEAN, no decisions were made, and it would probably be sensible to allow for another one or two conferences to cycle through before moving forward. At this point, benefits and drawbacks of the Conference would be clearer to stakeholders.

One finding linked to the Fair Seas Conference which came from stakeholders was there were mixed viewpoints on whether concrete actionable points had come from the Conference. A plenary resolution was agreed at the end of the conference which details some key areas where stakeholders agreed attention was needed, and an agreement reached to establish Ad Hoc Working Groups. Developing shorter and less formal communication materials summarising the results and agreed joint actions in a short knowledge product would strengthen short-term sustainability of the Conference for the remainder of the programme and beyond.

The programme has used a mixed approach to working with entities establishing MRCs. In many cases the MRCs have been inaugurated in existing structures such as government employment centres, and often working with implementers who have run (or are still running) MRCs before through the TRIANGLE or Safe and Fair programme. This strengthens the potential for sustainability, as it firstly reduces infrastructure overheads and ensures the MRCs are more likely to be institutionalised within existing structures. The experience of previous ILO programmes also gives indications of the strong possibilities for sustainability of the MRCs. The MRC model run by ILO is well accepted by government and other stakeholders in the target countries. As such, running an MRC supported by ILO, brings a level of recognition which helps establish the MRC in the local area. Individual evidence of this can already be seen in the MRC implemented by CENTRAL where government officials and trade unions are using the MRC building for community meetings and attending the outreach meetings in the extended community. A number of other organisations have also been able to leverage other opportunities including funding, networking, training, and consultation through being involved in the MRC delivery. This should help strengthen sustainability for the work of these organisations beyond the programme.

Some of the MRCs, particularly those with CSOs require new offices and structures in new locations. Evaluation findings identified a mixed likelihood of long-term sustainability in these cases. Some stakeholders, such as all three organisations / departments in Cambodia reported supplementing the budget given by ILO with their own funds, which bodes well for longer-term ownership of the structures. In other locations, such as Lao PDR, the implementers of the MRCs reported that it would be difficult to continue the centres without funds from ILO and that the short-term nature of the implementation agreements created uncertainty for their work. Other partners gave a more middle ground response to this question, indicating they would continue to keep working but the volume and pace would drop significantly.

*“Without ILO’s support it would be very difficult to continue what we are doing. However, even without the support it will not stop completely what we will be doing. We will continue our efforts to support the workers. However, the pace will be a lot slower in the future. We will continue individually to support the workers.” (CSO Official, Myanmar)*

In general, the main challenges to ensuring the gains of the programme are retained before the end of the funding cycle were the delays in finalising agreements and the short-term nature of the contracts. As discussed in the efficiency section, the back and forth with the partners to ensure concrete targets are part of the agreements and new partnerships can be piloted may increase the long-term efficiency of the programme, but does also may reduce sustainability if partners do not feel confident to undertake long-term planning and there is not enough time to accompany them in learning new practices. Finalising the agreements as soon as possible and where feasible discussing longer term funding and planning would help address this concern, although this is of course reliant on the proposals for activities from the partners being sufficiently detailed and including the logical steps for ensuring the good quality of results. It is worth noting as well, that this process is also part of the capacity building for partners as well which can support longer-term sustainability by improving their ability to assess funds from other funding sources through well-developed proposals.

While much of the work in the outcome 2 has focused on institutionalising system changes to support more adherence to international labour standards, challenges remain in ensuring lasting benefits. While there is evidence there have been improvements in the labour inspection system in Thailand in recent years, without strong leadership from both the central authorities and provincial

authorities which empowers labour inspections to be more pro-active in identifying violations and enforcing corrective actions, the concerns identified in the evaluation and other studies will remain.

To date, most of the work with employers has come through the GLP and through the engagement IOM has undertaken with businesses including research across the supply chain. The GLP has proven to be sustainable from the previous phase of the programme and some impacts in terms of broadening the involvement of migrant workers in worker committees have been identified, as well as other improvements in working conditions. However, ongoing attention will be needed to ensure the continued utility of the GLP. Recommendations to ensure this were made in a knowledge product the programme produced, and the industry associations made agreements on areas the industry should focus on moving forward. Of these recommendations, the one which was most significant in the findings of the evaluation was the need to ensure CSOs are actively involved in the activities of the GLP, such as factory visits and the logging of grievances.

A further area for strengthening the long-term benefits of the programme which was raised by a number of stakeholders was expanding the focus on the supply chain of the fishing and seafood processing sector. This aligns with some of the work IOM is conducting, and could be feasibly linked to the GLP, with the caveat that some of the work IOM conducts under CREST is conducted with non-disclosure agreements, and the links would need to focus on the publicly available element of CREST.

**What are the programme's most significant contributions to date to an enhanced knowledge base on labour migration in the fishing and seafood processing sectors within the target countries and region likely to be? Assess to what extent the practical tools developed by the programme (e.g., Policy briefs, training materials, Codes of conduct) are likely to produce a direct impact if their use is extensively promoted, or even better enforced?**

While the programme has produced a number of knowledge products, many of these have only recently been launched and many are still in process. As such it is difficult to assess at this stage of the programme, which are most likely to have the most significant contribution to the knowledge base, although some initial reflections are possible.

Government officials were most likely to reference gap analyses related to their legal frameworks as either being documents which had proved useful, or they believed would be useful for them once finalised. Support related to cross-border agreements for bilateral MOUs were also highlighted as being of use for them.

It would be important to recognise an increase in the knowledge base can come from capacity building activities, mentoring, and sharing of resources, as well as the formal production of knowledge products. Operators of the MRCs referred to the importance of receiving resources and training from ILO, either in reference to those they have already received or through identifying material they needed to receive. Reflections on the importance of cross-learning between stakeholders within countries and cross-border were also raised by evaluation participants. Stakeholders believed the programme has successfully offered a number of opportunities for this, for example through the Fair Seas Conference, but that the potential for more existed, such as through the formalisation of learning networks by MRC implementers.

As previously noted, the programme has developed strong synergies and interaction with other ILO, IOM, and UNDP programmes. This includes providing strong contributions to knowledge products produced by these programmes, including CREST and TRIANGLE. In addition, the programme has also contributed to research and events organised by other organisations and governments. This

includes interviews for research products and needs assessments, contributions to academic books, and presenting at university conferences. A number of contributions to ASEAN regional fora on topics relevant to the programme.

### **Have there been any unintended or negative impacts of the programme for women and men migrant workers in fishing and seafood processing sectors?**

The evaluation did not identify any negative impacts of the programme. However, greater attention to protection risks within the information given to migrant workers could help mitigate risks they face when addressing grievances. Discussion with staff and volunteers working in the MRCs indicated that much of the information focused on increasing awareness of labour rights and mechanisms for addressing grievances, with the goal to empower workers to access their rights. However, as is clear from the FGDs with migrant workers in Thailand, this does come with the potential risks of repercussions on the workers from the employers or the authorities. Although the sample for the evaluation was limited, this concern did not always appear to be accounted for:

*‘Since we have distributed the (MRC) business card, the employer doesn’t dare to violate the labour rights anymore.’ (MRC community volunteer)*

Ensuring outreach staff are more aware of some of the risks<sup>14</sup> and can also share mitigation approaches with migrant workers on how to consider safe avenues for address violations would help reduce the potential for negative outcomes. This concern came from an MRC where training from ILO is pending, and may be less of a concern with more established MRCs. Additionally, training on dispute resolution is planned in Cambodia and the programme is working with experienced legal support and access to justice organisations in Cambodia and Thailand, which may help address this. It is raised in the report though as an area for ILO to be aware of.

## **3.7 Gender Equality**

### **What progress has been made towards key results on gender equality and women’s empowerment by the programme?**

The gender equality and women’s empowerment strategy has recently been completed. A gender taskforce of programme staff has been appointed, and has met twice. The first meeting focused mainly on setting out the expectations for the taskforce, with the second reviewing upcoming actions to address gender equality including a launch of the strategy, including gender equality as a cross-cutting theme in the mid-term evaluation, including gender in the M&E training, developing guideline for gender budgeting, and review the inclusion of gender in the workplans at the reflection retreat. The programme has not yet though held the training on the gender and empowerment strategy and is thus at an early stage in making progress towards key results.

The strategy report makes a series of recommendations on activities on gender equality and women’s empowerment in each output of the results framework. It is probably beyond the capacities of the programme to implement all of these suggestions, but an action plan detailing which will be addressed and how it will be undertaken would support the process for the remainder of the programme.

---

<sup>14</sup> Potential risks the risk of retaliation for making a complaint such as having a contract terminated, wage theft, treated poorly at work, physical violence, and verbal abuse. Fishers in particular are vulnerable given the offshore nature of the work they undertaken.

There was a mixed response from stakeholders over recognising the differing experiences and needs of men and women migrants. Some stakeholders indicated there was very little difference between men and women migrants, beyond acknowledging under this programme that there was a difference in the industry women and men would work in and others expressed paternalistic attitudes (e.g. ‘women are at more risk because they are weaker’). However, many stakeholders were able to identify key differences and challenges and in some cases express solutions from the programme. This demonstrates there is quite a range of awareness and capacity on gender responsive work and training and on-going mentoring will be needed.

There was virtually no indication from external stakeholders that challenges linked to problematic behaviour of men are a challenge both for men working on fishing boats and also a barrier, along with key cultural taboos, for women to enter the on-boat fishing industry. This also provides an avenue for Ship to Shore to consider work on.

Issues related to the labour inspection system and gender equality are well documented in the strategy and in other documents. One additional area of interest separate from the traditional focus on exploitation and risks faced by women migrant workers in these reports, was a concern from a government stakeholder about the risks to the safety of women labour inspectors. The majority of labour inspectors in Thailand are women, and they are often required to go to PIPO centres for inspections after the hours of daylight, where they are entering into very male dominated environments, where there is already considerable pressure to minimise reporting of and taking action against violations by owners and captains.

#### **Are resources allocated sufficiently so the programme may achieve the expected results on gender equality and women’s empowerment activities?**

The Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment Strategy recommends an indicator target of 25% of the programme budget being allocated for activities focused on gender equality. The draft of the annual report for year 2, reports that 23% of the annual budget was spent on such activities. The programme has developed guidelines for gender budgeting. These include the indicator the programme has included of ‘% of programme budget spent on activities that disproportionately benefit women or specifically focus on issues of gender equality and women’s empowerment.’ What the guidelines do not include is what the definition of ‘disproportionately’ means, although the proportion of women participating in each activity is included in the annual report, and thus there is clear transparency to the donor on what is being counted, who can then ask for clarity from the programme if they did not agree with the classification of an activity.

#### **Is the M&E system sufficient to allow for the adequate gathering of disaggregated data by sex to determine ongoing and endline differences in the programme results for women and men?**

The annual reports for year 1 and year 2 show the programme is collecting gender-disaggregated data for the numbers of migrants provided with support and for attendance at training by programme stakeholders. At the moment though, this monitoring focuses purely on the counting numbers of men and women involved in the programme. The Gender and Women’s Empowerment Strategy recommends the results framework adds an indicator of “Number of women in supervisory roles in stakeholder organizations, committees, events and workplaces associated with the programme.” The programme has decided not to include this in the M&E plan as it is believed it would be difficult to measure. At the mid-stage of the programme, this may be the case and perhaps not a priority compared to other monitoring needs, however, other ILO programmes globally working in factories do include this as an indicator, and considering how to include a similar indicator when the next phase of the programme is designed could strengthen future results

frameworks. Additionally, qualitative assessments of the level of decision-making authority which women attending capacity building training have, would further strengthen the ability of the programme to understand the effect it is having on gender empowerment.

### 3.8 Country Specific Findings

#### **Cambodia**

##### **Main Evaluation Findings**

Cambodia is a sending country for migrants going to work in the fishing and seafood processing sector. Currently there is not a sector specific MOU with Thailand regarding the sending of workers in the fishing sector, which makes the regulation of migration in this sector more difficult. The Government of Cambodia has expressed an interest in agreeing a MOU with Thailand and has requested ILO's support in this manner. The programme has conducted a gap analysis of the legal frameworks for providing support to migrant workers. The programme supports three MRCs, implemented by CENTRAL, CLC, and the Department of Manpower. To date the CENTRAL MRC is the most advanced in activities. The programme has also signed an agreement with a legal aid CSO, LSCW, to provide legal support and advice to the MRCs.

- Strong collaboration between ILO, IOM, and UNDP has been developed. However, the awareness of the three agencies involvement in the programme is quite limited among external stakeholders. For example, the government agencies working on the national referral system for trafficking and the COMMIT process were unaware the activities are funded through Ship to Shore.
- Contracting with different types of stakeholders to implement the MRC provides opportunities for learning and monitoring the different benefits migrants experience. However, the learning approach to the MRCs would need to be strengthened to facilitate this. A system for conducting follow-ups with users of the MRCs is not yet in place.
- Stakeholders linked to the MRCs identified differences in the needs of information between men and women migrants, and expressed potential solutions to help strengthen the targeting of information, which could be explored further in the second half of the programme.
- MRC implementers shared that they were investing their own resources into the running of the MRCs. All three implementers felt the budget given by ILO was low for running a centre, particularly in order to ensure good outreach in the community. However, the use of their own funds bodes well for long-term sustainability.
- A strong value add of the UN agencies which was identified by a number of stakeholders was the ability to access stakeholders across the social partners and different ministries and support cross-border collaboration.

#### **Indonesia**

##### **Main Evaluation Findings**

Work to date in Indonesia has mainly focused on outcome 1 and working on the policy framework for fishing and with IOM's work in outcome 2 on mainstreaming the issue of forced labour and trafficking in persons in fishing sectors at the policy and local level. A significant proportion of the fishing and seafood sector workers in Indonesia are not migrants, and thus the focus on decent work as well as migrant labour is relevant for this sector. Responsibilities for oversight of the sector is currently split between a number of ministries, and much of the work ILO is conducting, is supporting the harmonization of laws and cooperation between the ministries. The programme is



aiming to support the piloting of joint inspections aboard fishing vessels, and is working both at the provincial level in West and Central Java, and the national level. To do this it is engaging closely with the labour inspectorate both the provincial and central level to develop access and collaboration with the labour inspectors' counterparts to jointly inspect fishing vessels. The initial engagement with the labour inspectorate is a critical element in achieving this.

- Many of the activities are just starting. The programme is finalising implementation agreements with social partners to implement work in outcomes 2 and 3. These are only just or not yet finalised. While the delay in agreeing implementation agreements has a potential impact on the delivery of the programme, the programme has taken the approach of ensuring there is strong joint collaboration on the development of agreements and establishing clear deliverables in the agreements. This should help the overall quality of delivery as well as strengthening the long-term sustainability of the partnerships.
- There are two other national projects which work on the fishing sector, which Ship to Shore collaborates with. This leads to both strong synergies and collaboration between the projects, but also at times confusion among external stakeholders as to which project is responsible for which activity. The Country Office has attempted to address this by holding joint NPACs with the key stakeholders.

## **Lao PDR**

### **Main Evaluation Findings**

ILO has a different staffing structure in Lao PDR. Instead of a NPC and Administration and Finance Assistant, activities are overseen by a Senior Programme Assistant, with technical and managerial support being provided by the Technical Officer from Bangkok. The programme has worked on a scoping study for Lao PDR migrants in the fishing and seafood process sector. This report is awaiting final editing and launching. The programme also worked on an analysis of the legal framework for recruitment for the seafood processing and fishing sectors. The Ministry of Labour has agreed to facilitate a response to the study and are particularly interested in the costs of recruitment and system for logging grievances. The programme has also worked with the government and Village Focus International to implement MRCs and supported the government with COVID-19 relief for returning migrants in 2021.

- A key challenge the programme faces is the limited number of migrants going to work as fishers and seafood processing workers in Thailand. To date, both MRCs have had limited success of identifying individuals planning to work in these sectors.
- The approach of engaging an NGO to implement an MRC has had significant positive benefits as a result of the pro-activity of the MRC. The NGO has implemented a system for following up with migrants using the MRC. While the results of this are limited to date, the approach is one which could be replicated elsewhere.
- Reference was made by stakeholders to the fact that there were limited staff resources in Lao PDR and many requests needed to go to Bangkok. While the quality of the technical support was not questioned, the capacity to respond in a timely manner was noted due to the limited human resources.
- Both the government and the NGO partner for the MRCs suggested they would be unable to continue the work in those particular MRCs without the ongoing support of ILO.
- The short-term nature of the funding agreements was cited as an area of instability as a result of a lack of clarity on longer term support.

- There was limited awareness of the gendered differences men and women experience in migration, particularly among government stakeholders.

## **Myanmar**

### **Main Evaluation Findings**

Work in Myanmar has been significantly affected by the 2021 military coup. The programme has followed the UN rules of non-engagement with the military regime, which in practical terms means the non-engagement of employers' associations as well. The programme developed a reprogramming memo which set out the adaptations in each output by all three agencies. In general, the programme has implemented activities through CSOs. Even these have proved challenging as the safety of staff from CSOs and workers' organisations is a significant concern in Myanmar. The programme in Myanmar is through contributing significantly to the numbers of migrant reached in outreach campaigns under indicator 1.3.2

- There was significant appreciation of the efforts by the programme to adjust to the new realities in Myanmar. Frustration was apparent among stakeholders but this was focused on frustration about the limits placed on their operating capacities by the government's actions rather than discontent with ILO, IOM, or UNDP. Satisfaction with the UN agencies' support was high. There was some concern raised though about how to provide support to survivors of trafficking as a result of the non-engagement policy with the government.
- The programme has been able to facilitate connections between organisations working in Myanmar and organisations working in Thailand. This helps increase the engagement with the target community and supports the organisations' learning processes about the experiences of fishers.

## **The Philippines**

### **Main Evaluation Findings**

The Philippines has seen a reorganisation of government ministries, combined with the Presidential election, which has delayed progress in outcome 1 of the programme. The newly formed Department of Migrant Workers will lead the NPAC but the department is not yet fully operational and is waiting for the Appropriations Act to be passed. ILO is finalising a scoping study on Filipino migrant fishers which will help engage the new department in developing policies on fishers. The government expressed an eagerness to see this report finalised. The programme plans to work with labour inspectors in PIPO centres to improve the quality of inspections.

- The programme in the Philippines has some unique elements which differ from other countries. Following on from work initially done under the FAIR programme, Ship to Shore works to strengthen the capacity of journalists to report on migration related issues. The programme is working to engage community newspapers. The programme is also working with the National Maritime Polytechnic to design a curriculum for fishers. Under the programme, this course will be offered free of charge to fishers, but will involve a course fee following the end of Ship to Shore. Working to highlight the benefits of the course to the fisher community will be important for sustainability. ILO is working on making the course more accessible to fishers through outreach programmes, and lowering costs.
- The Philippines also has a significant seafood processing sector with workers mainly being non-migrant workers. Engagement with the trade unions and employers' federations are still being finalised and so are difficult to assess for the evaluation.

## **Thailand**

### **Main Evaluation Findings**

The programme evolved from the first phase of Ship to Shore, which was implemented exclusively in Thailand (beyond some inter-regional activities). As such much of the activities in Thailand build on previous work which was carried out in the first phase. Most notably, the programme has continued its work on increasing the effectiveness of the joint PIPO inspections and supporting the GLP and the industry associations which implement it. A significant policy change came through the ratification of C.188 in the first phase of the programme. Activities in this phase of the programme are more linked to the implementation of policies and guidelines linked to C.188 rather than supporting the drafting of new laws, although some support has been given in on this front.

- The programme is working with an established workers' organisation, FRN, to support FRN's attempts to organise more migrants in workers organisations and to implement MRCs in four locations. As FRN is supported by the International Transport Workers Federation, the FRN is not particularly reliant on ILO to maintain these structures, instead the funds complement and help them expand their work. This supports the long-term sustainability of the initiatives. The FRN may be able to provide mentoring support to workers' organisations and CSOs in sending countries, although the MRC model will not be fully replicable given the different functions of an MRC in a sending country than one in a receiving country.
- There was a clear disconnection between the descriptions of violations and abuse migrant fishers experience and the understanding of the labour inspections on the levels of violations. This suggests significant work is still needed to ensure greater number of enforcement actions.
- Stakeholders were generally appreciative of the work being done by ILO, IOM, and UNDP. However, the significant reduction in staffing for Thailand from the first to the second phase of the programme was referenced by stakeholders who did believe the programme in Thailand specifically received less support than before.
- There appeared to be a greater recognition in Thailand than in other countries of the integrated nature of the work of ILO, IOM, and UNDP. Stakeholders linked to the national and international referral mechanisms on trafficking who worked with IOM and UNDP were aware that the work was part of the Ship to Shore programme, and those who worked with ILO specifically were more aware than in other countries of IOMs and UNDPs role.

## **Vietnam**

### **Main Evaluation Findings**

Some activities in Vietnam have been hampered by the delay in gaining permission from the government for the programme. Request for permission was submitted in 2021 but to date is still pending. This is not unique to the Ship to Shore programme. A number of UN programmes have authorisation pending. For example, the TRIANGLE programme has not had its reauthorization processed. The programme has the priorities of Government and the Party over the year 2022-2022 on policy reform and information dissemination (Sub-Law Development, Party Directive 20 and Information dissemination on the Law, in coordination with TRIANGLE and Safe and Fair. Activities have been limited to mainly work on policy reforms, as well as working with TRIANGLE to disseminate information on the fishing sector to migrants through three existing MRCs. Vietnam was also included in the baseline study undertaken by the programme.

- It is difficult to assess the programme too deeply in Vietnam as a result of the delays to implementation caused by the lack of programme approval.
- Despite the delays, the programme has been able to respond well to Government priorities on policy reform in labour migration. The programme, in collaboration with other ILO programmes provided detailed support and feedback to the government on the revision and adoption of five subordinate laws on the Law on Contract-Based Overseas Vietnamese Workers. These policies have relevance to the programme as they cover the fishing sector in a number of areas.
- The programme has also given feedback to the review of the Communist Party's new Directive on Labour Migration. The directive was made public in late 2022 and included many of the inputs and suggestions of ILO including reducing fees and costs to migrant workers, transparency of costs, inspection of recruitment agencies, and reducing irregular labour migration.
- There were repeated comments from stakeholders in Vietnam on the need to work on the corridors of migration to Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan. Although the programme intends to conduct a scoping study to understand the needs of migrant fishers in these corridors, it is beyond the scope of the programme to provide more detailed assistance such as establishing MRCs or supporting legal aid organisations unlike the approach which is possible with the Cambodia, Lao PDR, and Myanmar corridors.
- The programme has undertaken some work with the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development to pilot a model of improvement of labour standards for working on marine vessels in Vietnam. Similarly, to the Philippines and Indonesia, there is a significant domestic fishing population which could be relevant for the programme.

## 4. Conclusions, Recommendations, Lessons Learned and Emergent Good Practices

### 4.1 Conclusions

The Ship to Shore programme has made a strong start towards achievement of its outcomes and outputs despite operating at a time of significant disruption globally from the COVID-19 pandemic and regionally as a result of the 2021 Myanmar coup. The programme successfully established a full and coherent programme team and developed working modalities between its three implementing agencies. Important decisions will need to be taken to ensure continued momentum, catch-up where there have been delays, and reallocate resources if necessary, but the programme should be able to achieve many of its planned results by the end of the funding cycle.

- **Relevance:** The programme responds to the major vulnerabilities of migrant workers and their families and aligns with national needs and international frameworks. The asymmetric nature of design and implementation allows the programme to ensure relevance in the different contexts of the countries of implementation.
- **Validity of Design:** The programme is ambitious in scope and developments through the pandemic and the coup in Myanmar have made the context more challenging. The programme's different elements are logically connected.
- **Intervention Progress and Effectiveness:** The programme has made positive progress in achieving most, although not all, the outputs of the results framework, and in many cases has already achieved the target indicator for the end of the programme with high satisfaction being recorded among programme stakeholders.

- **Efficiency of Resource Allocation:** The budget of the programme is spread fairly thin across seven countries and the volume of demands on the regional team in particular is high. The programme has though been able to leverage good synergies with other UN programmes on migrant and decent work.
- **Effectiveness of Management Arrangements:** The programme has a good internal management system, although communication between the three UN agencies could be improved.
- **Impact Orientation and Sustainability:** Identifying progress toward impact goals is challenging at this point in the programme. There are good indications of sustainability from policy work and previous experience with implementing MRCs, although the level of potential sustainability appears to vary from country to country
- **Gender Equality:** The programme has recognised the importance of gender mainstreaming in its programming through the commissioning of the Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment Strategy. Several of the recommendations have already been acted on and the programme can utilise its effective workplan system to ensure the other points are included in each country’s workplan for the remaining two years of the programme.

#### 4.2 Recommendations

Recommendations	Addressed To	Priority and Timeframe	Resource Implications
<b>Programme Activities</b>			
1. Various recommendations on the MRCs were identified including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure training on MRC manual is given as early as possible in the implementation stage.</li> <li>• Set up a coordination structure between the implementing partners, including exchange visits to learn best practices from each other.</li> <li>• Provide training to strengthen awareness of protection risks to migrants who file complaints, try to unionise, ask for pay increase etc.</li> </ul>	ILO programme team	Medium Ongoing	Staff time, workshop and exchange visit costs
2. Ensure the recommendations of the Gender and Women’s Empowerment Strategy are incorporated into the annual work plans and work planning with partners. There are many recommendations in strategy and the programme needs to finalise which it has the capacity to respond to.	ILO, IOM, and UNDP programme team	High ASAP	Would depend on what recommendations are implemented
3. Consider options for how to expand work with the industry association and employers to other parts of the supply chain including the smaller factories and the sub-contractors. This could include expanding the GLP to address these issues and building on the work IOM is doing on the issue.	ILO and IOM	Medium Ongoing	Would depend upon they type of activities planned
4. Ensuring work on trafficking is constantly adapting to new challenges and the frameworks are flexible enough to adapt to these. This was a recommendation given by a number of	IOM and UNDP	Medium Ongoing	Staff time

<p>stakeholders in both Thailand and Cambodia who identified that the nature of trafficking and the approaches used by traffickers is constantly adapting, and believed it was important to ensure the frameworks developed are adaptive and responsive to this.</p> <p>It would be important under this programme to ensure the adaptations retain relevance to the Ship to Shore programme objectives.</p>			
<p>5. Draft sustainability plans for regional forums and processes. Both the COMMIT process and for the SEA Forum have sustainability concerns linked to the role of the UN agency, ownership of the process, and how the process could continue if not led by the UN agency. There are at different stages of implementation and there are different contexts involved with them, so require different approaches, but drafting plans which outline what sustainability will look like in the long run would form useful basis for discussions with key stakeholders.</p>	ILO and UNDP	Ongoing Medium	Staff time
<p>6. Conduct research on experiences of persons with disabilities at different stages of migration cycle. There is a dearth of information on disability and migration. Increase research into the number of persons with disabilities migrating, the barriers they face in the migration cycle, for experiences of migrants who have family members with disabilities, and how migrants who acquire disabilities reintegrate on return, would help identify programming options. This may be outside the scope of this programme but should be considered in the next phase or in new projects when they are developed.</p> <p>In this specific programme, adding questions on disability into the endline survey can provide some initial data.</p>	ILO, IOM, and UNDP	Medium In new projects	Consultancy fees
<b>Communication</b>			
<p>7. Consider reallocating funds to allow for the recruitment of a Communications Officer who could manage the day-to-day communication of the programme. This would support the strengthening external stakeholders' awareness of the Ship to Shore programme and the resources available. The programme has a considerable number of knowledge products and communication tools but needs more human resources to harness these and ensure they are</p>	ILO programme team and EU	High ASAP	Would require budget reallocation

<p>utilised effectively. This position could also contribute to advocacy campaigns such as a more coordination campaign regionally and potentially globally for the ratification of C.188. Establishing this position would though require trade-offs in the implementation of activities though.</p>			
<p>8. Continue to strengthen communication between ILO, UNDP, and IOM, particular in the planning of activities and strategic outreach/communications activities to ensure equal visibility in addition to improving stakeholder awareness of each agency's role in the programme. This would contribute to a more coordinated approach at key programme events, improve stakeholders' awareness of the contribution of all three agencies within the programme, and harness the value add of the three agencies better.</p>	ILO, IOM, and UNDP programme team	High Ongoing	None
<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>			
<p>9. Review the theory of change- consider how the different outcomes build on each other. This exercise would support the refreshing of ideas of how the different elements of the programme interact with each other to achieve the intended impact. Attention should be paid to how the separate work of ILO, IOM, and UNDP interacts to produce the pathways of change, as well as what connections exist between other migration and fishing programmes implemented in the region, and the different strategies for particular corridors of implementation and different strategies for working with migrant and local fisher communities. The exercise would support initial discussions on what the next phase of the programme would look like, as well as providing an internal opportunity for the regional team, NPCs, and UNDP and IOM to work together to develop how the work in the different countries contributes to the overall impact of the programme. This is not intended as an exercise to restructure the programme but one to reflect on the theory behind the programme and how this is working in practice and ensure the goal in the M&amp;E manual to 'support continuous improvement in understanding of the linkages between the activities and their intended long-term impact' is achieved</p>	Programme team (including ILO, IOM and UNDP)	High Early in 2023	Time and potentially flight and accommodation costs if conducted in person

<p>10. Consider, if possible, an assessment of the MRCs, their modality, and impact, across ILO programmes.</p> <p>The programme does not currently conduct follow up assessments of how most users of the MRC utilise the information they receive, what change it creates for them, or the outcome of their migration experience. ILO (and IOM) have implemented the MRC model for a number of years in different programmes, and while there have been some reviews of the modalities and outcomes, an updated assessment of the MRCs could be of benefit to Ship to Shore and other programmes in the future.</p>	<p>ILO programme team and other ILO programmes</p>	<p>Medium Before the end of the programme</p>	<p>Consultant fees (costs could potentially be shared between programmes)</p>
<p>11. Work to ensure the endline survey can measure the impact of the programme on migrant and country of origin workers who utilised the programme's services by ensuring they are included in the endline sample. If the endline follows the same methodology as the baseline, it will survey a sample of migrants who have returned, but not specifically capture migrants who used the programmes' services. While this approach would be relevant for longitudinal study over several phases, the length of time of this phase will probably mean many of the workers in the survey migrated before the programme began its services or did not receive any information or orientation.</p> <p>This issue could be addressed by having a control group of general population migrants and a comparison group of migrants drawn randomly from the MRC's beneficiary cards.</p> <p>Expanding the volume of outcome harvesting stories or collection stories of most significant change from the users of the MRCs, could also contribute to this.</p>	<p>ILO programme team</p>	<p>High ASAP</p>	<p>Would depend on the approach taken but is already included in the programme budget</p>
<p><b>Country Specific Recommendations</b></p>			
<p><b>Cambodia</b></p>			
<p>Develop a sharing platform for the users of the MRCs. This would allow discussion on common challenges, and the identification of solutions, as well as the sharing of resources which are developed. Including MRCs implemented through other programmes such as TRIANGLE and Safe and Fair would support synergies with other programmes.</p>	<p>Ship to Shore and other migration programmes. MRC implementer</p>	<p>Medium Ongoing</p>	<p>Staff time-potential budget for exchange visits</p>



Ensure the good collaboration between ILO, IOM, and UNDP extends to promoting awareness of the other agencies work in Ship to Shore, and clarity to external stakeholders on what activities are included with the programme.	IOM and UNDP	Medium Ongoing	None
Continue to support the development of the bilateral MOU between Thailand and Cambodia on the fishing industry.	ILO	High Ongoing	Should be withing existing programme budget
<b>Indonesia</b>			
The joint NPAC approach which has been implemented by the Country Director is a positive approach to ensuring collaboration and synergies between the projects and not overloading the same external stakeholders with constant meetings. However, one potential drawback to this, which needs attention, is some confusion among stakeholders about who in each project is responsible for what. Ensuring greater clarity of responsibilities would help address this and build on the positive structure for NPACs which has been developed.	ILO Country Office	Medium Ongoing	None
A number of activities are only just beginning and given the limited time left in the programme, this makes it challenging to ensure long-lasting impact for migrant and non-migrant workers. The programme should review all activities and consider what the long-term expectations are. For example, how will the MRCs be funded after the programme? Additionally, as experience with Thailand shows, enhancing the labour inspection process is a long-term activity which requires commitment from both the central and provincial authorities. This will require support beyond this phase of Ship to Shore. Developing a long-term approach to supporting the labour inspection system, is critical to ensuring significant impact can be achieved.	Programme team	High	Staff time Identifying longer term funding opportunities
<b>Lao PDR</b>			
Conduct an internal review of what impact the programme will be likely to have on the sector given the limited number of migrants who work in the seafood processing and fishing sectors. Consider what value for money impact this has the programme and whether some funds should be reallocated as a result.	Programme team	High ASAP	Potential reallocation of budget
Capitalise the approach used by Village Focus International for conducting follow ups of the MRCs and assess whether this could be used by other partners in the programme, both in Lao PDR and in other countries.	Other MRC implementer and ILO programmes working on MRCs	Medium Ongoing	Staff time

<b>Myanmar</b>			
Continue to support interaction between CSOs in Myanmar and Thailand. This is a point of potential significant value add of the programme considering the challenges of implementing in Myanmar.	ILO	High Ongoing	None- already included in budget
As preparations are made for future work in this field, either through another phase of Ship to Shore or a different funding mechanism, the three UN agencies need to reflect carefully with their implementing partners as to the possibilities of future engagement. It would be important in the current context to continue supporting CSOs and workers' organisations, but programme design needs to recognise the challenges of working in this situation and be sure the scope matches what is possible. Under the original design of this phase, this was not possible as the coup took place after the design stage.	ILO, IOM, and UNDP	High When the next phase is designed	Will impact future budgets
<b>Philippines</b>			
The programme should also review whether the curriculum for fishers will be institutionalised and the benefits of the programme considered attractive enough for fishers by the end of the programme to ensure the long-term sustainability of the intervention, and if necessary consider including continued support for this work in other projects or the next phase of this programme.	ILO programme team	Medium Ongoing	Staff time
Recommendation number 2 of the Indonesia recommendations applies to the Philippines as well.			
<b>Thailand</b>			
Focus on engaging the central authorities to push for a change in culture on acknowledging that violations occur in the industry and pushing for more enforcement action to happen. Where there are different levels of enforcement coming from different PIPOs, conduct more research to understand why this is the case and what are the barriers that labour inspectors face in some locations which are not present in others. Continue to push for the greater engagement of NGOs and CSOs in the inspection process, allowing them to be present as much as possible when inspections happen.	ILO programme team	Medium Ongoing	Staff time
Review if it is possible to expand the work of the GLP to other areas of the supply chain. This can link to the work IOM is doing with enterprises on this topic related to their publicly released research and tools. Current stakeholders involved in the GLP are keen to engage international buyers more clearer and would support ILO expanding the GLP to other countries.	ILO programme team	Medium Ongoing	Staff time Budget for activities

<b>Vietnam</b>			
As the programme has not yet received authorisation, and given there is about one and a half years left in the funding cycle, the regional and national programme team should review the planned activities and prioritise those which in that time can be finished and have a sustainable and lasting impact.	ILO programme team	High ASAP	Potential budget reallocation
Ensure the scoping study linked to the receiving countries in the migration corridor for fishers in Vietnam is completed promptly to allow reflection on what interventions are possible to strengthen the programme in this area. If Vietnam will be included in the next phase of the programme, this would allow the programme to identify and design approaches to fill the existing gaps as much as is possible within the organisation reach in the countries of destination.	ILO programme team	Medium ASAP	Budget development of the next phase

### 4.3 Lessons Learned

More detailed descriptions of the lessons learned are contained in annexes

1. Including both countries in a migrant corridor in a programme ensures easier collaboration between stakeholders.
2. Training of labour inspectors is not sufficient on its own. It requires political will to empower labour inspections to enforce regulations and address violations. Encouraging interaction with NGOs would be strongly recommended.
3. Regional programmes are successful in broadening the scope of a programme and building on momentum but require sufficient resources in each country to ensure ongoing progress.
4. The harmonisation of laws and operating procedures between ministries is a challenging but necessary requirement for supporting the integration of multi-ministries working on a particular area of the enforcement of workers' rights and decent working conditions. Stakeholders in Indonesia shared with the evaluator the importance of ILO working to strengthen coordination between ministries. At the moment there are laws and regulations that have been issued by more than one ministry. In many cases this isn't well coordinated and creates ambiguity and areas where clarification needs to be given. A previous ILO programme produced a gap analysis identifying areas where harmonisation was needed. The current programme has made considerable progress and utilised ILO's comparative advantage to engage different ministries, and this will need to be continued to ensure the laws can be consistently applied.
5. The engagement of NGOs, CSOs and workers' organisations remains a key tool in ensuring better response to working condition violations, improved access to justice, and the provision of better response services for survivors of trafficking. In the programme, the work with FRN has demonstrated that workers' can be supported to organise within restrictive environments through an organisation with strong grassroots connections. Engagement of

workers through their peers in the communities they live in and the environments they work in is critical for this. Work with CSOs and workers' organisations in Myanmar also demonstrates the importance of such organisations when operating in a very challenging environment. Both the provision of information and support of survivors of trafficking has been possible through working in a sensitive manner with these organisations in Myanmar. Another branch of the work with CSOs, the work with legal organisations, demonstrates the importance of civil society in helping migrants gain access to justice. Such services are not provided by governments and legal costs are outside of the means of migrants.

#### 4.4 Emerging Good Practices

1. Quick assessment and design of reprogramming in Myanmar allowed for the programme to continue in some form. Although replication of this context will hopefully be limited, the programme does provide an example of how to address significant upheaval in a country where disengagement with the government is required.
2. Using different providers for MRCs increasing learning opportunities and encourages different approaches. The programme is partnering with CSOs, workers' representatives and different government agencies to implement MRCs in different countries. This presents opportunities for cross-learning and collaboration between the different entities and also if learning strategies are applied within ILO. This approach in this programme is though in its early stages and will require follow-up.
3. Ensuring deliverables are clear in implementation agreements is critical for strong delivery, even if this delays implementation of the programme's activities. The evaluation noted that there have been some delays in finalising implementation agreements with partners. While this is partly related to COVID-19 and ILO's bureaucratic requirements, a significant reason is also the insistence of the programme on ensuring clear proposals are developed by the partners which outline the outcomes of the agreements and the means to achieve these (outputs and activities). Delays in responses from partners has contributed to the overall delays. While this does raise concerns about there being enough time for partners to develop long-term capacities through the programme, it is a key strength of the programme that implementation agreements are substantive and that ILO has ensured partners lead on designing activities and not just imposed proposals on partners to speed up the process.

#### 4.5 Case Studies

##### **Case Study - Participation of Workers' and Civil Society Organisations**

###### **Question**

What are the key experiences and what lessons can be learned so far from the participation of workers' and civil society organisations in the programme? Are these feeding into changes (at the outcome level) vis a vis the expected outcome?

###### **Current Progress**

The stages of the involvement of the workers' and civil society organisations in the Ship to Shore programme vary between countries. In some countries, most particularly Thailand and Myanmar,

the agreements and the work of the partners were operationalised sufficient early to have allowed for considerable progress towards meeting targets. In other countries, including the Philippines and Indonesia, the agreements with the CSOs are being finalised and thus the work has not started. Individual agreements in other countries, particularly on legal aid support in Thailand and Cambodia have also only just been finalised. Cambodia and Lao PDR have seen some implementation of partnerships with CSOs but are not as advanced as Thailand and Myanmar. Work with workers' organisations in Vietnam has not yet started due to the delays in authorisation of the programme.

### **Strengths and Good Practices**

- Working with partners with existing relationships

The programme has been able to leverage existing relationships with CSOs and workers' organisations. This has come either through past work on Ship to Shore in the case of Thailand or through the interaction the UN agencies have had with these partners in other programmes. In Myanmar previous work with the CSOs through TRIANGLE and the working relationship previously developed with one of the Ship to Shore regional team, was cited as being particularly beneficial to the supporting trust in the relationship in a very challenging operating context where risks from government action against a CSO are always present.

- Significant involvement of the partners in designing the activities

There was strong appreciation from partners in most cases for the participatory nature of the design of activities and agreements. It was indicated that ILO and IOM have not imposed a set programme on the partners, but have worked collaboratively to develop partnership agreements. This has included insisting on clear achievable in agreements.

*“We are happy. At the beginning it was very difficult, ILO was asking a lot of detailed questions about things but it has become clear that this really helped us- the process has worked” (CSO representative)*

- Tripartite plus nature of the Fair Seas Conference

There was also significant appreciation from CSOs on their inclusion in the Fair Seas Conference in Bali in September 2021. Positive feedback included appreciation for being able to learn from experiences in other countries and the access to governments and employers which the conference facilitated.

- Positioning of ILO, IOM, and UNDP.

Access in general to other stakeholders, not just at the Fair Seas Conference, was raised as a key strength of ILO, IOM, and UNDP. In particular, CSO stakeholders (along with other stakeholders) were appreciative of the ability of the UN agencies to bring multiple stakeholders around the table. In the case of CSOs, this including facilitating access to government stakeholders, and also supporting cross-border collaboration and partnership among the CSO themselves.

### **Challenges**

- Delayed start to partnerships in some countries and length of agreements

There have delays to starting partnerships in some countries. Many of the partnerships are only just starting or have not started yet. As there is now only a year and a half left in the programme, this raises questions both about the depth of the impact and the long-term sustainability. The delays are partly linked to the positive point mentioned above concerning the interactive process for designing

agreements and the strengthening of ownership of the work as a result should not be overlooked. However, other reasons linked to the length of time it takes for contracts to be developed, a lack of clarity at times over expected outputs, and the limited human resources in the programme were also all cited as challenges.

- Ensuring the voice of migrants is heard in the programme through the follow up on migrants after they have used the MRCs

The feedback mechanisms for the programme are mainly through the CSOs. Systems for ensuring the voice of migrants is heard are quite ad hoc. One avenue for this could be through the CSOs. There is currently limited follow up with migrants who have received pre-departure orientation or other services from the MRCs, unless the migrant is actively seeking a service such as legal support. As a result, it is difficult to identify the impact the MRCs have on migrants, such as whether they change decisions or approaches to migration, or behave differently in the country of destination. The endline survey will attempt to measure some impacts but it is not specifically targeting MRC users. One CSO in Lao PDR did report establishing a system where follow up is conducted using What's App, Messenger, and Facebook which could be used as an example for other MRCs, but currently other follow-up is limited. As a result, the voice of migrants Identifying means to follow-up and trace the migration experience throughout the cycle of the users, would strengthen learning about the programme.

- Potential overload on particular organisations

There are a limited number of organisations with the capacity and experience to work on migration and decent work issues. These organisations tend to get overloaded in requests for partnerships. Although as most of the partnerships are early in the engagement, it is not currently clear if this will be a problem for the programme, it was noted by some stakeholders as a concern which may have impact the efficiency and effectiveness of delivery.

### **Opportunities and Lessons Learned**

- Review the theory of change:

There is a need to review the theory of change to understand more clearly how the work in outcome 3 creates pathways of change in outcomes 1 and 2, particularly in influencing policy development and the strengthening of the systems for enforcing policies.

- Engaging CSOs more in labour inspection processes- lesson which could be taken to other countries

An opportunity for increasing the engagement of the CSOs comes in working with labour inspectorates to build meaningful partnerships with CSOs to attend, witness, and support inspections at the PIPO centres. This was suggested as key recommendation by both CSO and government stakeholders to help support greater awareness of the challenges migrant fishers are facing by the labour inspectors and to allow the CSOs to monitor compliance with key guidelines. As the work in Thailand has demonstrated, changing the culture of labour inspection is a slow process. This lesson should encourage early engagement of the CSOs in the Philippines and Indonesia where the work with the labour inspectorate will commence soon.

- Cross-border interactions

Cross-border interactions can help ensure migrants are supported along the migration corridor, and provide strong learning opportunities as experiences and needs of migrants can be shared. These can be used to feed into programming including information materials and sessions, and the type of support offered.

### **Case Study – Capacity Building in the Labour Inspectorate**

#### **Question**

How have the lessons learned and evaluations recommendations identified in the last programme have been actioned in the current programme.?

#### **Background**

The first Ship to Shore programme included considerable emphasis on enhancing the quality and integrated nature of labour inspections in PIPO settings, including stressing the importance of quality of assessment as opposed to quantitative volume of inspections. The second phase of Ship to Shore has continued to focus on capacity building and has held a theory of change workshop with a number of senior Department of Labour Protection and Welfare (DLPW) labour inspectors, under the Thai Ministry of Labour to conceptualize a more systematic and measurable approach for making improvements. The programme has also begun initial work with labour inspectors in Indonesia and will work with the labour inspectorate in the Philippines as well in the second half of the programme.

The evaluation of the previous phase included a recommendation for labour inspections. The programme also produced a lesson learned document which included a section on labour inspection. The recommendation from the evaluation was:

- Set explicit performance targets for the labor inspectorate, monitor results, and take corrective action if targets are not achieved.

The lessons learned document included the following lessons learned relevant to this programme:

- Measures of reform focused more on inputs – for instance, number of labour inspections or training hours – as opposed to impacts. Results such as enforcement actions and changes in compliance should be the measure of progress. The Thai government’s inputs were impressive but misleading as hard measures of enforcement results were (and are) considerably lower.
- Fishing should be integrated with other labour inspection functions to institutionalize protection of these workers in the relevant agencies Labour inspectors’ performance and promotion should be tied to enforcement results. This connection helps to back up the government’s rhetoric about fairness and independence in its dealings with the politically powerful fishing industry.
- Labour officials must be proactive in identifying problems and labour risks by building relationships with local CSOs working with migrant workers. Waiting for vulnerable migrant workers or CSOs to bring complaints is an unacceptably passive approach to the problem of labour abuses.

#### **Key Findings**

The evaluation found a significant disconnect between the experiences of migrant fishers and the labour inspectors. Migrant fishers detailed experiences of abuses and violations including not receiving contracts in two languages, withholding of wages, not being paid electronically, threats of

violence, actual physical and verbal violence, retention of key papers which prevented them switching employers, and a lack of attention to health and safety standards on board the vessels. Labour inspectors suggested they found minimal violations including indicating that all workers had contracts in two languages and payment was made electronically. Discrepancies which were found were passed off as misunderstandings. The descriptions of the approach to privacy also suggested there was limited attention to ensuring employers and boat owners could not hear conversations.

The level of enforcement actions for violations remains very low. The annual report indicated a figure of 2%, representing an increase from 1% in the baseline. The target for the programme is 10% by 2024, which is unlikely to be achieved on the current trajectory.

### **Addressing previous lessons learned and recommendations**

The recommendation from the first phase of the Ship to Shore programme and the first point from the lesson learned document requires commitment from the government to make sufficient changes. ILO has set targets within the programme for improvements in the percentage for enforcement actions. However, it has currently not been able to persuade the government to set similar targets (such as in the New Zealand system). This has hampered attempts to make progress on improving performance.

The second lesson learned identified by the previous phase of the programme concerns the integration of fishing into the labour inspection system. The programme is working to strengthen the multi-disciplinary nature of inspections which includes member of the labour inspectorate. This is a key lesson which has incorporated into the work with Indonesia through the attempts to develop a joint inspection system. This will be piloted in two provinces in the coming months.

The important of including CSOs in the inspection system was recognised by both government and CSO stakeholders. Indeed, one government official acknowledged that CSOs are much more likely to find incidents of forced labour and trafficking than government officers working on these issues. However, there is yet to be much evidence of pro-active engagement of CSOs by the labour inspectors. It was indicated by the labour inspectorate that CSOs are able to join inspections, but reported that in practice this often does not happen.

### **Emerging Lessons Learned and Areas of Engagement**

- Length of time for change

A key lesson from the work of Ship to Shore, is that the process of change takes time and will need attention over a number of cycles. The improvement on the percentage of enforcement actions taken from 0.03% in 2017 to 1.99% in 2022 is small but is nonetheless significant and a move in the right direction. This does give an indication of progress with which to work with the government on. This should be built into programming plans and targets when developing work with the labour inspectorate. Currently the programme has not begun the engagement in the Philippines and although considerable engagement with the labour inspectorate has taken place in Indonesia, the pilot is still yet to be fully rolled out. It is important to ensure there is a long-term commitment to working with the labour inspectors to encourage incremental progress.

- Top-level leadership

The programme has done a lot of capacity building with labour inspectors in the two phases of the programme. This has been linked to the Government of Thailand prioritising improvements in inspections since the yellow card was issued. However, as noted above the pace of improvement in



enforcement actions has been slow. To create more momentum on the pace of progress, leadership from the central level which works towards a culture whether identifying violations is prioritised is important, and that the absence of reported violations is not an indicator of success. Focusing more on the targeted inspection of high-risk vessels would support this strategy.

- Engagement of CSOs

This is covered more deeply in the case study on the role of CSOs in the work the programme has been doing. Briefly, the engagement of CSOs to attend inspections and work in collaboration with the inspectorate is highly recommended and should be a key point of advocacy from the start of the work the programme is doing in the Philippines and Indonesia.

- Safety of women labour inspectors

It is clear from the reflections of stakeholders that the employers including boat owners and captains still have significant control over the direction of labour inspection and the responses to violations which are raised. This presents serious safety concerns for migrants reporting violations, which is one of the reasons to engage CSOs in the process. Another concern which was raised by government stakeholders regards the safety of the labour inspectors. The majority of labour inspectors in Thailand are women. The port areas are men-dominated locations; the vast majority of owners, captains, fishers, security guards are men, as are many of the port-side workers (although women do work in this part of the sector). Labour inspectors have to go for inspections at irregular hours, and the safety of women was raised as a concern. This is a potential area the programme could consider engaging on through the gender and women's empowerment strategy with the goal of identifying ways to ensure labour inspections feel confident and empowered to safely do their jobs.

**TERMS OF REFERENCE  
INDEPENDENT MID-TERM EVALUATION**

**Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia:  
Regional programme on labour migration in the fishing sector**

KEY FACTS	
<b>TC Symbol:</b>	RAS/20/01/EUR
<b>Regions and countries covered:</b>	Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand, Viet Nam (and other countries and sub-regional organizations, e.g., Malaysia and ASEAN bodies)
<b>Duration:</b>	48 months
<b>Start Date:</b>	1 August 2020
<b>End Date:</b>	31 July 2024
<b>Implementing Partners:</b>	ILO, IOM and UNDP
<b>Donor:</b>	European Union
<b>Budget:</b>	EUR 10 million
<b>Administrative unit:</b>	ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP)
<b>Technical backstopping unit:</b>	ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP)
<b>Collaborating ILO units:</b>	MIGRANT, FUNDAMENTALS and SECTOR
<b>ILO programme and budget P&amp;B Outcome(s)</b>	Outcome 7: Adequate and effective protection at work for all
<b>SDG(s) under evaluation</b>	Main SDGs: 8 and 10 Other SDGs: 3,5,12,14,16 and 17
<b>Evaluation requirements:</b>	Mid-term Independent Evaluation
<b>Timing of evaluation:</b>	August - November 2022

More information on Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia can be found at [www.shiptoshorerights.org](http://www.shiptoshorerights.org)

## CONTENTS

---

I.	<a href="#">INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE</a> .....	76
II.	<a href="#">BACKGROUND ON THE PROGRAMME</a> .....	76
III.	<a href="#">PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION</a> .....	5
IV.	<a href="#">EVALUATION SCOPE</a> .....	5
V.	<a href="#">EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS</a> .....	5
VI.	<a href="#">METHODOLOGY</a> .....	8
VII.	<a href="#">MAIN OUTPUTS</a> .....	9
VIII.	<a href="#">MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS AND WORK PLAN</a> .....	85
IX.	<a href="#">REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS FOR EVALUATOR</a> .....	86
X.	<a href="#">LEGAL AND ETHICAL MATTERS</a> .....	87
	<a href="#">ANNEX 1: EVALUATION POLICIES AND GUIDELINES</a> .....	87
	<a href="#">ANNEX 2: LIST OF MRCs AND IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS</a> .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
	<a href="#">ANNEX 3: POLICY AND LEGISLATION ADOPTED OR AMENDED</a> .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
	<a href="#">ANNEX 4: PROGRAMME DOCUMENTATION TO BE REVIEWED</a> .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>

## List of Abbreviations

CPO - Country Programme Outcome

CSOs – Civil Society Organizations

DWCP - Decent Work Country Programme

DWT - Decent Work Team

EM - Evaluation Manager

EQs – Evaluation Questions

EVAL - ILO Evaluation Unit

EU - European Union

IEC – Information, Education and Communication

ILO – International Labour Organization

IOM - International Organization for Migration

IPs – Implementing Partners

LGBTQI- Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer and intersex persons

MRC – Migrant Resource Centres

MTE - Mid Term Evaluation

M&E - Monitoring and Evaluation

P&B - Programme & Budget

ROAP – ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific

SDGs – Sustainable Development Goals

S2SR - Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia

TPR - Technical Progress Report

UN - United Nations

UNDP – United Nations Development Programme

UNDAF - United Nations Development Assistance Framework

UNSDCF – United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework

VFM - Value for Money

## INTRODUCTION AND RATIONALE

---

Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia (S2SR) is a multi-country, multi-year programme on labour migration focused on the fishing and seafood processing sectors in the South East Asia region. It is an initiative of the European Union (EU) and the United Nations (UN) and is implemented by the ILO in collaboration with IOM and UNDP.

The programme delivers technical assistance and support, with the overall objective of promoting regular and safe labour migration among South-East Asian countries. The programme will address the specific characteristics of work in the fishing and seafood processing sectors as well as the barriers and risks present in the labour mobility system, which can lead to unsafe migration, decent work deficits, labour rights abuses and forced labour.

In accordance with the ILO policy and the contribution agreement signed with the European Union (EU), an independent mid-term evaluation is required for the S2SR programme. The evaluation will be carried out from August to November 2022, applying the criteria agreed upon with the EU in the S2SR Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan.<sup>15</sup>

The evaluation will provide an impartial assessment of the performance of the S2SR programme during its first two years of implementation. The main objectives of this assessment are to determine the progress towards outcomes achieved by the programme, provide recommendations for adjustments to improve results and identify lessons learned and good practices to support organizational learning.

The ILO *Policy guidelines for results-based evaluation* will provide the framework for carrying out the evaluation. The guidelines adhere to the evaluation norms and standards of the United Nations system.

## PROGRAMME BACKGROUND

---

Fishing is recognized as one of the most hazardous occupations globally. Workers in commercial fishing operations face long working hours, dangerous weather conditions and hazardous marine environments. The fishers live and work onboard vessels, often for extended periods in relatively confined spaces and in isolation from sources of assistance. They are under the direct control of the skipper during their time at sea and often even while in port. The working and living conditions on vessels are difficult for government authorities to regulate.

Migrant fishers have often been recruited and placed outside of the labour migration regulatory framework. National legislation in a number of countries in South East Asia remain inconsistent with international labour standards and allows for recruitment and related fees to be charged to migrant workers, and in some cases permits employers to request money or other assets from the workers as reimbursements for expenses. Some migrant workers are also required to pay a deposit before their employment, which they forfeit if they attempt to terminate the contract early. Moreover, migrant fishers are often charged excessive fees<sup>16</sup> well above even the allowable national limits.

---

<sup>15</sup> The criteria are in line with OECD/DAC Evaluation Quality Standards and ILO Evaluation Policy guidelines.

<sup>16</sup> For example, intermediary/agent fee, recruitment agency fee, documentation costs, medical examination charges etc.,

Work in seafood processing has more in common with other land-based work such as manufacturing. However, recent ILO research in Thailand shows that there are areas of informality in the seafood processing sector that remain largely unexplored. Home-based workers, who are predominantly women and pier-based workers (both men and women) are engaged in loading/unloading vessels and vehicles as well as primary processing of seafood. Women are more likely to be engaged in such precarious work where the wages are often below the legal minimum and gender inequalities persist, including unequal pay.

Many migrant workers in the fishing and seafood processing sectors continue to experience significant decent work deficits. Work onboard fishing vessels, for example, are often not adequately covered by labour protections, and in many countries, not subject to effective labour inspections. Migrant workers commonly experience poor working conditions and labour rights violations, including excessive working hours, limited freedom of movement and wage theft. Fishers are also subject to duress and coercion through a variety of other means, such as accumulation of excessive debt, retention of identification documents and ATM cards, withholding of wages, and violence and abuse. In the most severe cases, these labour rights violations can amount to forced labour.

There is also a lack of effective workers' organizations and robust representation for migrant workers' rights in fishing and seafood processing work. In Thailand, for example, migrant workers are not permitted to form their own unions or to assume leadership roles in existing unions, restricting their ability to bargain collectively for improved working conditions. There are also practical restrictions for migrant fishers who work onboard fishing vessels as they are isolated at sea for extended periods of time, as well as for women employed in pier and home-based work where few unions exist. To address these and other challenges to decent work, the Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia (S2SR) programme was initiated in August 2020.

### **Programme Framework**

At global level, the S2SR programme contributes to the achievement of Programme and Budget Outcome 7 (Adequate and effective protection at work for all), including Outputs 7.5.1, 7.5.2 and 7.5.3 specifically. The interventions have been incorporated and/or influenced the development of outcomes for Decent Work Country Programmes and United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks/Sustainable Development Cooperation Frameworks in target countries where these were developed during the life of the programme.

The S2SR programme is informed by and advances the 2030 Agenda, which recognizes the importance of decent work and economic growth in Goal 8, as well as the need to reduced inequalities at Goal 10. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) also specifically recognize some of the key challenges facing migrant workers, particularly those in precarious employment, the need for well-managed migration policies, and to promote safe and secure work environments. The programme's sectoral focus also supports SDG 14 and the need for sustainable fisheries management policies. Some of the key SDGs that the programme advances are Goal 8 (particularly target 8.7 and 8.8) and Goal 10 (particularly target 10.) The programme also contributes to the health and wellbeing of migrant workers at Goal 3, and to other SDGs including Goals 5,12, 14,16 and 17.

S2SR interventions benefit from the ILO General principles and operational guidelines for fair recruitment and definition of recruitment fees and related costs, which are used to guide project stakeholders in assessing and developing effective labour recruitment policies in compliance with internationally recognized human rights and labour standards, eliminating fraudulent and abusive practices, improving protection and access to remedies for victims of abuses, and supporting human

rights due diligence by both the public and private sectors, in line with programme objectives.

The programme activities are also underpinned by the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, which are used to guide stakeholders in recognizing the needs of migrant workers, and developing effective labour protections in the targeted sectors that are consistent with international labour standards. The 2008 ILO Declaration on Social Justice for a Fair Globalization also guides interventions. The Action is also informed by the 2019 ILO Centenary Declaration for the Future of Work by taking a human-centred approach in investing in social protection, skills, gender and promoting an enabling environment for sustainable enterprises, economic growth and decent work for all. Interventions for the benefit of fishers are guided by the Work in Fishing Convention, 2007 (No. 188), the Work in Fishing Recommendation, 2007 (No. 199), the outcomes of the ILO's Tripartite Meeting on Issues relating to Migrant Fishers (September 2017), as well as the relevant guidelines and tools developed by the ILO.

S2SR supports programming in Thailand, Cambodia, Myanmar, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Indonesia, Philippines and Viet Nam and will promote multi-country cooperation in the region. It engages with current, potential and returning migrant workers in fishing and seafood processing sectors, as well as their families and communities.

The programme works with government authorities, workers' organizations, employers and recruitment agencies, civil society organizations and community-based organizations to achieve three inter-linking specific objectives as described below:

1. **Policy:** Strengthened legal, policy and regulatory frameworks related to labour migration and employment for women and men in the fishing and seafood processing sectors.
2. **System:** Increased protection of labour rights and promotion of safe and secure working environments for women and men migrant workers from recruitment to return and reintegration.
3. **Household:** Women and men migrant workers, their families, organizations and communities are empowered to exercise their rights

The programme strategy also mainstreams the following **Cross-Cutting Strategies** within its interventions:

- **Worker's voice and agency:** To build an enabling environment for the amplification of workers' voice and support their agency. Support workers' advocacy and representation through labour organizations as well as networks of migrant workers.
- **Right-based approach:** To ensure a right-based approach to migration as enshrined by the ILO Multilateral Framework on Labour Migration (2005), which respects the dignity and agency of migrant workers throughout all stages of migration and protects their rights under international law.
- **Gender equality and women's empowerment:** To ensure that gender equality and women empowerment is mainstreamed into the Action. There will be a focus on gendered dynamics of labour migration in the communities of origin and destination. In response to this, a gender analysis has been carried out during the first year of implementation.
- **Broad engagement of stakeholders:** To ensure that the Action maximises its impact and sustainability, the stakeholders are defined in a broad sense to include tripartite partners including relevant government agencies, workers and employers' organizations, recruitment

agencies, vessels owners, international buyers as well as CSOs, academia, media representatives and others.

- **Trafficking in persons and other transnational crimes:** To strengthen national and transnational referral systems, particularly between labour inspectorates and law enforcement institutions. Also engage in research to better understand the correlation between trafficking for forced labour, IUU fishing and other transnational crimes.
- **Marine resources conservation and sustainability:** To improve stakeholder understanding of the labour impacts of fish stock depletion and distant water fishing practices. Raise awareness among employers' organizations and international buyers on the impact that high demand for inexpensive fish and seafood has on the environment, practice and labour conditions.

### Management Arrangements

The overall management and implementation of the project is the responsibility of the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), based in the ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP) in Bangkok.

The management structure and staffing arrangements are described in the Action Document. At the time of this review, the programme staff includes 17 team members from ILO (The CTA, Technical Officer, M&E and Knowledge Management Officer, 6 National Programme Coordinators, 1 Programme Assistant and 7 Administrative and Finance Assistants), as well as one core team member from IOM (Programme Officer for Migrant Assistance and Counter Trafficking Unit) and three UNDP part-time staff (Counter-Trafficking/Migration Protection Coordinator, Thailand National Programme Coordinator and Research Coordinator).

Backstopping support is provided by the International Labour Migration Branch (MIGRANT), the Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Branch (FUNDAMENTALS) and SECTOR based in Geneva. The ILO Senior Regional Labour Migration Specialist, and ILO Senior Regional Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work Specialist are also assigned to provide technical backstopping to the programme.

### Programme Governance

The project is overseen by the **Programme Steering Committee (PSC)** providing strategic leadership and oversight to the programme and ensuring that there is effective coordination between implementing agencies. The PSC is co-chaired by the EU and ILO representatives.

The project is furthermore guided by **National Programme Advisory Committees (NPAC)** in each of the seven countries, which allow tripartite plus representatives to identify priority interventions, provide guidance on the implementation of country-specific activities and endorse annual workplan.

## PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

---

The mid-term evaluation will support accountability, adaptive management and learning and knowledge sharing for the ILO and key stakeholders of the Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia. The specific objectives of the evaluation are the following:

1. To determine the progress achieved to date in achieving in reaching the three programme outcomes.
2. To provide recommendations for adjustments to the programme strategy that will improve results moving forward.



3. To identify lessons learned and good practices that will support organizational learning and knowledge sharing for the ILO and other key stakeholders.

In addition, the mid-term evaluation aims to gather information needed to evaluate the programme as recommended in the evaluability assessment and designed in the M&E plan.

## EVALUATION SCOPE

The evaluation period will be from the beginning of Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia from August 2020 to November 2022. Geographically, the evaluation will cover both interventions at the regional level and country-level work in Cambodia, Lao PDR, Indonesia, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam. It is recommended that the evaluation field missions focus on the countries where activity has been most intensive to date: Thailand, Indonesia and Cambodia.

As cross-cutting themes, the evaluation will also take specific note of integration of gender mainstreaming<sup>17</sup>, disability inclusion, international labour standards, social dialogue<sup>18</sup>, environmental sustainability, as well as contribution to SDGs, COVID-19 response<sup>19</sup>, non-discrimination concerns, and medium and long-term effects of capacity development initiatives throughout the evaluation methodology and all deliverables, including the final report.

The mid-term evaluation will review the contribution of the programme to the ILO's programme and policy frameworks at the national and global levels, UNDAF/UNSDCF and national sustainable development strategy (or its equivalent) or other relevant national development frameworks, including any relevant sectoral policies and programmes.

### **Evaluation Clients**

The primary end users of the evaluation's findings will be the management team of the Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia, the ILO administrative unit (ROAP) the ILO technical unit at headquarters (MI-GRANT), IOM, UNDP and the donor (European Union Delegations). Secondary parties making use of the results will include tripartite constituents and civil society organizations who have partnered with the project, as well as other agencies working on labour migration and human trafficking at national and regional levels. Actors from other regions working on these issues may also take an interest in the evaluation's assessment.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The evaluation criteria have been adapted from the standard ILO criteria and will be as follows:

1. Relevance and strategic fit.
2. Validity of design.
3. Intervention progress and effectiveness.
4. Efficiency of resource use.
5. Effectiveness of management arrangements.
6. Impact orientation and sustainability.
7. Gender equality.

---

<sup>17</sup> [https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed\\_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms\\_746716.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746716.pdf)

<sup>18</sup> [https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed\\_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms\\_746717.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_746717.pdf)

<sup>19</sup> [https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed\\_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms\\_757541.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_mas/---eval/documents/publication/wcms_757541.pdf)

More detailed evaluation questions (EQs) will guide the evaluation process. The EQs will be answered by leveraging a wide range of data sources to ensure validity, including interviews with key stakeholders,

It is expected that the evaluation will address all of the questions detailed below. Adaptation is encouraged where necessary, but any fundamental changes should be agreed upon between the evaluation manager and the evaluator and reflected in the inception report.

### **1. Relevance and strategic fit**

- a. Does the programme address the major causes of vulnerability and respond to the most urgent needs of migrant workers in the fishing and seafood processing sectors in South East Asia?
- b. Are the activities aligned with national, regional and global policy frameworks on labour migration/work in the fishing and seafood processing sectors?
- c. Are the governance structures participatory in approach, providing for the inclusion of the perspective of governments, social partners, civil society and women and men migrant workers?
- d. Does the programme make use of the ILO, IOM and UNDP comparative advantages in implementing its strategy? (e.g., tripartism, international labour standards, UN Migration Network, Business and Human Rights frameworks, etc.)
- e. Has the role of the EU as a major market for South East Asian seafood products been effectively leveraged to strengthen results?

### **2. Validity of intervention design**

- a. Is the scope of the interventions realistic given the time and resources available?
- b. Have the design and strategic planning documents developed proven useful in implementing the programme? (Description of the Action, M&E Plan, Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment Strategy, etc.)
- c. Does the intervention's Theory of Change clearly articulate assumptions, provide logical pathways of change between different levels of results and align with the ILO's strategic objectives and outcomes at the regional and global levels, as well as with the relevant SDGs and related targets?
- d. Has the programme applied an evidence-based approach in formulating and implementing the activities?

### **3. Intervention progress and effectiveness**

- a. What amount of progress has been made in achieving the programme's eight outputs? (Applying a scale of minor, moderate or major progress, with justification).
- b. To what extent are tripartite constituents and other key stakeholders satisfied with and/or benefitting from the outputs produced?
- c. Which individual partnerships/relationships with tripartite constituents, civil society and the private sector have led to the most effective cooperation in implementing the programme? Are there any other partnerships that should be considered?
- d. How effective has the collaboration and coordination been with other project's working on labour migration issues/fishing sector in maximizing synergies and eliminating duplication? (e.g., ASEAN-ACT, CREST, TRIANGLE in ASEAN, Safe and Fair, etc.)

- e. How effective was the programme in responding to the impact of COVID-19 on migrant workers?

#### **4. Efficiency of resource use**

- a. Has the allocation of resources been optimal for achieving the programme's outcomes? (financial, human, institutional and technical, etc.)
- b. Have the programme activities been completed on-time/according to work plans?
- c. Are there particular activities which have delivered high value for money?
- d. Has the programme been able to leverage cost-sharing or in-kind contributions to complement its resources? (e.g., from other ILO projects, slippage funds, inter-agency collaborations and private sector contributions)

#### **5. Effectiveness of management arrangements**

- a. How effective is the internal management of the programme? (including staffing arrangements and capacities, governance and oversight, work planning, etc.,)
- b. Has the communications and visibility strategy been effective in raising the profile of the programme within the target countries and at regional level?
- c. Has the monitoring and evaluation system supported results-based management of the programme?
- d. Have programmatic, contextual and institutional risks been managed effectively by the programme?
- e. What value added has the UN inter-agency model brought to the programme?

#### **6. Impact orientation and sustainability**

- a. What influence has the programme had on the development of policies and practices at national and regional levels?
- b. What strategies have been applied to ensure the achievement of lasting results after the completion of the programme?
- c. What are the programme's most significant contributions to an enhanced knowledge base on labour migration in the fishing and seafood processing sectors within the target countries and region likely to be? Assess to what extent the practical tools developed by the programme (e.g., Policy briefs, training materials, Codes of conduct) are likely to produce a direct impact if their use is extensively promoted, or even better enforced?
- d. Have there been any unintended or negative impacts of the programme for women and men migrant workers in fishing and seafood processing sectors?
- e. What good practices and lessons learned can be drawn from the programme to inform the development of future interventions on labour migration, human trafficking and forced labour?

#### **7. Gender equality**

- a. What are the key results achieved by the programme on gender equality and women's empowerment?
- b. Has the use of resources on gender equality and women's empowerment activities been sufficient to achieve the expected results?
- c. Has M&E data been adequately disaggregated by sex to determine if there are differences in the programme results for women and men?
- d. Has the sectoral focus of the activities been effective in addressing the different vulnerabilities of women and men migrants in fishing and seafood processing sectors?

## METHODOLOGY

---

The evaluation will apply a qualitative and participatory approach, engaging with key stakeholders of the S2SR programme during the design, field work, validation and reporting stages. To collect the data for analysis, the evaluation will make use of the techniques listed below. The data from these sources will be triangulated to increase the validity and rigor of the evaluation findings.

- **Desk review** of project design and strategy documents, activity documents, communications and research and publications (see annex 4)
- **Key informant interviews** with programme staff, relevant ILO specialists, EU, tripartite constituents, civil society organizations and other stakeholders and partners (see annex 2).
- **Focus group discussions** with beneficiaries in fishing and seafood processing sectors (women and men potential migrants, migrant workers, return migrant workers and members of their families)
- **Observation of programme activities** at provincial, national and regional level (to be determined based upon scheduling of activities)
- **Validation workshop** debriefing the project team and key stakeholders on the initial evaluation findings.
- **Review of the draft evaluation report** by key stakeholders.

A more detailed methodology for the assignment will be elaborated by the evaluator on the basis of this TOR, in consultation with the ILO Evaluation Manager and key stakeholders. It should take into consideration the following:

- The data and information should be collected, presented and analysed with appropriate gender disaggregation even if project design did not take gender into account.
- To the extent possible, the data collection, analysis and presentation should be responsive to and include issues relating to ILO's normative work, social dialogue, diversity and non-discrimination, including disability issues.
- The methodology should clearly state the limitations of the chosen evaluation methods, including those related to representation of specific group of stakeholders.
- The detail approach and methodology, including the work plan should be part of the inception report. Criteria for selecting key informants for interviews, survey, or selected areas/units for in-depth assessment must be elaborated in the inception report.

### Sampling

A purposive sampling approach will be used, collecting data from key programme stakeholders. To ensure a diverse set of voices are heard, data collection must obtain a balanced perspective from women and men beneficiaries and tripartite plus stakeholders, as well as of marginalized groups such as irregular migrants, informal sector workers, ethnic minorities and LGBTQ+ persons. The final list of respondents to be interviewed will be determined during inception.

## MAIN OUTPUTS

---

The evaluator will complete the following deliverables during the assignment:

**Output 1. Inception report:** (10 days) Based upon the desk review and initial discussions with programme staff and stakeholders, the evaluator will develop an inception report for the evaluation. At a minimum, the inception report should include:

- Description of evaluation methodology: key evaluation questions, evaluation sample and data collection methods, data collection instruments, field mission schedule, analytical techniques to be applied and an outline of the evaluation report.

- The inception report should also respond to the requirements outlined in ILO Checklist 3: Writing the inception report (see annex 1).

Output 2. Presentation of preliminary findings: (25 days) The ILO, IOM and UNDP will organize a debriefing in Bangkok to validate the preliminary findings of the evaluation after data collection is completed. The evaluator will develop a PowerPoint presentation and work with the evaluation manager to set the agenda for the workshop. The presentation should provide a brief review of key results for each evaluation criteria.

Output 3. First draft of evaluation report: (10 days) The first draft of the evaluation report will be submitted to the evaluation manager for review by S2SR staff from ILO, IOM, UNDP, and the EU Delegation. The evaluation report should provide practical and specific recommendations designating the parties responsible. The draft evaluation report should be prepared as per the ILO Checklist 5: Preparing the Evaluation Report which will be provided to the evaluators.

Output 4. Final evaluation report: (5 days) The final output of the evaluation will be a report systematically assessing the results of the programme to date based upon the evaluation criteria. The report should be no longer than 40 pages (excluding appendices) and will include an evaluation summary of no more than five pages and appropriate for publication on the ILO website (including recommendations and a summary of lessons learned and good practices). The evaluator will incorporate comments received from the ILO and other key stakeholders into the final report and comply with the requirements outlined in ILO Checklist 6: Rating the quality of evaluation report.

Any data files associated with the assignment will also be provided to the ILO at its conclusion. Ownership of the data from the evaluation rests jointly with the ILO and the evaluator. The copyright for the evaluation report is held exclusively by the ILO. However, key stakeholders may freely make use of the evaluation report, as long as appropriate acknowledgement of the source is made.

The expected structure of the final report as per the proposed structure in the ILO evaluation guidelines is outlined below:

- Cover page with key intervention and evaluation data
- Executive Summary
- Acronyms
- Description of the Project
- Purpose, scope and clients of evaluation
- Methodology
- Findings (organized by evaluation criteria)
- Conclusions
- Recommendations
- Lessons learned and good practices

The evaluator is required to append the following items:

- Terms of Reference
- Data collection instruments
- List of meetings / consultations attended
- List of persons or organizations interviewed
- List of documents / publications reviewed and cited
- Lessons learnt based on the ILO templates
- Good practices based on the ILO templates
- Any further information the evaluator deems appropriate can also be added.

## MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS AND WORK PLAN

---

### Roles and responsibilities

**Evaluation Manager:** The evaluation will be managed by an ILO certified evaluation manager who has no prior involvement in the project. For this exercise, the evaluation manager is Narendra Nadh Choudary Bollepalli, Technical Officer for Monitoring and Evaluation, ILO Country Office Kathmandu ([bollepalli@ilo.org](mailto:bollepalli@ilo.org)). He is responsible for the overall management of the evaluation and in particular to:

- Develop the evaluation TOR with inputs from key stakeholders;
- Develop the expression of interest and select the independent evaluator;
- Brief the evaluator on ILO evaluation policies and procedures;
- Coordinate with the programme team on the development of the field mission schedule;
- Circulate the inception report for comments by key stakeholders;
- Coordinate with the programme team on organizing the debriefing meeting with the programme team;
- Conduct a quality standards review of the draft report before circulating the report to key stakeholders and the project staff for their review.
- Circulate the first draft of the evaluation report for comments by key stakeholders;
- Collect all comments and forward the consolidated comments to the evaluator;
- Ensure the final version of the evaluation report meets ILO requirements and the information needs of key stakeholders.
- Submit the report to the ILO Evaluation Office (EVAL) for final approval. Once approved, the evaluation report, good practices, and lessons learned will be uploaded and stored at ILO i-eval Discovery to provide easy access to all development partners and target audiences to maximize the benefits of the evaluation.

**ILO Regional Office:** Ms. Pamornrat Pringsulaka, Regional Evaluation Officer, ROAP ([pamornrat@ilo.org](mailto:pamornrat@ilo.org)) will also conduct quality assurance of the report.

**Programme Staff:** The S2SR programme team will manage the administrative and contractual arrangements for the assignment, provide logistical support for the field missions and cover all of the costs associated with the assignment. During the evaluation, the programme staff will provide full cooperation and answer all questions as candidly as possible. The staff of the S2SR programme are responsible for the following specific tasks:

- Provide inputs on the TOR for the evaluation;
- Provide project documentation to the evaluator;
- Prepare a list of recommended interviewees;
- Schedule meetings for field visits and coordinate in-country logistical arrangements (e.g. flight and hotel reservations, local transportation, interpretation, etc.).
- Participate in interviews and provide inputs as requested;
- Organize and participate in the debriefing meeting;
- Review and provide comments on the draft evaluation report;
- Provide a management response to the final recommendations of the evaluation.

**Key Stakeholders:** Stakeholders will be engaged throughout the evaluation process, including providing inputs to the terms of reference, participating in interviews during the field work, contributing to the validation of the preliminary findings and commenting on the draft evaluation report. This includes but is not limited to EU Delegations in Bangkok and the target countries, the ILO Evaluation Office, tripartite constituents and CSOs at national and regional levels and other programme

partners. In addition, the EU will be provided with an opportunity to review the evaluator’s CV before final selection and participate in the field visits during the evaluation as appropriate.

### Indicative work plan

The duration of the contract is expected to be for 50 working days between mid-August to mid-December 2022. The field missions to project countries will start in early September 2022.

Task	Completion date	Responsible
Preparation and sharing of the TOR	1 July 2022	Evaluation Manager
Approval of the TOR	15 July 2022	Regional Evaluation Officer/EU
Issuance of EOI and selection of consultant	22 July 2022	Evaluation Manager/Regional Evaluation Officer
Issuance of individual contract	8 August 2022	S2SR Team
Draft mission schedule and list of key stakeholders to be interviewed	15 August 2022	S2SR Team
Brief evaluator on ILO evaluation policy and the programme	22 August 2022	Evaluation Manager and S2SR Team
Document review and development of the inception report	24 August 2022	Evaluator
Approval of the inception report	31 August 2022	Evaluation Manager/S2SR Team and EU
Field missions completed	7 October 2022	Evaluator
Debriefing meeting	9 October 2022	Evaluator
First draft of evaluation report submitted	24 October 2022	Evaluator
Consolidated stakeholder comments on the draft report returned to the evaluator	7 November 2022	Evaluation Manager
Final draft of the evaluation report submitted	14 November 2022	Evaluator
Approval of the evaluation report	21 November 2022	Evaluation Manager/ Evaluation Office/S2SR Team and EU
Management response to the evaluation recommendations	30 November 2022	S2SR Team
Presentation of the evaluation results to the Programme Steering Committee	December/January (meeting date TBD)	Evaluator

### REQUIRED QUALIFICATIONS FOR EVALUATOR

Selection of the consultant will be based on the strength of their expressions of interest in the assignment and interviews with a shortlist of candidates. The consultant will report to the evaluation manager for the period of the assignment. The selected evaluator will possess the following experience and qualifications:

- No prior involvement in project implementation.
- Graduate degree with a minimum of 7 years of relevant professional experience, including completion of independent evaluations for development projects of a similar size, scope and complexity.
- Extensive knowledge of evaluation methodologies, including qualitative and participatory data collection techniques;
- Strong thematic expertise in labour migration governance and gender equality. Knowledge related to private sector engagement and skills development will be considered assets.

- Substantial prior work experience in one or more ASEAN countries.
- Knowledge of the ILO's organizational mandate, tripartite structure, normative frameworks and core values.
- Excellent verbal and written communication skills in English;
- Ability to listen to and value the opinion of a diverse range of respondents;
- Awareness of the critical importance of ethics in evaluation practice.

## LEGAL AND ETHICAL MATTERS

---

The evaluation will comply with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and the ILO Code of Conduct (see annex 1). Due to the highly sensitive nature of many of the programme's interventions and the vulnerable populations who will be interviewed during the evaluation, particular attention should be paid to ensuring the confidentiality and anonymity of respondents.

An independent evaluator will be selected who has no prior relationship to the S2SR programme. The ILO will appoint an evaluation manager who is not affiliated with the programme to oversee and manage the evaluation process.

The EU have the right to join any of the field missions during the evaluation, as deemed appropriate by the evaluator and evaluation manager.



## Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix

Question	Secondary Lines of Enquiry (if applicable)	Indicators	Data Sources	Method	Analysis and assessment
<b>Relevance and Strategic Fit</b>					
Does the programme address the major causes of vulnerability and respond to the most urgent needs of migrant workers in the fishing and seafood processing sectors in South East Asia?	Does it adequately meet the needs of both men and women? Does it respond equally to needs in different sectors? Does it respond to needs of marginalised groups? Has the programme adapted to any changes in needs and vulnerabilities as a result of COVID-19 and other context changes?	Evidence of needs assessments Evidence of alignment with stated needs of migrant workers Examples of adaption to context change	Programme Documents Men and Women Migrant Workers CSOs and Trade Unions	Document Review KIIs FGDs	Thematic analysis and triangulation of interview data showing relevance to various stakeholder needs. Assess measures taken to adapt the programme to changing priorities
Are the activities aligned with national, regional and global policy frameworks on labour migration/work in the fishing and seafood processing sectors?	GCM, SDGs, Colombo Process, ILO Conventions, Additional Protocols, and Guidelines, ILO P&B goals	Evidence of alignment with key policy frameworks	Programme Documents Government Officials Programme Staff	Document Review KIIs	Qualitative Content Analysis of relevant national and donor policy documents.
Are the governance structures participatory in approach and do they provide for the inclusion of the perspective of governments, social partners, civil society and women and men migrant workers?	What feedback mechanisms exist in the programme? Is there equal input of the different stakeholders into the governance structures?	Existence of feedback mechanisms Evidence of feedback being used to adapt the programme	Programme Documents Meeting Minutes Key Stakeholders Programme Staff	Document Review KIIs FGDs	Thematic analysis of interview data
<b>Validity of Design</b>					

Is the scope of the interventions realistic given the time and resources available?	Link to questions on effectiveness and efficiency Will the programme achieve its outcomes? Will quality as well as quantity be maintained?	Actual vs planned implementation Existence of work plans demonstrating plans for completing the programme	Programme Documents Programme Staff Other Stakeholders	Document Review KIIs	Analysis of work plan against outputs
Have the design and strategic planning documents developed proven useful in implementing the programme? (Description of the Action, M&E Plan, Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment Strategy, etc.)	Are programme staff and partner staff aware of and use the documents. Has the programme clearly articulated expected results on gender equality?	Evidence of understanding and use of the documents by NPCs and other staff.	Internal reports Programme Staff Partner Staff	Document review KIIs	Qualitative content analysis of key planning documents and thematic analysis of interview data
Does the intervention's Theory of Change clearly articulate assumptions, provide logical pathways of change between different levels of results and align with the ILO's strategic objectives and outcomes at the regional and global levels, as well as with the relevant SDGs and related targets?	Are the interlinkages in the theory of change clear and valid? Is there a clear links between the outputs/outcomes in the different countries and the programme as a whole? Are there breakdowns in implementation which impact the overall goals of the programme? Are changes recommended?	Existence of clear theory of change Evidence the theory of change is understood and used by programme stakeholders Examples of connections between the national and overall outcomes	MEL documents Programme Staff Other Key Stakeholders	Document review KIIs	Analyse theory of change for completeness and valid pathways Thematic analysis of interview data GRES
Has the programme applied an evidence-based approach in formulating and implementing the activities?	Has adaptive management been used as emerging findings from research have been available? Did the programme build on the findings of previous programmes implemented by ILO and others in this field?	Examples of research and feedback being used to amend activities. Evidence of evaluation recommendations of previous programmes	Progress Reports Amendments to Programme Documents Programme Staff	Document review KIIs	Analyse of use of evidence in programme adaption

		being acted upon in design and implementation of S2S			
<b>Intervention Progress and Effectiveness</b>					
What amount of progress has been made in achieving the programme's eight outputs? (Applying a scale of minor, moderate or major progress, with justification).	What is the progress against the action plan? Where there are delays, are there plans for achieving the outputs? Has the programme successfully addressed issues of environmental sustainability in its implementation.	Planned vs actual achievements Existence of action points to address programme delays	M&E data Progress Reports ILO, IOM, and UNDP staff	Document review KII	Analysis of work plan against outputs
To what extent are tripartite constituents and other key stakeholders satisfied with and/or benefitting from the outputs produced?	Do differences exist in satisfaction between the different constituents and other stakeholders?	Examples of satisfaction from key stakeholders	Tripartite constituents, migrant workers, other stakeholders.	KIIs FGDs	Thematic analysis of interview data
How effective are the individual partnerships/relationships with tripartite constituents, civil society and the private sector? Are there partnerships showing particular promise for achieving programme results?	Does this vary between countries? Is it clear why?	Examples of ownership of the programme by partners- including planning and implementing activities.	Programme Documents Programme Staff Partner Staff	Document Review KIIs	Thematic analysis of interview data
How effective has the collaboration and coordination been with other projects working on labour migration issues/fishing sector in maximizing synergies and eliminating duplication? (e.g., ASEAN-ACT, CREST, TRIANGLE in ASEAN, Safe and Fair, etc.)	What synergies exist between this programme and other projects/programmes implemented by ILO and other UN agencies? How?	Examples of coordination with other programmes, other UN agencies, and other actors working on migration/the fishing sector.	Programme documents ILO, UNDP, IOM staff Other actors working on fishing	Document review KIIs	Assess measures to improve coordination and reduce duplication between different interventions

How effective was the programme in responding to the impact of COVID-19 on migrant workers?	Was the COVID-19 relief considered effective by the recipients? Did the programme leverage this work as an entry point for other programming?	Testimony from migrant workers- examples of how the programme benefited them.	Programme documents Migrant workers and CSOs/Trade Unions Government and industry stakeholders	Document review KIIs FGDs	Thematic analysis of interview data
<b>Efficiency of Resource Use</b>					
Has the allocation of resources been optimal for achieving the programme's outcomes? (financial, human, institutional and technical, etc.)	Are principles of equity, economy, efficiency and effectiveness built into the programme? Are there areas where wastage occurs?	Examples of combined approach providing savings/efficiency Evidence the workload is distributed effectively across the programme team.	Programme documents ILO, IOM, and UNDP Programme Staff Other key stakeholders	Document review KIIs	Analyse against the 4 Es of value for money framework
Are the programme activities current being implemented on-time/according to work plans?	Link to question on progress in Intervention Progress and Effectiveness	Actuals vs planned	Programme documents Programme Staff	Document Review KIIs	Analysis of work plan against outputs
Has the programme been able to leverage cost-sharing or in-kind contributions to complement its resources? (e.g., from other ILO projects, slippage funds, inter-agency collaborations and private sector contributions)	Link to the question on synergies in intervention progress and effectiveness. What sharing of resources have there been? Does ILO have a system for identifying and accounting for sharing of resources.	Existence of documentation detailing resource sharing	Programme documents Documents from other programmes Programme staff	Document Review KIIs	Assess measures to improve coordination and use of expertise of each agency and other projects
<b>Effectiveness of Management Arrangements</b>					

How effective is the internal management of the programme? (including staffing arrangements and capacities, governance and oversight, work planning, etc.)	Do team members understand their role? How effective is the reporting process?	Existence of workplans, communication plans, minute meetings, M&E plans and evidence they are utilised	Programme documents Programme staff	Document Review KIIs	Thematic analysis of interview data
Has the communications and visibility strategy been effective in raising the profile of the programme within the target countries and at the regional level?	Are external stakeholders aware of the programme's goals and achievements?	Evidence stakeholders are aware of and engaged in the programme	Programme documents Programme staff	KIIs	Thematic analysis of interview data
Has the monitoring and evaluation system supported results-based management of the programme?	Are indicators smart? Is data collected and analysed on a timely basis?	Examples of smart indicators Updated programme data Regular review of workplans	Programme documents Programme Staff	Document review KIIs	Analysis of M&E system
Have programmatic, contextual and institutional risks been managed effectively by the programme?	Refer to question in relevance. Are risks reviewed and updated regularly?	Evidence of regular updating of the risk matrix and review by senior management	Programme documents Programme Staff	Document review KIIs	Qualitative content analysis
What value added has the UN inter-agency model brought to the programme?	Does the combined UN approach promote or hinder efficiency? Does the programme best use the comparative advantage of each agency?	Evidence of strong coordination between the agencies in implementing the activities.	Programme documents Programme Staff	Document review KIIs	Thematic analysis and triangulation of interview data showing coherence and synergies between UN agencies
<b>Impact Orientation and Sustainability</b>					
What initial influence has the programme had on the development of policies and practices at national and regional levels? What is the potential to achieve	What policy changes have occurred to date? What progress has been made on other policy changes, not yet finalised? Can the contribution	Evidence of commitment to policy changes Examples of policy change	Programme documents Government stakeholders	Document review KIIs	Thematic analysis of interview data and qualitative content analysis of key policy documents

change by the end of the project?	of the programme to these changes be identified?				
What strategies have been applied to ensure the achievement of lasting results after the completion of the programme?	Is there an exit/sustainability strategy for different interventions (eg MRCs, Labour Inspectors etc)? Has the programme considered how to provide support for programme gains in future	Existence of exit/sustainability strategy or plans for post programme support.	Programme documents Programme Staff Partner Staff	Document review KIIs	Qualitative content analysis of strategy documents and thematic analysis of interview data
What are the programme's most significant contributions to date to an enhanced knowledge base on labour migration in the fishing and seafood processing sectors within the target countries and region likely to be?	Assess to what extent the practical tools developed by the programme (e.g., Policy briefs, training materials, Codes of conduct) are likely to produce a direct impact if their use is extensively promoted, or even better enforced? Is environmental sustainability considered within the tools? Do the learnings support gender equality and women's empowerment?	Evidence of initial use of knowledge products. Evidence of stakeholders being interested and having the capacity to use the products.	Programme documents Programme partners Other stakeholders	Document review KIIs	Thematic analysis of interview data
Have there been any unintended or negative impacts of the programme for women and men migrant workers in fishing and seafood processing sectors?	How do these alter the theory of change? For other negative impacts, has this come from government, employers or other sources?	Example Evidence of any negative reaction from employers/government to organising or other activities of migrant workers	Migrant Workers CSOs	KIIs FGDs	Thematic analysis of interview data
<b>Gender Equality</b>					
What progress has been made towards key results on gender equality and women's empowerment by the programme?	Link to validity of design question on how clearly the expected results are articulated. Link to question on intended and unintended outcomes	Examples from migrants of women's empowerment (eg leadership in workers organisations) or gender	Programme documents Key stakeholders	Document review KIIs FGDs	Assess results on GRES scale

		equality (eg gender responsive policies)			
Are resources allocated sufficiently so the programme may achieve the expected results on gender equality and women's empowerment activities?	Are the guidelines for measuring the gender budget understood and utilised by the programme team?	Sufficient resources allocated in budget Evidence of use of gender budgeting guidelines	Programme Budget Management Data Programme Staff	Document review KIIs	Assess budget against gender budgeting guidelines
Is the M&E system sufficient to allow for the adequate gathering of disaggregated data by sex to determine ongoing and end-line differences in the programme results for women and men?	What data has been collected to date? What data will be collected by the end of the programme? Are there any gaps which need addressing?	Existence of disaggregated data	Programme Monitoring Data Programme Staff	Document review KIIs	Qualitative content analysis of M&E data

### Annex 3: List of Interviews Conducted

#### In-Person Interviews

#	Name	Position	Organisation	Gender	Country
1	Januar Rustandi	NPC, Improving Workers' Rights	International Labour Organisation	M	Indonesia
2	Hariyanto	Chair Person	SBMI (Indonesian Migrant Workers Union)	M	Indonesia
	Juwarih	Advocacy Coordinator		M	
	Dios Lumban	Policy Analysis		M	
	Moh. Ernawan	Economic Empowerment Coordinator		M	
	Trafficking survivor	Name withheld for confidentiality		M	
3	Siti Umi Salamah	Director of Labour Inspection System	Ministry of Manpower	W	Indonesia
	Dyah Tanti	Coordinator for the Planning of the Supervision System of Labour		W	
	Siti Wahyu Rejeki	Sub-Coordinator for the Planning of the Supervision System of Labour		W	
		Sub-Coordinator for the Planning of the Supervision System of Labour		M	
4	Rendra Setiawan	Director Placement and Protection of Indonesian Migrant Workers	Ministry of Manpower	M	Indonesia
5	Nurhayadi	Director of Maritime Security and Resilience	Coordinating Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Investment	M	Indonesia
	Adriani Kusumawardani	Deputy Director for Maritime Resilience		W	
	Komar Hellyus	Deputy Director for Coastal Resilience and Most Outer Islands		M	
6	Supardi	Chairperson	FSB KAMIPARHO	M	Indonesia
	Sulistri	General Secretary		W	
7	Thomas Darmawan		APINDO	M	Indonesia
	Imron Natsir	Committee for Fisheries		M	
8	Michiko Miyamoto	Country Director	ILO	W	Indonesia
9	Ek Samol	National Programme Coordinator	IOM	M	Cambodia
	Tha Saravuth	National Programme Coordinator	UNP	M	
10	Sokchar Mom	Executive Director	Legal Support for Children and Women	M	Cambodia
11	Meun Tola	Executive Director	CENTRAL	M	Cambodia



	Horng Vuthy	M&E Officer and Support MRC Team		M	
12	Ath Thon	President	Cambodian Labour Confederation	M	Cambodia
	Chea Sopheak	Programme Coordinator		M	
	Phal Chomrern	MRC Officer		M	
13	Ket Saroat	Deputy Director	Department of Legal Protection, Ministry of Women Affairs	W	Cambodia
	Heng Bunkheng			M	
	Chou Sovann			M	
14	Lo Sophearith	Deputy Director	National Employment Agency	M	Cambodia
	Siv Keang	Deputy Director for Planning and Cooperation		M	
15	Ouk Ravuth	Deputy Director	Department of Employment and Manpower, Ministry of Labour and Vocational Training	M	Cambodia
	Kim Sosamrach	Chief Office		M	
	Hou Vuthy	Secretary of State		M	
16	Chu Bun Eng		Division of Anti-Trafficking in Persons	W	Cambodia
17	Seab Seyha	MRC Coordinator	CENTRAL	M	Cambodia
	Lay Heang	Finance Officer- MRC		W	
18	Francesca Gilli	Attaché Programme Officer Cooperation	European Union	W	Regional
19	Chalermchai Suwannarak	Director General	Department of Fisheries	M	Thailand
20	Migrant Fisher	Name Withheld	Ranong	M	Thailand
21	Jon Hartough	South East Asia Regional Coordinator, ITF Fisheries Section	Fishers' Rights Network / International Transport Workers Federation	M	Thailand
22	Jitavadee Thonglim-	Human Resources Manager	Foundation for Education and Development	W	Thailand
	Wai Phyo	Project Trainer		W	
23	Yosson Ruangsungamsiri	Special Case Inquiry Official - Bureau of Human Trafficking Crime	Department of Special Investigation, Ministry of Justice	M	Thailand
24	Ratchapon Maneelek	Director, Head of Protection and Victim Rights Advocacy Group	DATIP	M	Thailand
25	Viboon Supakarapongkul	Vice President	Thai Frozen Foods Association	M	Thailand
	Saowanee Khamfang	Executive Director		W	
	Nareerat Junthong	Deputy Director		W	
26	Attapan Masrungsan	Advisor	Thai Tuna Industry Association	W	Thailand

	Vorapon Patananukit	Officer		M	
	Nonthawat Padungkiat	Officer		M	
27	Polwish Subsrinunjai	Deputy Program Director	Human Rights and Development Foundation	M	Thailand
	Pheniccha Jankomol	Project Coordinator for Anti-Labour Trafficking		W	
	Sofy Vittoria Dia	Intern		W	
28	Kanchana Poolkaew	DLPW Deputy Director-General	Department of Labour Protection and Welfare, Ministry of Labour	W	Thailand
29	Nichananan Sangnual			W	
	Weerachart Boonkhem			M	
30	Chalothorn	Bureau of International Cooperation	Office of the Permanent Secretary, MoL	W	Thailand
31	Aleksandra Lasota	Migration, Business and Human Rights Lead	IOM	W	Regional
32	Deepa Bharati	CTA Safe and Fair	ILO	W	Regional
33	Nilim Baruah	Senior Specialist, Labour Migration	ILO	M	Regional
34	Bharati Pflug	Senior FPRW, DWT Bangkok		W	Regional
36	Rene Robert	Labour Administration & Labour Inspection Specialist	ILO	M	Regional
37	Anna Engblom	CTA TRIANGLE	ILO	W	Regional
38	Adisorn Kerdmongkol	Project Coordinator	Migrant Working Group	M	Regional

#### Focus Group Discussions/Group Interviews

#	Description	# Women	# Men	Country
1	CENTRAL MRC Safe Migration Ambassadors	3	2	Cambodia
2	Former fishers who have received support from CENTRAL	0	3	Cambodia
3	Community members who have attended pre-departure information sessions	2	3	Cambodia
4	FRN MRC staff in Ranong	0	6	Thailand
5	Current fishers in Ranong	0	7	Thailand
6	Labour inspectors and interpreters in Ranong	2	3	Thailand
7	Migrant women who received COVID-19 relief packages	8	0	Thailand

#### Remote Interviews

#	Name	Position	Organisation	Gender	Country
1	Ben Harkins	Technical Advisor	ILO	M	Regional
2	Phumphat Chetiyononth	Monitoring and Evaluation Officer	ILO	M	Regional
3	Mi Zhou	CTA	ILO	W	Regional
4	Albert Bonasahat	NPC	ILO	M	Indonesia

5	Sambo Sok	NPC	ILO	M	Cambodia
6	Anyamane Tabtimsri	NPC	ILO	W	Thailand
7	Hussein Macarambon	NPC	ILO	M	Philippines
8	Nguyen Thi Mai Thuy	NPC	ILO	W	Vietnam
9	Yazar Win	NPC	ILO	M	Myanmar
10	Anonglack Phaniphong	Senior Programme Assistant	ILO	W	Lao PDR
11	George May	Counter-Trafficking/Migrant Protection Coordinator	UNDP	M	Regional
12	Ingpat Pakchairatchakul	Thailand Project Coordinator Human Mobility	UNDP	W	Thailand
13	Among Resi	Sr. Programme Assistant	IOM	W	Regional
14	Muhammad Nour	National Project Coordinator	Accelerator Project 8.7, ILO	M	Indonesia
15	Roberto Valerio	Secretary-General	Employers' Confederation of the Philippines - Zamboanga, Basilan, Sulu, Tawi-Tawi Chapter	M	Philippines
16	Herbert Dernos	Regional Coordinator for Region 12	SENTRO, MARINO (subnational affiliate)	M	Philippines
17	Doan Mau Diep	Chairman	Association of Manpower Supply	M	Vietnam
18	Yan Htaik Seng	Country Director	BBC Media Action	M	Myanmar
	Theint Theint Phooe	Project Manager		W	
19	Bounsouan Xaiyasinh	Director,	Overseas Employment Division, Department of Employment	M	Lao PDR
	Soysavanh Outhaphone	Deputy Director		W	
20	Parastou Hatami	Volunteer Project Officer	Australian Volunteers Program	W	Thailand
21	Ann Lopez	Senior Director	Asian Institute of Journalism and Communication	W	Philippines
22	Souksavanh Vongkhamthong	Deputy Head of MRC, Bolikhamxay	Provincial Department of Labour and Social Welfare	M	Lao PDR
23	Moe Wai	Project Coordinator	Foundation for Education and Development	M	Myanmar
24	Thet Thet Aung	Executive Director	Future Light Center	W	Myanmar
	Kan Min Thar	Finance Manager		M	
26	Le Dinh Tung	Deputy Director	Thanh Hoa Department of Labour	M	Vietnam
27	Ha Thi Phuong Thao	Deputy Head - International Department	Vietnam General Confederation of Labour	W	Vietnam
28	Geraldine Mendez	Director II	DMW, Overseas Employment Administration	W	Philippines
29	Kongseng Piengpanya	Programme Coordinator	Village Focus International	F	Lao PDR
30	Nguyen Gia Liem	Deputy Director General	DOLAB, MoL, Invalids and Social Affairs	M	Vietnam

## Annex 4: List of documents consulted

- Project Document
- MEL Plan-including results framework and theory of change
- Interim Narrative Report 2021
- Monthly and Quarterly Reports
- Work Plan for 2021-22 (included in the annual report package)
- Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment Strategy Report and supporting documents
- Myanmar Reprogramming Document
- Evaluability Review
- Report of Ship To Shore 1 project and Sea Fisheries: Strengthened Coordination to Combat Labour Exploitation and Trafficking in Fisheries in Southeast Asia Final Evaluations
- Meetings of PSC, NPAC, Gender Taskforce, and Team meetings
- Baseline Report
- Riding Out the Storm Organizational resilience of trade unions and civil society organizations following the military takeover in Myanmar
- Lao PDR Gap Analysis
- Rough seas: The impact of COVID-19 on fishing workers in South-East Asia
- Turning principles into pathways: The future of the Seafood Good Labour Practices programme
- M&E Training Manual
- MOUs for various MRC implementation
- Report and theory of change on Labour Inspection Training
- Legal Aid Support MOUs
- Documents on Fair Seas Labour Conference
- Bilateral Trade Union Cooperation MOU
- ILO's evaluation guidelines (2020)
- UN Women Evaluation Handbook (2015)
- UN Women Good Practices in Gender Responsive Evaluations (2020)
- UN Women Evaluation Policy (2012)
- United Nation's Evaluation Group's (UNEG) guidelines on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation

## Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia

### Regional programme on labour migration in the fishing sector

**Project DC/SYMBOL:** RAS/20/01/EUR

**Name of Evaluator:** Chris Morris

**Date:** 20 February 2023

*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.*

<b>LESSON LEARNED ELEMENT</b>	<b>TEXT</b>
<b>Brief description of lessons learned</b> (link to specific action or task)	Including both countries in a migrant corridor in a programme ensures easier collaboration between stakeholders.
<b>Context and any related preconditions</b>	The programme operates in sending countries in two contexts, those which are sending migrants to other countries included in the programme (Cambodia, Lao PDR, and Vietnam to Thailand), and Vietnam and the Philippines whose main migration corridors is with Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan. The Philippines and Indonesia have a significant domestic labour market for fishing and seafood processing.
<b>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</b>	Designers of future migration programmes.
<b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>	Particularly in Vietnam, stakeholders referencing the gaps which exist by not being able to provide support at both ends of the migrant corridor. While the programme should still be able to provide useful pre-departure and reintegration support, there is a gap during migration the programme currently does not respond to.
<b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>	Migrants to Cambodia, Lao PDR, and Myanmar, mainly go to Thailand. The programme has been able to work on bilateral interactions between governments (excepting Myanmar) and also between CSOs and workers' organisations.
<b>ILO Administrative Issues</b> (staff, resources, design, implementation)	

# Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia

## Regional programme on labour migration in the fishing sector

**Project DC/SYMBOL: RAS/20/01/EUR**

**Name of Evaluator: Chris Morris**

**Date: 20 February 2023**

*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.*

<b>LESSON LEARNED ELEMENT</b>	<b>TEXT</b>
<b>Brief description of lessons learned</b> (link to specific action or task)	Training of labour inspectors is not sufficient on its own. It requires political will to empower labour inspections to enforce regulations and address violations. Encouraging interaction with NGOs would be strongly recommended.
<b>Context and any related preconditions</b>	Both this phase and the previous phase of the Ship to Shore programme in Thailand have conducted a lot of capacity building training for labour inspectors. This has aligned with new laws in Thailand and a focus from the Government of Thailand on the issue since the yellow card was issued. To strengthen the quality of joint inspections and number of enforcements, a cultural change in how success is defined within the inspectorate (i.e. not assuming low identification of violations is a positive) and direction from the central and provincial governments towards more strategic inspection of high risk vessels is needed.
<b>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</b>	ILO programmes working with labour inspectors.
<b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>	There have been incremental improvements in the percentage of inspections which lead to enforcement action, but this is still very low, and there is clearly a disconnect between the experience of migrant fishers and the understanding of labour inspectors of the migrant worker experience.
<b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>	There have been small improvements in enforcement actions which gives a basis to engage the government further.
<b>ILO Administrative Issues</b> (staff, resources, design, implementation)	

# Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia

## Regional programme on labour migration in the fishing sector

Project DC/SYMBOL: RAS/20/01/EUR

Name of Evaluator: Chris Morris

Date: 20 February 2023

*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.*

LESSON LEARNED ELEMENT	TEXT
<b>Brief description of lessons learned</b> (link to specific action or task)	Regional programmes are successful in broadening the scope of a programme and building on momentum but require sufficient resources in each country to ensure ongoing progress.
<b>Context and any related preconditions</b>	The Ship to Shore programme has expanded from one country in the first phase to seven countries in the second phase.
<b>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</b>	Designers of multi-country programmes
<b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>	<p>Stakeholders who participated in the evaluation referenced the limited resources per country as being a challenge in getting sufficient support in a timely manner.</p> <p>In this programme, the budget is also split between three UN agencies with individual administration requirements, which also reduces funds available for staff in each country.</p>
<b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>	The quality of support was still regarded by external stakeholders as being very high and there was strong appreciation for the work being done by the three agencies
<b>ILO Administrative Issues</b> (staff, resources, design, implementation)	Budget and programming trade-offs may be needed in future programming to ensure sufficient resources are available. In this programme the original budget of \$15 million was cut to about \$9 million but the number of countries involved remained the same.

## Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia

### Regional programme on labour migration in the fishing sector

Project DC/SYMBOL: RAS/20/01/EUR

Name of Evaluator: Chris Morris

Date: 20 February 2023

*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.*

LESSON LEARNED ELEMENT	TEXT
<b>Brief description of lessons learned</b> (link to specific action or task)	The harmonisation of laws and operating procedures between ministries is a challenging but necessary requirement for supporting the integration of multi-ministries working on a particular area of the enforcement of workers' rights and decent working conditions.
<b>Context and any related preconditions</b>	Several countries have a mix of laws and jurisdictions for the inspections of fishing vessels which complicates efforts to ensure the enforcement of decent working conditions and redress for violations.
<b>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</b>	ILO programmes working on integrated programming across multiple ministries.
<b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>	
<b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>	Stakeholders in Indonesia shared with the evaluator the importance of ILO working to strengthen coordination between ministries. At the moment there are laws and regulations that have been issued by more than one ministry. In many cases this isn't well coordinated and creates ambiguity and areas where clarification needs to be given. A previous ILO programme produced a gap analysis identifying areas where harmonisation was needed. The current programme has made considerable progress and utilised ILO's comparative advantage to engage different ministries, and this will need to be continued to ensure the laws can be consistently applied. This builds on experiences from Thailand in the previous phase of the Ship to Shore programme.
<b>ILO Administrative Issues</b> (staff, resources, design, implementation)	Requires CTAs, TOs, and NPCs experienced in navigating different ministries and building strong relationships with government counterparts.



# Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia

## Regional programme on labour migration in the fishing sector

Project DC/SYMBOL: RAS/20/01/EUR

Name of Evaluator: Chris Morris

Date: 20 February 2023

*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.*

<b>LESSON LEARNED ELEMENT</b>	<b>TEXT</b>
<b>Brief description of lessons learned</b> (link to specific action or task)	The engagement of NGOs, CSOs and workers' organisations remains a key tool in ensuring better response to working condition violations, improved access to justice, and the provision of better response services for survivors of trafficking.
<b>Context and any related preconditions</b>	
<b>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</b>	ILO programmes working on similar issues
<b>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</b>	The operating environment remains a challenge for CSOs and workers' organisations due to restrictive laws and practices in several of the countries of implementation.
<b>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</b>	In the programme, the work with FRN has demonstrated that workers' can be supported to organise within restrictive environments through an organisation with strong grassroots connections. Engagement of workers through their peers in the communities they live in and the environments they work in is critical for this. Work with CSOs and workers' organisations in Myanmar also demonstrates the importance of such organisations when operating in a very challenging environment. Both the provision of information and support of survivors of trafficking has been possible through working in a sensitive manner with these organisations in Myanmar. Another branch of the work with CSOs, the work with legal organisations, demonstrates the importance of civil society in helping migrants gain access to justice. Such services are not provided by governments and legal costs are outside of the means of migrants.
<b>ILO Administrative Issues</b> (staff, resources, design, implementation)	

## Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia

### Regional programme on labour migration in the fishing sector

Project DC/SYMBOL: RAS/20/01/EUR

Name of Evaluator: Chris Morris

Date: 20 February 2023

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

<b>GOOD PRACTICE ELEMENT</b>	<b>TEXT</b>
<b>Brief summary of the good practice</b> (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	Quick assessment and design of reprogramming in Myanmar allowed for the programme to continue in some form.
<b>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</b>	Replication of this context will hopefully be limited, the programme does provide an example of how to address significant upheaval in a country where disengagement with the government is required.
<b>Establish a clear cause-effect relationship</b>	The programme responded quickly to the coup in Myanmar which occurred on February 1, 2021. By July 2, 2021, the programme had produced a reprogramming memo detailing how all three UN agencies would respond in each output.
<b>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</b>	The measurable impact will be the continuation of activities in Myanmar and any benefits migrants and CSOs gain by the end of the programme. Without the reprogramming effort, activities could have ceased completely.
<b>Potential for replication and by whom</b>	UN programmes in future countries where engagement rules are changed due to external events.
<b>Upward links to higher ILO Goals</b> (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	Links to the UN Principals for Engagement in Myanmar.
<b>Other documents or relevant comments</b>	

# Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia

## Regional programme on labour migration in the fishing sector

Project DC/SYMBOL: RAS/20/01/EUR

Name of Evaluator: Chris Morris

Date: 20 February 2023

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

<b>GOOD PRACTICE ELEMENT</b>	<b>TEXT</b>
<b>Brief summary of the good practice</b> (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	Using different providers for MRCs increases learning opportunities and encourages different approaches. The programme is partnering with CSOs, workers' representatives and different government agencies to implement MRCs in different countries. This presents opportunities for cross-learning and collaboration between the different entities and also if learning strategies are applied within ILO.
<b>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</b>	This approach in this programme is in its early stages and will require follow-up. Replicability will depend on learning which can be gleaned from this approach, particularly if effective strategies are identified for use elsewhere.
<b>Establish a clear cause-effect relationship</b>	It is too early to assess the cause-effect relationship as the programming has only recently started. This should be considered in the final evaluation.
<b>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</b>	As above
<b>Potential for replication and by whom</b>	Other programmes supporting MRCs.
<b>Upward links to higher ILO Goals</b> (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	Output 7.5, increased capacity of Member States to develop fair and effective labour migration frameworks, institutions and services to protect migrant workers.
<b>Other documents or relevant comments</b>	

# Ship to Shore Rights South East Asia

## Regional programme on labour migration in the fishing sector

Project DC/SYMBOL: RAS/20/01/EUR

Name of Evaluator: Chris Morris

Date: 20 February 2023

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

GOOD PRACTICE ELEMENT	TEXT
<b>Brief summary of the good practice</b> (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	Ensuring deliverables are clear in implementation agreements is critical for preparing for strong delivery, even if this delays implementation of the programme's activities.
<b>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</b>	The evaluation noted that there have been some delays in finalising implementation agreements with partners. While this is partly related to COVID-19 and ILO's bureaucratic requirements, a significant reason is also the insistence of the programme on ensuring clear proposals are developed by the partners which outline the outcomes of the agreements and the means to achieve these (outputs and activities). Delays in responses from partners has contributed to the overall delays. While this does raise concerns about there being enough time for partners to develop long-term capacities through the programme, it is a key strength of the programme that implementation agreements are substantive and that ILO has ensured partners lead on designing activities and not just imposed proposals on partners to speed up the process.
<b>Establish a clear cause-effect relationship</b>	The early effects of this approach can be seen in the strong delivery form partners in the implementation agreements which have been finalised. More detailed reviews of the remaining implementation agreements (where there has often been more need to go back to the partners for more detailed plans) can be assessed more clearly at the end of the programme.
<b>Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries</b>	The ultimate beneficiaries will be the recipients of the services provided and the implementing partners who benefit from capacity building.
<b>Potential for replication and by whom</b>	ILO programmes developing implementing agreements.

---

**Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)**

---

**Other documents or relevant comments**

---