

ILO EVALUATION

Evaluation Report

Evaluation Title: Final Evaluation Promoting Decent Work through good governance, protection and empowerment of migrant workers: Ensuring the effective implementation of the Sri Lanka National Labour Migration Policy – Phase III

ILO TC/SYMBOL:	LKA/15/02/CHE
Type of Evaluation:	Final Independent
Country:	Sri Lanka
Project start-end date	6th April 2016 – 29th February 2020
Name of consultant(s):	Sten Toft Petersen (International Consultant), Rachel C. Perera (National Consultant)
ILO Administrative Office:	ILO CO, Colombo
ILO Technical Backstopping Office:	DWT New Delhi
Evaluation Duration:	January to March 2020 (evaluation mission between 20 and 28 Feb 2020)
Donor/ budget USD:	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) /US \$ 1.500.000
Evaluation Manager:	Rattaporn Pongpattana

This evaluation has been conducted according to ILO's evaluation policies and procedures and has undergone quality control by the ILO Evaluation Unit.

Table of Contents

Contents

List of Acronyms	4
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	6
1.1 Relevance.....	7
1.2 Coherence and Validity of the Design	7
1.3 Intervention’s Progress and Effectiveness	7
1.4 Efficiency.....	8
1.5 Effectiveness of Management Arrangement.....	9
1.6 Sustainability and Impact.....	9
1.7 Recommendations.....	10
2. Background.....	12
2.1 Sri Lankan Labour Migration	12
2.2 Project Background.....	13
2.3 Goals and Objectives of the Programme.....	16
2.3.1 Alignment	16
2.3.2 Project Management Arrangements.....	17
2.3.3 Strategy and Logical Framework.....	18
2.3.4 Objectives, Expected Results and Activities of the Project	19
2.3.5 National Implementing Partners:	19
2.3.6 The Donor	19
2.3.7 Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries	19
3. Purpose, scope and clients of the Final Evaluation.....	21
3.1 Introduction and Rationale for the Evaluation.....	21
3.2 Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation	21
3.3 Scope of the Evaluation	21
3.4 Selection Criteria	22
4. Evaluation Methodology.....	25
4.1 Identifying and Analysing the Expected/Unexpected Outcomes.....	26
4.2 Limitations	29
5. Overall Findings.....	31
5.1 Relevance.....	31
5.2 Coherence and Strategic Fit.....	33
5.3 Validity of the Intervention’s Design.....	34
5.4 Intervention’s Progress and Effectiveness	38
5.4.1 Achievements concerning Objective 1 – Outcome 1:.....	43

5.4.2	Achievements concerning Objective 2 – Outcome 2:.....	45
5.4.3	Achievements concerning Objective 3 – Outcome 3:.....	46
5.4.4	Achievements concerning Objective 4 – Outcome 4:.....	47
5.4.5	Effectiveness of management arrangements.....	53
5.5	Efficiency of Resource Use.....	53
5.6	Likelihood of Sustainability.....	56
5.7	Impact:	58
5.8	Cross-cutting issues:	59
6.	Conclusions and Recommendations	61
6.1	Conclusion	61
6.2	Recommendations.....	64
	Appendix1 ToR - attached separately.....	67
	Appendix 2 Lessons Learned and emerging good practise.....	67
	Appendix 3 Recommendations.....	74
	Appendix 4 Field Mission Schedule.....	78
	Appendix 5 LIST OF PEOPLE / ORGANIZATIONS MET.....	80
	Appendix 6 Documents reviewed.....	82
	Appendix 7 Results against Indicators.....	84
	Annex I Overview of Stakeholder, Topics and Data Collection Methodologies.....	89
	Annex II Key Questions for final evaluation.....	92
	Annex III tools potential MW.....	95
	Annex IV tool Project team	97
	Annex V tool PAC.....	98
	Annex VI Tool GOV	99
	Annex VII tool employers	100
	Annex VIII tool EOs.....	100
	Annex IX tool TUs.....	101
	Annex X tool Agent.....	102
	Annex XI tool for Implementing partners.....	102

List of Acronyms

ADD	Abu Dhabi Dialogue
ALFEA	Association of Licensed Foreign Employment Agents
CoEC	Code of Conduct for Ethical Recruitment
CP	Colombo Process
CSO	Civil Society Organisations
EFC	Employers' Federation of Ceylon
FBR	Family Background Report
FEDO	Foreign Employment Development Officers
FGDs	Focussed Group Discussions
GCM	Global Compact on Migration
GFMD	Global Forum on Migration and Development
GOSL	Government of Sri Lanka
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IOM	International Organization for Migration
ITUC	International Trade Union Confederation
MDO	Migration Development Officers
MoJ	Ministry of Justice
MSDELR	Ministry of Skills Development, Employment and Labour Relations
NAC	National Advisory Committee
NAP	National Action Plan
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organisations
NLMP	National Labour Migration Policy
NPC	National Project Coordinator
NSCRR	National Steering Committee on Return and Reintegration
OM	Operation Manual
PAC	Program Advisory Committee
PD	Project Documents
PEP	Partner Exchange Platform
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Corporation
SGBV	Sexual and Gender Based Violence
SLBFE	Sri Lanka Bureau of Foreign Employment
SMB	Special Mediation Board
TAF	The Asia Foundation
TOT	Training of Trainers
TCPR	Technical Corporation Progress Report
UN	United Nations

Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by an evaluation team consisting of: Team leader, Sten Toft Petersen; International Consultant and team member, Rachel C. Perera; National Consultant, Rattanaporn Pongpattana; ILO's evaluation manager also provided support and guidance throughout the process as well as valuable comments for the evaluation process.

The management and programme staff in the ILO country office, in Colombo, Sri Lanka provided valuable input to and support for the evaluation.

The evaluation team would like to thank the ILO constituents, implementing partners and their local CSO partners in Sri Lanka, especially the key informants from the Foreign Employment Section of the Ministry of Skills Development, Employment and Labour Relations (MSDELRL), and the Sri Lanka Bureau of Foreign Employment (SLBFE), who participated in the evaluation. The implementing partners were very helpful in establishing the institutional memory, in relation to the project. The ILO Regional Migration Specialist and the former project NPC were very helpful in providing information, especially about the project's background and choice of design – this was highly appreciated.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The project under evaluation, "*Promoting decent work through good governance, protection and empowerment of migrant workers: Ensuring the effective implementation of the Sri Lanka National Labour Migration Policy – Phase III*" is a continuation that builds on the International Labour Organisations (ILO)'s experiences in supporting the GoSL, to take forward the actions stipulated in the National Labour Migration Policy (NLMP).

The Labour Migration Phase III project, that was implemented between March 2016 and March 2020, build on the achievements and learnings of Phases I and II (December 2010-December 2015) and aimed at upscaling and consolidating work carried out in the past five years. The project continued to build on the ILO's experiences in supporting the responsible Ministry to take forward the actions stipulated in the NLMP. In this phase, ILO ensured the strategic continuation of programmes and initiatives supported in the previous phases as well as a few new initiatives to further policy objectives.

The overall developmental objective of the Labour Migration (LM) Project phase III was to promote effective implementation of the National Labour Migration Policy resulting in better protection of women and men migrant workers and families increased development benefits. This development objective is pursued through four main objectives:

Objective 1: To improve the policy, legislative and regulatory frameworks and processes that govern labour migration to reflect and respond to current contextual situations and needs that further safeguard the rights of women and men migrant workers and families.

Objective 2: To protect the rights of and empower women, migrant workers, and their families.

Objective 3: To maximise the benefits of labour migration.

Objective 4: To document and share experiences, best practices and lessons at national, regional and global level.

This report contains the findings of the final evaluation of the project conducted during February 2020. The purpose of this final evaluation was to be accountable to the Project's donor as well to its tripartite constituents, and to serve as internal organisational learning for improvement of similar projects in the future. The evaluation used an evidence-based methodology, consisting of quantitative information gathered from a desk review and qualitative information gathered from focus groups and in-depth interviews, covering a cross-section of project stakeholders.

The project was able to complete almost all outputs and activities that were under the control of the ILO for delivery, whereas some outputs were not completed because of the delays caused by lack of implementing capacity, political environment and many changes among the responsible government officials. It can be concluded that the most significant outcome of the project, including its preceding two phases, has been its contribution to the recognition of labour migration/foreign employment as an important part of the public and political agenda in Sri Lanka.

As concerns the strategic fit of the project objectives, it was reported that the objectives of the two first phases were developed, based on discussions with stakeholders, whereas the third phase was developed as a follow-up for outcomes that were not fully achieved in the second phase.

As concerns effectiveness and efficiency, it is concluded that the 4 objectives were achieved, to the greatest extent possible, within the given circumstances. One of the main reasons for the project's inability to complete all the activities on time and, hence, to achieve the planned outcomes, was mainly caused by delays within the government system, when implementing some of the activities.

The Project's engagement strategy was to work with the key government ministry mandated to govern labour migration from Sri Lanka, and the Sri Lanka Bureau of Foreign Employment (SLBFE), the main state agency that deals with all administrative and mandatory issues concerning migration for employment.

The Project's success in establishing a mechanism to promote dialogue between government and non-government stakeholders is a noteworthy achievement. However, the evaluation finds that the project was challenged in establishing national ownership beyond the Ministry and SLBFE.

1.1 Relevance

The objectives of the project are very consistent with the beneficiaries' needs, as the project was intended to support the implementation of the NLMP and the protection of migrant workers and their families, while overseas and upon their return. The project objectives were closely aligned to those of the NLMP. In addition, the relevance of the LM Project to the needs of Sri Lanka has been very high.

1.2 Coherence and Validity of the Design

The project design, as laid down in the Project Document (PD), is quite logical and coherent with a comprehensive Logical Framework (Logframe) defining the objectives, outcomes, outputs, indicators and means of verification.

The indicators described in the PD and Logframe were not particularly precise, as no actual numbers were given. The indicators in the Logframe were generally gender sensitive, with explicit attention being paid to women workers in the project's objectives. The lessons learned from Phases I and II were explicitly taken into account, when designing this Phase III project.

The evaluation finds that the design could have been strengthened if a ToC had been in place when the project was designed. This could also have helped to strengthen the M&E.

1.3 Intervention's Progress and Effectiveness

The Project allocated significant efforts in meeting its Objective 1: "To improve the policy, legislative and regulatory frameworks and processes that govern labour migration to reflect and respond to current contextual situations and needs that further safeguarding the rights of women and men migrant workers and families" and its Outcome: "Governance and regulation of labour migration improved through enhanced policies and effective implementation of the National Labour Migration Policy". The supported reforms and new practises met some of the gaps

disclosed during the previous phases of the project but might not in full have reacted to some of the new challenges. The project has prepared the basis for new initiatives to take off, but these were not realized within the lifetime of the project.

The Objective 2: “To protect the rights of and empower women and migrant workers and their families” of the LM project and its Outcome: “Rights of men and women migrant workers and their families protected through effective policy implementation” have received attention from the project, but the evaluation could not identify any documented improvements. The capacity building and other initiatives can have created the basis for a better protection of the rights of migrant workers. The pre-departure training can have empowered the migrants departing through regular channels to protect their own rights. THB and GBV has been included in the new OM, this can be seen as positive, but the evaluation is concerned, that this is not followed by development of psycho-social competency in the diplomatic mission or an immediate referral mechanism.

Overall the LM project has contributed to a limited extend to meeting the Objective 3:” To maximise the benefits of labour migration” and its Outcome:” Benefits of labour migration optimized through improved coordination and practice”. The project has contributed to a number of initiatives for better pre-departure procedures. The reintegration efforts can have a positive effect and increase benefits of labour migration.

The project Objective 4: “To document and share experiences, best practices and lessons at national, regional and global level” and its Outcome: “Increased contribution to national, regional and global discourse on migrant workers” is properly the objective which was met to the biggest extend. Sri Lanka has actively contributed with its experiences in various international fora. Nationally labour migration has become a high-profile issue both in the public and on the political agenda. The project has contributed actively to both processes.

Compared to most ILO projects the involvement of the workers and employers’ organisations in the project’s implementation was limited.

Gender issues have received substantial attention in the design, as well as during the entire implementation of the project, although there is no solid recommendation on gender mainstreaming in the NLMP’s NAP. After years of female prevalence among migrant workers, the concern has now shifted to the reasons behind the rapidly declining number of female migrants and the role played in this by various regulations (e.g. the FBR).

With 23 Outputs and 41 Activities identified in the project design, the complexity of the programme and the high number of tasks to be undertaken by the project staff seem to have been underestimated, at the design stage.

1.4 Efficiency

The project initiatives generally appear to have delivered value for money. The resources and inputs (funds, expertise, and time, etc.) were generally allocated and used strategically, to achieve the planned results.

Concerning integrated gender equality, it was assessed that most stakeholders were very aware of the importance of including gender mainstreaming in the project's implementation and made efforts to have women included among the participants in workshops and training courses.

Many of the identified outputs and activities were closely aligned to the Government's policies, as laid down in the NLMP and the SLBFE Act; therefore, the employed methodology was adequate and correct steps were taken to contribute to improving the implementation of these policies.

The value of the project or the percentage of budget that actually reached the primary and secondary beneficiaries is quite high as the project worked very closely with the Ministry and SLBFE, as well as with the SDC and its partners. The migrants themselves and their families benefited indirectly, through the improved work of the FEDOs, and the SDC's Partner CSOs.

1.5 Effectiveness of Management Arrangement

The change of the PAC, from being a Project Advisory Committee for the LM project to a Program Advisory Committee for all the SDCs partner projects, challenged ownership, specifically of the LM project. Since this change occurred there was no steering or advisory committee in place for the project. This function was filled by frequent meetings between donor representatives and the NPC.

Reporting was transparent during the lifetime of the project. In the TPRs, the link with the Logframe is clear at the general Objectives' level, but somewhat difficult to establish in detail. Regarding the dissemination of the publications, produced under the project, the ILO has identified a two-page 'Dissemination Strategy' which includes target groups at international and national level. Policy briefs were circulated to the relevant recipients, depending on the theme of the brief, as an alternative manner of information dissemination.

1.6 Sustainability and Impact

The sustainability of the achieved results differs among the various project components. As a whole, the results of Objective 1 are quite durable, especially because most of them are embedded in the structures and policies of the Ministry and the SLBFE. The same is true for the revision of the SLBFE-Act (1985). The capacity building for recruitment agencies, on ethical recruitment, could become a sustainable result which could be scaled up or replicated by other partners. The results of Objective 2 also showed a clear durable character, with the FEDO training manual and resource pack being completed and the training of FEDOs started. The revision of the Operational Manual (OP) for Labour Attaches was completed and is expected to be approved for sustainability. Monitoring and continued follow up is required. The establishment of a pilot Special Mediation Board (SMB) in Kurunegala marked an important step with issue of 3 key Gazette notifications; the project delivered all that was expected for the operation of the SMB.

Among the Objective 3 results, the existence of the new Reintegration Unit is not only a sign of durability but also of the concrete institutionalisation of political will on the side of the government. The completion of the Resource Directories for FEDOs and their dissemination is another important step, for which plans need to be developed for scaling up. Among the results of

Objective 4, the published Policy Briefs are tangible project outputs, which contribute to the stakeholders' visibility and attention towards the concrete policy issues.

Overall ownership of the project has been relatively high, at the Ministry, which was oriented towards the implementation of the NLMP. The project objectives fit well with the national priorities in the NLMP, which the GoSL owns and uses to guide all of its work on labour migration. As the SLBFE was heavily involved in the implementation of the project, ownership here is substantial.

The Government of Sri Lanka is deeply involved in several international and regional consultative processes. These include the CP, the ADD, GFMD, the GCM and the ILMS meetings. Regionally, governments have benefited from being informed about activities and outputs under the project. The work undertaken by the SDC's Partner CSOs at the local level, and the support for return and reintegration from the national level to the local level, through the newly established Reintegration Unit of the SLBFE, can also be counted as benefits.

The capacity building efforts and the Reintegration Unit at the Bureau are, in themselves, sustainable outputs and the developed training courses and manuals can be used to upscale the Ministry's training in the future.

Concerning the extent to which the impact of the project is sustainable over the longer term the evaluation has concluded that labour migration has become an integrated part of the political and economical agenda of Sri Lanka, and that it will remain there for many years to come.

1.7 Recommendations

Recommendation 1: It is recommended to include both in-bound and out-bound migration in a comprehensive long-term employment strategy. Such a strategy should be developed, after a detailed study has been made of the benefits and the challenges of migration and the changes in employment structures for the country in general, and the employers and workers in particular. The strategy should be developed on the basis of tripartite consultations. There is a good momentum for developing this as both foreign employment and labour are under the same Ministry for now.

Recommendation 2: The ILO should consider supporting an independent study of the new trends in labour migration, including the issue of women's undocumented migration. Based on this, together with the constituents, it should develop adequate initiatives.

Recommendation 3: SLBFE to institutionalise the training for recruitment agencies (ethical recruitment) and run periodic training programs for personnel in licenced recruitment agencies, to update them about current issues in relation to LM. This should be followed by the establishment of correct monitoring mechanisms, to be put in place by the SLBFE to monitor the process of LM.

Recommendation 4: To increase the capacity of the LA to validate employers to ensure both living, employment and working conditions are in compliance with generally accepted standards.

Recommendation 5: Secure a maximum involvement of the industry in the further development of the CoEC. This is to ensure that it meets the needs of the industry and creates an ownership. The ILO's relevant projects should support this process and technical assistance be provided. The original idea of linking compliance to obtaining/renewal of licenses should be considered.

Recommendation 6: Sri Lanka should continue its active participation in the international fora post project. ILO should continue technical support for GoSL in their international activities.

Recommendation 7: The Ministry should review the training of FEDOs and include training on counselling on socio-psychological issues and financial literacy for the families receiving remittances.

Recommendation 8: The information booklet, safe migration guides and other materials developed by the project should be distributed to all offices, as well as updated and re-printed at regular intervals. It should include more information on the return and re-integration aspects.

Recommendation 9: The blacklisting of agencies, which are in non-compliance, will require strong legal procedures and principles and could have some negative consequences. However, a positive listing of those in compliance could have a positive impact on the agencies' behaviour. It is recommended jointly to establish such a positive list. This could eventually be linked to the Migrant Recruitment Advisor developed by the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) and supported through the two other ILO projects in the country, REFRAME and EQUIP.

Recommendation 10: It is recommended that skills' recognition and certification be institutionalised by the application of international standards. Market intelligence should be developed to identify the market needs and standards of receiving countries. Long- and short-term requirements should be identified. These initiatives should be seen as a part of a comprehensive national employment strategy.

Recommendation 11: The ILO to strengthen its project budget monitoring system to ensure that there is a timely delivery, as per the implementation plan and by implementing partners.

Recommendation 12: The ILO should consider nominating a person from among relevant project staff to be in charge of the LM Unit, to secure coordination and the institutionalisation of the Units' work, as per the concept note.

1.8 Lessons Learned and Emerging Good practises

The evaluation finds that the establishment of a Program Advisory Committee where all projects targeted on a specific subject meet with the constituents for reporting on progress and discussing way forward is an emerging good practise which can have a positive impact on achieving joint objectives. During the current project, the projects invited for the PAC were limited to those funded by one donor. If this was opened up to cover all donors funding activities in a specific field of intervention the outcome would have the potential to be even stronger.

The evaluation points to three Lessons Learned from the current project. Firstly, the evaluation finds that a complex project like this has to have a steering or advisory committee to secure involvement and ownership among all three constituents. Secondly, an important labour market policy area like labour migration will benefit from a strong tripartite approach to policy development and implementation. Thirdly, the current project has focused on out-bound migration in a situation where the country is challenged by increasing in-bound migration both in relation to skills development and maximum use of local workforce would all parties benefit from seeing the migration issues as a part of a broader labour market policy.

2. Background

2.1 Sri Lankan Labour Migration

Overseas labour migration has been an important safety valve for domestic employment pressures, in Sri Lanka, and has been a major source of foreign exchange, for the Sri Lankan economy since the 1970s. In fact, the remittances, sent back by migrant Sri Lankan workers have become the number one foreign exchange earner for the country.

The Sri Lanka Bureau of Foreign Employment (SLBFE) estimates that approximately 1.8 million Sri Lankans are currently working overseas. According to the Central Bank of Sri Lanka's annual report in 2018, remittances accounted for 7.9% of the country's GDP, down from 8.3% in 2017, when it accounted for 63% of export earnings. It is estimated that approximately 2.8% of the country's labour force migrates annually, although the number of registered migrants, especially women, has been declining, since 2015. This decline in regular labour migration is mainly attributed to legislation that prevents women with children under the age of 5 to migrate. Age restrictions on women migrating for domestic work and upgrade of training requirements has also contributed to the decline. The decline in labour migration is reflected in the declining remittances from Sri Lankan workers overseas.

2018 statistic figures from the SLBFE show that 129.774 males and 81.685 females departed for foreign employment, and there was a slight increase in the numbers of women migrating. This is explained by the SLBFE as a result of its efforts to increase the awareness among female potential migrants wanting to leave on a visit visa. Often women confronted with the risks by SLBFE staff in the airport decide to cancel their departure on a visit visa and instead go through a regular departure for employment. The Middle East region continued to dominate the foreign employment market, accounting for more than 80 per cent of departures from Sri Lanka.

For these reasons, the welfare and protection of this segment of the population has become a priority for the Government of Sri Lanka (GoSL), and a separate ministry, the Ministry of Foreign Employment Promotion and Welfare was created in 2007, to look after the interest of the segment. Thus, the migrant labour force came to be seen as a vital part of Sri Lanka's labour force, in terms of its participation in and contribution to the national economy.

Sri Lanka's labour migration sector has a number of pressing issues which demand attention. In terms of managing the labour migration process, Sri Lanka is making various efforts to ensure migration is handled with dignity, security and equity for all Sri Lankan citizens. As a country of both origin and destination, Sri Lanka's focus on labour migration is determined by the demands of the international labour market, which has shaped the profile of the country's migrant labour force.

Despite widespread initiatives, from both government and non-governmental entities, on out-bound labour migration, Sri Lankan migrant workers continue to face a multitude of obstacles, in all stages of the migration cycle, including pre-departure, in service and upon return and

reintegration. Many of these issues stem from the skills profile of Sri Lanka's migrant work force, where the majority of workers fall within the low-skilled and domestic worker categories. In-bound labour migration is a relatively new phenomenon in Sri Lanka; but, with an estimated 400.000 legal and 300.000—400.000 irregular migrants; it is an issue of concern.

Many migrant workers face exploitative and abusive situations, for a number of reasons, which can be personal, regulatory or structural. Some (but not all) of the reasons for these exploitations and abuses can be: the lack of skills with a majority of the migrants, that prevents them from getting higher paid jobs; inadequacies in training, education and social stresses; the lack of comprehensive contracts and government-to-government agreements to safeguard and protect migrant workers; the inadequacy of government-led monitoring mechanisms or service provisioning in the labour receiving countries that provide for proactive assistance through diplomatic missions; and a lack of legal mechanisms for redresses.

Sri Lanka intends to tap the growing market of semi-skilled and skilled labour in various disciplines, while simultaneously reducing the number of unskilled departures. Some areas that are being considered for providing formal training to Sri Lankans, seeking foreign employment, are disciplines such as nursing, medicine, IT, finance, accounting, management, and engineering and industries, such as tourism, sea and air transportation, high-tech manufacturing, construction, and health care. Both government officials and agency representatives believe that skills' upgrading will give Sri Lanka an edge over countries, such as the Philippines, Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, China and other Asian countries, and will strengthen the country's capacity to meet the skilled-labour category, particularly in the age group of 35—44 years of age.

The National Labour Migration Policy (NLMP) of Sri Lanka, which was adopted by the Government of Sri Lanka, in 2009, addresses a large number of issues in the labour migration process, within a framework of three pillars: the governance; protection and empowerment of migrant workers and their families; and it links migration and development processes. It also contains a detailed plan of action.

2.2 Project Background

The government of Sri Lanka developed its labour migration policy in recognition of the increasing importance of the migrant workers' segment to the national economy. The MFE, which was the primary institution responsible for the implementation of the policy, requested technical support from the International Labour Organisation (ILO) in order to implement this policy effectively. The ILO responded to the Ministry's request with support from the Swiss Agency for Development and Corporation (SDC) who were to provide financial resources. The discussions between the ILO and the SDC resulted in a project called "*Promoting decent work through good governance, protection and empowerment of migrant workers: Ensuring the effective implementation of the Sri Lanka National Labour Migration Policy*", which was brought in to support the government's effectively implementation of the National Labour Migration Policy. This project was rolled out in three phases. The first phase ran from December 2010 until March

2013, and the second phase from March 2013 to September 2015. This was later extended to December 2015, and the current, third phase ran from April 2016 until February 2020.

The overall developmental objective of the Labour Migration (LM) Project was to promote an effective implementation of the National Labour Migration Policy (NLMP), to result in the better protection of men and women migrant workers and their families as well as increasing developmental benefits. This developmental objective was pursued through four main objectives; relating to the policy, legislative and regulatory frameworks that govern labour migration in Sri Lanka; promoting rights at work; optimising the benefits of labour migration, through supporting return and reintegration; and increasing contributions to the national, regional and global discourse on migrant workers.

In the first phase of the project, it was remarked that the existing grievance handling system should be centralised with the systems/involvement of the other agencies that also received complaints that concerned migrant workers. The belief was that a more coordinated effort among agencies would help to fill the gaps in the way grievances were reported and addressed. This has a bearing on the amount of information and awareness about safe migration and grievance redress mechanisms that filtered down to local communities; thus, empowering them to make informed decisions on migration. It was seen as essential that policy-level work filtered down to the local communities and governance mechanisms.

During the first two phases of the project, efforts were also made to enhance implementation and to review and enhance the legislative and regulatory mechanisms. It also aimed to use practical tools, frameworks and systems, to improve the GoSL's service providers' capacity to enable more effective information and service delivery.

Phase III aimed at policy updating and enhanced implementation to ensure good governance of the migration process, as well as the protection and empowerment of migrant workers and their families. It was also designed to create an environment that would promote migration and development. It built on the achievements and lesson learned from Phases I and II and focussed on upscaling and consolidating the work that had been carried out in the past years. This enabled the institutionalisation of support and enhanced effective service delivery. The project continued to build on the ILO's experiences of supporting the Ministry to advance the actions stipulated in the NLMP. The ILO worked towards ensuring the strategic continuation of the programmes and initiatives that had been supported in the previous phase, as well as some new initiatives that aimed to further policy objectives.

The SDC has been supporting global migration programmes since 2010, including the governance of labour migration and more, under the country's Swiss Medium Term Programme. The project fits well into the Swiss co-operation strategy for Sri Lanka. Given this, the ILO and the SDC were partners in this project, with the key aims of: improving and protecting migrant workers' rights, addressing the gaps in redressal mechanisms, strengthening the policy-legal-institutional frameworks and identifying effective processes for regulation and accountability.

Three interlinked strategic areas were identified: 1) strengthening policy, legal and institutional processes; 2) improving the training of prospective migrant workers; and 3) improving the efficiency and effectiveness of regulatory, protection and grievance handling mechanisms by strengthening institutional capacity.

The ILO was the primary policy-level partner, and it was joined by the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) and UN Women at the policy level. At the local level, there were several civil society and non-governmental partners, who are implementing specific local activities, such as the Helvetas Swiss Intercorporation in Sri Lanka (HSL), and the Asia Foundation (TAF) as well as the below SDC Partners / CSOs:

-
- *Social Organisations Networking for Development (SOND) (till mid-2018)*
 - *Social Welfare Organisation – Ampara District (SWOAD)*
 - *Eastern Self-Reliant Community Awakening Organisation (ESCO)*
 - *Caritas Seth Sarana (CCSS) Caritas SEDEC*
 - *Plantation Rural Education Development Organisation (PREDO)*
 - *Community Development Services (CDS) in partnership with: Center for Human Rights and Community Development (CHRCO)*
-

The project was also aligned to the Labour Migration Portfolio of the ILO’s country office, through the Decent Work Country Programmes (DWCP) 2013—2017 and 2018—2022. It was also aligned to the ILO’s (sub-) regional and global work on Labour Migration. In addition, the project contributed to Sri Lanka’s United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2013—2017, Pillars 1: Equitable Economic Growth and Sustainable Livelihoods and Pillar 3: Governance, Human Rights, Gender Equality, Social Inclusion & Protection, as well as to the United Nations’ Sustainable Development Framework (UNSDF) 2018—2022 Driver 3: Human Security and Socio-Economic Resilience. It also contributed to Sustainable Development Goals 8 & 10 – Decent Work & Economic Growth and Reduce Inequalities respectively.

The overall development objective of all three phases of the Project is to “*increase the protection and empowerment of women and men migrant workers by facilitating the effective implementation of the National Labour Migration Policy through the improved efficiency and effectiveness of regulatory, protection and grievance redressing systems and strengthened institutional capacity*”; thus, ultimately creating a space to support and facilitate the realisation of the commitments included in the NLMP.

2.3 The Labour Migration Project (Phase III)

The project under evaluation, “*Promoting decent work through good governance, protection and empowerment of migrant workers: Ensuring the effective implementation of the Sri Lanka*

National Labour Migration Policy – Phase III, is a continuation of Phase II of the same project, with a focus on the objectives and outputs that were initiated, but not achieved, in Phase II.

The project focused on three inter-linked strategic areas; 1) strengthening policy, and legal and institutional processes; 2) improving the training of prospective migrant workers; and 3) improving the efficiency and effectiveness of regulatory, protection and grievance handling mechanisms through the strengthening of institutional capacity. The project's main approach was to work with government mechanisms at policy level, through a participatory approach that was inclusive of all the stakeholders in the process.

For these reasons, Phase III of the project continued the work already begun in areas of Phase II. These included addressing the grievances of migrant workers and their families; working towards ethical recruitment practices, to stem abuses in the process of migration for employment; and promoting the effective reintegration of migrant workers through policy-level commitments.

New specific strategic objectives were also included into Phase III: to improve the government mechanisms that gave migrants and their families access to information at a local level, to increase prosecutions by the State for offenses of human trafficking; to increase the interaction between the government and civil society organisations in addressing migrant workers' issues; and improved advocacy and a greater and wider sharing of the knowledge and experiences of the project at local, regional and international levels.

2.3 Goals and Objectives of the Programme

The overall developmental objective of the Labour Migration (LM) Project is to promote an effective implementation of the National Labour Migration Policy (NLMP), which it is hoped will result in a better protection of women and men migrant workers and their families as well as increasing developmental benefits. This development objective is pursued through four main objectives:

- 1) To improve the policy, legislative and regulatory frameworks and processes that govern labour migration in Sri Lanka, to reflect and respond to current contextual situations and needs to further safeguard the rights of women and men migrant workers and their families.
- 2) To promote the rights at work for women and men migrant workers and the protection of their families.
- 3) To optimise the benefits of labour migration, through supporting return and reintegration.
- 4) To increase contributions to national, regional and global discourse on migrant workers.

2.3.1 Alignment

The NLMP was adopted by the GoSL in 2009, and its implementation was supported through a programme funded by the SDC, from 2010 onwards, also called the "Safe Labour Migration Programme" (SLMP). The current LM project, to be evaluated, was Phase III of a ten-year

programme with the GoSL, funded by the SDC, and implemented by the ILO and several other partners. The details of the three phases are as follows:

Phase	Started	Ended	Budget in USD
I	Dec. 2010	March 2013	699,000
II	March 2013	Dec. 2015	639,000
III	April 2016	Feb. 2020	1,500,000

The current Phase III is based on the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the MFE and the Embassy of Switzerland, of 2015. In terms of the ILO’s partnership with the SDC, Phase III is guided by the SDC’s overall goals and framework on labour migration.

The project has also worked with several other government institutions, namely the Sri Lanka Bureau of Foreign Employment, and the Ministries of Labour, Justice, Women and Child Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Youth, Skills, and Health, and with the Tertiary and Vocational Education Commission (TVEC). Cooperation was also foreseen with the other tripartite constituents, but only materialised to a limited extent.

Although the ILO is a primary policy-level partner, it was joined by the International Organisation for Migration (IOM) as an implementing partner, and they were allocated a third of the total budget. At the local level, cooperation was established with several civil society and non-governmental partners, who were responsible for implementing specific activities at the local level, such as the Helvetas Swiss Intercorporation in Sri Lanka (HSL) and other SDC partners. The Asia Foundation (TAF) was sub-contracted by the ILO as a service provider.

Three other projects, in the area of labour migration, were implemented within the ILO’s Country Office (CO) during the lifetime of the LM project:

1. Skills Recognition of Sri Lankan Migrant Workers funded by the SDC through IOM (ended in 2018).
2. Global Action to Improve the Recruitment Framework of LM (REFRAME), funded by the EU
3. Equipping Sri Lanka to Counter Trafficking in Persons (EQUIP), funded by US-DOS.

Together with the LM project, these projects made up the LM Unit within the ILO CO, which is responsible for oversight, strategizing, the overall guidance of project staff, and monitoring, as well as seeking to avoid overlaps and maximizing resources

2.3.2 Project Management Arrangements

At the national level, the Director of the ILO Colombo CO was responsible for the overall implementation of the project. The ILO serves as the lead agency, assisting the Government of Sri Lanka, and in particular the responsible Ministry and the SLBFE, in its execution and

implementation. The project is managed by a National Programme Coordinator (NPC) who reported to the Director of the ILO's country office. The NPC was the principal officer, responsible for programme implementation, supervising staff, allocating programme budgets, preparing progress reports and maintaining programme relations with institutional partners. The NPC was also responsible for elaborating the final programme document, for gathering supporting information and for developing the preliminary work plans. The NPC was supported by a full-time Finance & Administrative Assistant and, since August 2019, by a Project Assistant.

The implementation of the project was carried out under the overarching Safe Labour Migration Programme of the GoSL, through the Ministry. A periodic monitoring of progress and coordination with key stakeholders took place through the Programme Advisory Committee (PAC), which was chaired by the Secretary of the Ministry and the PAC members. These consisted of the ILO's tripartite constituents on labour migration, social partners, research and academic organisations, and civil society organisations. This PAC has a unique nature, in that it has expanded to monitor and coordinate the work of all the other SDCs partners, consisting of the IOM and UN Women, who are working at the national level, as well as the civil society partners, who are working at the local level as they all contribute towards the implementation of the NLMP. The contributions of the Project were also shared and discussed with the National Advisory Committee (NAC) on Labour Migration, which is chaired by the Minister in charge of Foreign Employment. In addition to the above was a Partner Exchange Platform (PEP) established by SDC as a forum for exchange between local and national project partners.

The project was technically backstopped by the ILO's Regional Migration Specialist, at the Decent Work Team in New Delhi, India. The ILO's Regional Office in Asia and the Pacific (ROAP) and the International Labour Migration Branch (MIGRANT), at the ILO's headquarters in Geneva, also provide policy-level support on various aspects. Apart from the bi-annual progress reports to the SDC, the project also had frequent progress review discussions with the SDC, because of delays in delivery. These progress reviews also aimed to strengthen ties with the donor's civil society partners, who were implementing initiatives at the local level. This approach was expected to strengthen ties and synergies among all partners at all levels.

2.3.3 Strategy and Logical Framework

The project was guided primarily by the provisions of the National Labour Migration Policy, which was based on the ILO's Multilateral Framework and the ILO and UN Conventions. It also takes Sri Lanka's National Policy on Decent Work into account. The ILO continued to work within the overall objective of contributing to Sri Lanka's sustainable economic and social development, by ensuring decent and productive employment opportunities for women and men while safeguarding the rights, freedoms, security and dignity of migrant workers and their families.

2.3.4 Objectives, Expected Results and Activities of the Project

The overall objective of the project was to increase the protection and empowerment of women and men migrant workers, by facilitating the tripartite constituents' effective implementation of the National Labour Migration Policy. This was to be done through an improved efficiency and effectiveness of regulatory, protection and grievance redressing systems and a strengthened institutional capacity.

2.3.5 National Implementing Partners:

The project gave high priority to working with governmental institutions, such as the Ministry, the SLBFE and the Ministries of Labour, External Affairs, and Justice, and some priority to secure involvement of the Employers' Federation of Ceylon (EFC), Trade Unions, the Association of Licensed Foreign Employment Agents (ALFEA), and civil society representatives.

2.3.6 The Donor

The project was funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) in Sri Lanka. The SDC is Switzerland's International Cooperation Agency within the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA).

The Swiss cooperation strategy for Sri Lanka, the Swiss Medium-Term Programme, was jointly developed by the SDC and the Human Security Division, which Switzerland co-funds, and which implements and coordinates humanitarian and development projects. It also extends support to political dialogue and the rule of law, in partnership with international agencies, non-governmental organisations (NGO) and the government.

The SDC's Global Programme for Migration and Development supports the improved governance of labour migration, in several countries of origin of migrant workers, including Sri Lanka.

2.3.7 Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries

The direct beneficiaries of Phase III were policy-level government officials in the Ministry and the SLBFE, the Ministries of Justice and External Affairs, government officials at district and divisional level, and civil society organisations, labour attaches, recruitment agencies, and women and men migrant workers. The government officials included those responsible for policy-making and monitoring policy implementation in the Ministry, the officials responsible for programme planning and implementation in the SLBFE, and the Labour Attaches in countries where Sri Lankan workers are employed.

At the district level, the project worked with government officers, law enforcement officers, recruitment agencies and civil society organisations, whereas at community level the project worked with community-level government administrative officers and migrant workers, prospective migrant workers and their families. The project aimed to build the capacity of the different stakeholders to better plan, innovate and implement the various policy guidelines and

programmes, in order to benefit migrants and their families, through coaching, training, collaboration, networking and exposure programmes.

The secondary beneficiaries were: the much larger numbers of female and male migrant workers in the pre-departure stage, before taking a decision to work overseas; those leaving for overseas employment; and migrant workers returning home, after finishing their employment contracts, or because of other reasons. By improving policy and programme implementation, migrant workers were expected to receive improved services relating to their social protection and welfare while overseas, and their economic reintegration on return. The programme was designed to be especially responsive to women migrants, by reducing their vulnerability to labour exploitation and promoting their access to decent jobs overseas.

3. Purpose, scope and clients of the Final Evaluation

3.1 Introduction and Rationale for the Evaluation

The evaluation, reported herein, is the final evaluation of the project on “*Promoting decent work through good governance, protection and empowerment of migrant workers: Ensuring the effective implementation of the Sri Lanka National Labour Migration Policy – Phase III*” which ended on the 29th of February 2020. As stated in the project documents, the ILO was obliged to conduct a final evaluation, to assess the project’s effectiveness, impact and sustainability and to identify any lessons learned. As concerns the monitoring and evaluation of the progress of the project, a mid-term evaluation was conducted after 30 months of the project’s 47-month duration, had elapsed.

Therefore, this report contains the findings of the final independent evaluation that was conducted during February 2020.

The present Final Evaluation of the LM project is conducted under the ILO’s evaluation policy and procedures. The ILO adheres to the United Nations system’s evaluation norms and standards, as well as to the OECD/DAC’s Evaluation Quality Standards. The ILO uses a conceptual framework that is consistent with Results-Based Management (RBM) and which addresses seven Evaluation Criteria, as specified in the ToR (see Annex 6). For each of these criteria, a series of evaluation questions was developed in the Inception Report (see Annex 7 of the present report). A mix of qualitative and quantitative data was used, as well as observations, critical reflection and a triangulation of acquired information.

3.2 Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation

The main purpose of this final, independent evaluation was to assess the extent to which the project objectives had been achieved and to assess the impact of the project, particularly on improving the status of the direct and indirect beneficiaries. The final evaluation also identified lessons-learned and good practices for both accountability and learning for possible similar interventions in the future.

The focus was also to assess the impact, and emerging impact, of the interventions (either positive or negative) and the sustainability of the project’s beneficiaries and the local partners’ strategy and capacity to sustain them. It also examined the strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and challenges and any external factors that might have affected the achievement of the immediate objectives and the delivery of the project’s outputs. The final evaluation assessed the extent to which the project had responded to the Recommendations of the Mid-Term Evaluation, from Oct 2018.

3.3 Scope of the Evaluation

The evaluation covered all of the geographic coverage of the LM project. The evaluation looked, specifically, at the locations of intervention; namely Gampaha and Kurunegala. It paid

particular attention to any synergies between the components and contributions to national policies and programmes. The evaluation should help to understand how and why the project obtained or did not obtain specific results, from outputs to potential impacts.

Gender equality and non-discrimination, the promotion of international labour standards, social dialogue, tripartite processes and constituent capacity development were also considered in this evaluation. The evaluation integrated gender equality as a cross-cutting concern, throughout its methodology, deliverables and final report. This was addressed in line with EVAL guidance Note n° 4 and Guidance Note n° 7, to ensure stakeholder participation. Furthermore, the evaluation paid attention to issues related to the governing of labour migration and rights at work for women and men migrant workers and the protection of their families.

Moreover, the evaluators reviewed data and information that was disaggregated by sex and gender, and thereafter assessed the relevance and effectiveness of gender-related strategies and outcomes at improving lives of women and men.

The primary clients of the evaluation are the beneficiaries, donors, the ILO's constituents and the ILO technical units directly involved in the project, who are:

- Government of Sri Lanka
- The ILO Country Office in Colombo
- Workers and employers' organisations
- The ILO HQ, ROAP and DWT - New Delhi
- The donor – the SDC
- Other relevant ILO policy departments, branches and programmes

3.4 Selection Criteria

The evaluation addressed the ILO's overall evaluation concerns, such as relevance, coherence effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact; as defined in the ILO Policy Guidelines for results-based evaluation, of 2017.

The review addressed the following the ILO evaluation concerns;

- Relevance
- Coherence and strategic fit of the project
- Validity of the project design
- Project effectiveness
- Efficiency of resource use
- Sustainability of project outcomes
- Impact orientation
- Gender equality and non-discrimination

By February 2020, policy implementation was made nationwide. The evaluation team conducted field missions to Gampaha and Kurunegala. Whereas Kurunegala was reported to have

been rather successful in the implementation Gampaha seems to have been less so. Time restraints did not allow the team to visit all five locations. The reasons for selecting Gampaha and Kurunegala were: 1) they were the districts from where the highest number of migrant workers originates; 2) building ('sensitising') activities were undertaken at the District office here, with Foreign Employment Development Officers (FEDO) from the Ministry and the SLBFE, on the reintegration sub-policy, and trained by Helvetas; and 3) the SDC's partner, CHRCD, that works with individual migrant workers and with the local government, is located here. In addition, these locations were also selected partially because for logistic reasons. For example, a visit to Batticaloa, where the same activities could be observed, only required travelling for about two full working days.

The core ILO cross-cutting priorities, such as gender equality and non-discrimination, promotion of international labour standards, tripartite processes, and constituent capacity development were considered in this evaluation. In particular, the gender dimension was considered as a cross-cutting concern throughout the evaluation. Data collection and analysis was disaggregated by sex, as described in the ILO Evaluation Policy Guidelines and relevant Guidance Notes, as much as possible.

The evaluators examined the following key issues:

(a) Relevance and strategic fit of the intervention

- (i) Did the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries, global, country, and partner/institutions' needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances changed? Did the intervention support the goals outlined in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (SDG target 8.8, SDG target 10.7), Programme & Budget Outcome 7 and Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) outcome 3.3.?
- (ii) Was the project able to leverage the ILO's contributions, through its comparative advantages (including tripartism, labour migration supporting return and reintegration, rights at work for migrant workers, and the ILO's Decent Work Team etc.)?

(b) Coherence and strategic fit of the intervention

- (iii) How well did the intervention fit with other interventions in the country, sector or institution? Was the project coherent with the government's objectives, National Development Frameworks, and beneficiaries' needs?
- (iv) How well did the project complement and fit with programmes and priorities of the constituents?
- (v) To what were the synergies and interlinkages between the interventions and other interventions carried out by the ILO Sri Lanka, the government and the social partners in place?

(c) Validity of intervention design

- (vi) To what extent and how did the project strategy address the major root causes of the decent-work deficits of the migrant workers and their families, as identified for the target group?
 - (vii) To what extent did the problem analysis identify its differential impact on women and men migrant workers and their family members?
 - (viii) To what extent was the project aligned to the National Labour Migration Policy for Sri Lanka?
 - (ix) To what extent was the project realistic (in terms of expected outputs, outcome and impact), given the proposed intervention logic, time and resources available as well as the social, economic and political environment?
 - (x) To what extent had the project integrated the ILO's cross-cutting themes (such as the protection of labour migrants and their families, tripartism, and gender and non-discrimination) into the design?
 - (xi) Were the indicators of the achievements clearly defined, describing the changes that had been brought about? Were the indicators designed and used in such a manner that they enabled reporting on progress under specific SDG targets and indicators?
 - (xii) To what extent were the elements, presented in the points above, articulated in a comprehensive and systemic Theory of change that could guide project implementation towards the project objectives?
- (d) Project intervention progress and effectiveness (including effectiveness of management arrangements)
- (i) To what extent did the project achieve the overall project outputs/objectives/outcomes, and to what extent did the project identify and address the factors identified that affected the project's implementation (positively and negatively)
 - (ii) Did the management and governance structure, put in place, work strategically with all key stakeholders and partners in Sri Lanka, the ILO and the donor, to achieve project's goals and objectives?
 - (iii) Was the knowledge sharing and communication strategy effective in raising the profile of the project within the country and among the cooperating partners?
 - (iv) To what extent was the monitoring and evaluation system results-based and to what extent was it used to make management decisions?
 - (v) Assess how contextual and institutional risks and positive external to the project factors were managed by the project management?
- (e) Efficiency of resource use

- (i) Were resources (financial, human, technical support, etc.) allocated strategically in order to achieve the project outputs and specially outcomes?
 - (ii) Was the project's activities and operationalisation in line with the schedule of activities, as defined by the work plan? If not, what were the factors that hindered timely delivery and what were the counter measures taken to achieve project outcomes and impact during the lifetime of the project?
 - (iii) To what extent did the project leverage resources to promote rights at work for women and men migrant workers, gender equality and non-discrimination?
- (f) Impact orientation and sustainability
- (i) What level of influence did the project have on the reduction of the decent-work deficits for women and men migrant workers and their family members, in the NLMP and other areas of policies and practices at national and subnational levels?
 - (ii) Did the project contribute to expanding the knowledge base and build evidence regarding the project's outcomes and impacts?
 - (iii) To what extent are the results of the intervention likely to have long-term, sustainable, positive contributions to the DWCP Sri Lanka, and the SDGs and relevant targets? (explicitly or implicitly)
- (g) Gender equality and non-discrimination
- (i) What were the key achievements of the project on gender equality and women's empowerment?
 - (ii) Was the use of resources, on women's empowerment activities, sufficient to achieve the expected results?
 - (iii) To what extent did the M&E data support the project's decision making related to gender?
 - (iv) Did the project address other vulnerable groups, such as people living in poverty, youth and informally employed, and if so, which ones?

4. Evaluation Methodology

The independent final evaluation complied with all evaluation norms and standards and followed all ethical safeguards, as specified in the ILO's evaluation procedures. The ILO adheres to the United Nations Development Group's (UNDG) evaluation norms and standards, as well as their Evaluation Quality Standards.

The evaluation engaged with the project's key stakeholders at all levels during the design, field work, and validation and reporting stages. The evaluation was implemented through a consultative and transparent approach. In order to collect data for the analysis, the evaluation used the methods, tools and techniques listed below:

- (i) a desk review of project documents, TPRs, MTE report, researches/studies, policy briefs and other relevant literature (see Annex 5)
- (ii) a staff and partner workshop
- (iii) semi-structured interviews with key informants and stakeholders
- (iv) focus group discussions with returned migrant workers and their families and trained governmental officials
- (v) direct observation, made during field visits to Gampaha and Kurunegala, 13-14.02.20
- (vi) a validation workshop on the preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations with all key stakeholders, at the end of the field work

The data from these sources were triangulated to increase the validity and rigor of the evaluation's findings.

The selection of the field visits locations was made by the evaluation team in consultation with the project team. Criteria considered were:

- Locations with successful and less or unsuccessful results (from the perception of key stakeholders and the progress reports)
- Locations that were identified as providing particularly good practices or that had brought out particular key issues, as identified by the desk review and initial discussions

4.1 Identifying and Analysing the Expected/Unexpected Outcomes

The evaluation team applied an outcome harvesting approach, to assess the intervention's underlying theory of change, and to assess any factors that might have contributed to, or impeded, the achievement of results, as outlined in the LFA. They also used this approach to assess the extent to which the initiative was 'fit for purpose'.

An outcome harvesting approach implies that the evaluation team works with the ILO/project team and its local implementation partners to identify the planned and unexpected outcomes of the project. It also identifies any possible impact that the project may have had on migrant workers, authorities and agencies. It examines how the intervention may have contributed to these changes through the implemented activities, including (but not limited to):

- Capacity building of government officials
- Mobilisation and empowerment of women and men migrant workers and their families
- Awareness of agencies about CoEC

- Institutional development

Such outcomes may – as indicated in the intervention’s LFA – relate to changes in migrant workers’ employment conditions, through the establishment of a Code of Ethical Conduct and government officials’ improved capacity, It may also relate to changes which may be preconditions to achieving the intervention’s desired results at a later stage, such as changes in workers and agencies/employers’ attitudes towards compliance with laws and regulations, or changes in trade unions’ ability to represent migration workers.

Because of this, the evaluation team conducted an outcome harvesting workshop with the ILO’s project staff and the implementation partners, on the first day of the field mission.

The evaluation team worked to substantiate the workshop’s findings, through interviews and focus group discussions with migrant workers, government officials, trade union representatives, employer’s association, agencies and others, after the workshop.

The evaluation methodology included an attempt to establish the interventions’ Theory of Change. This, specifically in light of the logical connection between the levels of results, their coherence with external factors, and their alignment with the ILO’s strategic objectives, the NLMP, DWCP, and SDG and related targets’ national, and the ILO’s country-level outcomes.

Despite the fact that the intervention did not establish a ToC from its start point, the OH workshop found that the intervention had been built on the rationale that:

- *if* a NLMP is implemented,
- *if* good governance is in place,
- *if* women and men migrant workers and their families are protected and empowered; and
- *if* decent work for male and female migrant workers is promoted,

then the benefits of labour migration will be maximised and decent and safe labour migration will be in place.

The evaluation team worked in close cooperation with project staff, the ILO’s CO and the implementation partners to identify informants among the intervention’s stakeholders, including government officials, migrant workers, trade union representatives, employers and agencies. In line with the proposed methodology, and to ensure that the evaluation contributed to a more in-depth understanding of the factors (in design and operations) that contributed to, or impeded, the achievement of results, the sample of informants included:

- Interviews with 11 ILO staff (and one former staff), including the heads of other labour migration projects. The purpose for this was to explore how, or under which circumstances, the intervention contributed to the desired changes.
- Interview with one migration agency. The purpose was to explore potential differences in approaches to compliance.

- Three focus group discussions with returned migrants/trainees (in total 38 all women) from national and local training activities. The purpose was to understand the level of change in daily work that the trainees experienced and to what extent this led to increased safe migration.
- Interviews with 11 governmental officials, who were dealing with migration at local/regional and national levels. The purpose was to understand to what extent governmental institutions were ready to continue the initiatives, beyond the project.
- Interviews with 2 trade union leaders and 2 representatives from employers' and recruitment agency associations. The purpose was to understand the level of engagement and perspectives for social dialogue on migration.

The above samples are not statistically representative, because the methodology of this evaluation mainly used a qualitative approach for data collection. Time and resource constraints did not allow for a full sample.

The analysis began with the teams' going through the project documentation and identifying the original outcomes, indicators of outcomes, outputs and activities and sub-activities that had been planned for the project (Stage 1 of the evaluation). This information was obtained primarily from the project documentation and the Logframe developed for the project, at its inception.

During the review of the progress reports, it was discovered that some of the original output had been changed during the project, without the Logframe being changed.

The analysis of the findings began with each activity, which either had a quantitative or a qualitative indicator, or a combination of both, as its measurement of achievement for that activity. The evaluator looked for quantitative evidence in the secondary data, which was substantiated – when necessary – by the qualitative data, gathered from the fieldwork that was done through FGDs and DIs. Both the qualitative and quantitative data were analysed to gauge the level of completion/achievement of each output, which was then linked to the relevant indicators and outcomes of the project (Stage 2 of the evaluation).

The methodology of the evaluation was mixed and both qualitative and quantitative methods were employed. In addition, the selected methods drew on both subjective and objective sources of data. Objective data were gathered, especially from written documents and databases (including financial ones), and subjective data included, for example, the opinions of the individual stakeholders interviewed. These different types of data were subsequently cross-checked with each other, as well as with the impressions gathered by the evaluators when visiting stakeholders and field locations (observation). All data collected were then triangulated and discussed among the evaluators, and this was included in the present report.

The evaluation consisted of three phases. The first, preparatory phase conducted a desk review of the key documents (see Annex 5). This first phase also included the correspondence and discussions held with the evaluation manager and the project team in Colombo, as well as the drafting and finalising of the Inception Report (see Annex 7).

The second phase comprised a field mission to Colombo, to consult with the relevant ministries, the tripartite constituents, the donor, and a selection of the implementing partners, beneficiaries and other key stakeholders. The mission program is Annex 3. A first meeting was held with the ILO CO's Director and with the project team, as well as with other ILO staff from the Labour Migration Unit, the Finance Department, and others. The ILO Regional Migration Specialist and the former NPC were interviewed via Skype.

This phase also included two field trips; to Kurunegala and to Gampaha.

On the last day of the mission (19th of February 2020), a stakeholder workshop was held. The evaluators presented the preliminary findings and recommendations, and the stakeholders present commented on them.

The third phase concerned the writing of the draft evaluation report, which was shared with all the relevant stakeholders, and their comments were evaluated by the consultants and considered for inclusion in the final report.

Gender dimension and non-discrimination were considered as cross-cutting concerns throughout the methodology, deliverables and final report of the evaluation.

4.2 Limitations

The project involved a big number of not only stakeholders and partners (as shown above) but also of project locations. Given the limited time available for the mission, not all of the stakeholders could be interviewed separately. Therefore, a selection was made from among those stakeholders most involved in the project; for example, among ministries, among trade unions and among the SDC's Partners. Focus group discussions were conducted, but it turned out to be difficult for the local CSO to find people who had been trained. Notwithstanding, the Focussed Group Discussions (FGDs) were informative, as they were the participants who had the strongest migration experience. The selection of the two locations, i.e. Kurunegala and Gampaha/Negombo, for visits to meet district stakeholders is further explained in Chapter 2.

The link between the Logframe and the TPRs is clear at the objectives and outcome level, but somewhat difficult to establish in detail, because the "Summary of Outputs" discusses, not the outputs as defined in the Log Frame but a different range of activities or indicators. It may be that the reporting in the TPRs suffered, because, the Logframe was a moving target, so not all of the changes were documented and institutional memory was not present.

A general problem for the evaluation was the lack of direct contact between the project team and the people implementing the project activities at the local level, and some partners. The evaluation team had to arrange most of the meetings and FGDs, though the implementation partners, who again had to contact their local partners. The efficiency of the work and the communication suffered because of this. This might also have been one of the reasons why it turned out to be difficult for the evaluation team to reach out to the migrant workers who has themselves directly

participated in the project activities. The responses to Key Evaluation Question C (vi) and (vii) as well as F (i) and G (i) could have benefitted from first-hand information.

The evaluation found that the institutional memory about the project to a large extent lay with the implementing partners and the donor, rather than with the ILO CO, this was especially visible during the workshops. Therefore, key information to a certain extent was provided through the lens of the implementation partner and the donor rather than the project holder.

5. Overall Findings

The final evaluation of the project “*Promoting Decent Work through good governance, protection and empowerment of migrant workers: Ensuring the effective implementation of the Sri Lanka National Labour Migration Policy – Phase III*” is based on the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria. The seven evaluation criteria were identified, in the previous chapter, and will be discussed in depth in this chapter. Key evaluation questions will be responded to individually.

5.1 Relevance

- *Is the project coherent with the Government objectives, National Labour Migration Policy, National Development Frameworks, beneficiaries’ needs? Does it support the goals outlined in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (SDG target 8.8, SDG target 10.7), Programme & Budget outcome7 and Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) outcome 3.3.?*

At the global level, the project contributed to Outcome 9 of the ILO’s 2016—2017 and 2018-2019 Programme and Budget: “Promoting Fair and Effective Labour Migration policies-Labour migration governance is strengthened to ensure decent work for migrant workers meet labour market needs and foster inclusive economic growth and development”. In relation to Sri Lanka’s Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) 2013—2017, the project contributed to Country Priority No 1, “Promotion of full, decent and productive employment and an enabling environment for competitive, sustainable enterprise development” (DWCP 1.1), and to Country Programme Outcome (CPO) LKA 105, “Policies and programs in place to better govern labour migration, particularly for reintegration and prevention of trafficking of persons. Regarding Sri Lanka’s DWCP 2018—2022, the project was linked to Country Priority 3 on Rights at Work For all, and in particular to Outcome 3.2 on “Labour market outcomes for (low-skilled) migrants are improved and their vulnerability to exploitation (forced labour) reduced”.

- *Has the project been able to leverage the ILO contributions, through its comparative advantages (including tripartism, labour migration supporting return and reintegration, rights at work for migrant workers, ILO Decent Work Team etc.)?*

The employer’s association and the trade unions were involved with the project as follows:

- both were members of working groups that gave inputs to the NLMP updating and the series of consultations held on updating the policy
- both participated in consultations and provided inputs on legislative revisions
- as members of the PAC, both provided guidance and steered the work under the NLMP by SDC partners
- both constituents have taken part in consultations held on the FBR study
- EFC is a member of the National Steering Committee on RR etc

The participation in these committees and meetings did not create an ownership to the project.

The EFC was also involved in the project in connection with the skills’ development activities (skills’ passport) and in a dialogue with the recruitment agencies.

The project design did not invite strong and active involvement of the two constituents besides providing inputs to and participate in the above meetings.

Even though there is large in-bound migration in Sri Lanka, no comprehensive policy is in place, in this field. To a certain extent, the project dealt with this issue, by developing a background paper and by initiating communication with the GoSL. However, even the project was focussed mainly on out-bound Sri Lankan workers and attention to in-bound migration was not foreseen when the project was designed, the project still managed to generate some information and comment on issues of in-bound migrant workers via the background paper.

Including in-bound migration in the project could have made it more relevant, especially for the social partners (employers and trade unions) as in-bound migration has a more direct and visible impact on the national labour market. It is an issue of great concern, especially for the trade unions and would have supported greater participation of the TU’s on migrant worker issues beyond participating in meetings, workshops and discussions etc.

Recommendation 1:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
ILO and constituents	High	Short-term	High

It is recommended to include both in-bound and out-bound migration in a comprehensive long-term employment strategy. Such a strategy should be developed, after a detailed study has been made of the benefits and the challenges of migration and the changes in employment structures for the country in general, and the employers and workers in particular. The strategy should be developed on the basis of tripartite consultations. There is a good momentum for developing this as both foreign employment and labour are under the same Ministry.

- *To what extent the project is aligned to the National Labour Migration Policy for Sri Lanka?*

The objectives of the project were very consistent with the beneficiaries’ requirements, as the project intended to support the implementation of the NLMP and through this better the protection of migrant workers and their families, while overseas and upon their return. The project’s objectives were closely aligned to those of the NLMP. In addition, the LM Project’s relevance to the needs of Sri Lanka was very high, from the beginning, as a huge number of Sri Lankans are either working as overseas labour migrants or are returning from overseas work.

The project focused on policy update and implementation within a context, where policies had been developed already before; therefore, it was relevant to concentrate on contributing

to the implementation of these policies and updating the policy itself. The project contributed to establishing a dialogue on the very much disputed FBR which is reported to have contributed to an increase in younger women choosing irregular migration. The GOSL established a high-level committee which recommended to revoke the practise, this proposal was however not supported by the President.

5.2 Coherence and Strategic Fit

The project strategy and approach is consistent and pertinent to the current and long-term developmental needs of Sri Lanka, and the partners and donor's policies. With the government playing the central role in the migration process, employment/job security of the regular migrant women workers is reported to have improved.

Migration is a core issue in the DWCP, especially as low-skilled workers are given priority; thus, the project matched this priority well. Practically all the interviewed stakeholders highlighted the issue of skills' development and recognition (skills' passports). This is a field of intervention which was not foreseen in the LM project. However, skills recognition was taken up towards the end of the Phase III.

In general, it was found that the methodology of implementation was adequate under the given circumstances. As concerns *Objective 1*, to improve the policy, legislative and regulatory frameworks and processes that govern labour migration in Sri Lanka, it is imperative to update and revise the NLMP, to have an expert group as a sounding board, to support the revision of the SLBFE Act, to start capacity building of the recruitment agencies on ethical recruitment and to investigate migration costs, as well as the position of sub-agents in the recruitment industry. NLMP and the SLBFE Act revision should according to informants focus more on protection than promotion. Civil society groups and migrant societies participation should be made compulsory. The SLBFE Board has no representation of migrant societies, the Board would benefit from including these. Divisional Secretariats should recognize the migrant societies in their divisions. The role of ALFEA in institutionalizing the CoEC amongst recruitment agencies should be spelt out and it could be mandatory for agencies to become members of ALFEA or similar associations. It would be of great importance to take into account the subject of in-bound migration and look at labour migration as a part of the wider employment policy.

The ALFEA reported that since the CoEC is no more mandatory it is hard to convince agencies to adhere to it, and the association has lost almost half of its members. The role of the CoEC is therefore diminished significantly.

Concerning *Objective 2*, to promote the rights of women and men migrant workers and to protect their families, the training of FEDOs was important, as were the Gazette notification on grievance handling through SMBs, the revisions of the OM for labour attaches and the inputs in the NAPs regarding SGBV and in the National Human Rights Action Plan, Strategic National Action Plan to combat Human Trafficking as well.

For *Objective 3*, dealing with optimising the benefits of labour migration through supporting return and reintegration, it was positive that the Resource Directories, supporting reintegration by FEDOs, were completed and disseminated to the five selected districts; that the Review of the Reintegration Plan of the sub-policy was completed with the SLBFE; and that the Reintegration Unit was set up within the SLBFE.

Under, *Objective 4*, increasing contribution to national, regional and global discourse on migrant workers, the publication of the Policy Briefs, support for a large International Technical Meeting on LM statistics, the support to the Ministry and the Bureau on developing the indicators for SDG targets, as well as the sharing of the Sri Lanka experiences on LM through international fora and the coordination and organisation of a number of national meetings (e.g. PAC and PEP) reported to be highly appreciated by stakeholders. The project provided strategic input and technical guidance to Sri Lanka's Permanent Mission to the UN in Geneva, on several occasions.

As many of the outputs and activities identified were closely aligned to the Government's policy, as laid down in the NLMP and the SLBFE Act, the employed methodology was adequate, and the proper steps were taken to improve the implementation of these policies.

5.3 Validity of the Intervention's Design

- *To what extent and how does the project address the major root causes of the decent work deficits of the migrant workers and their families identified for the target group?*

As already indicated above, the lessons learned from Phases I and II were explicitly considered when designing this Phase III project. The PD identified the lessons learned from Phase II, and described their contribution to the key activities to be implemented in Phase III which can be summarised as follows:

- A strong evidence base for a deeper understanding of causes and effects of LM
 - Consultative processes to encourage and enhance ownership
 - Standardised guidelines and tools for setting benchmarks
 - Customised capacity building as a key element to foster effectiveness at different levels
 - Innovative structures to encourage cross-feeding of lessons learned
 - Support for government, to ensure safe and dignified labour migration
 - Bringing together the multiple stakeholders in the process
- *To what extent did the problem analysis identify its differential impact on women and men migrant workers and their family members?*

The number of women registered as departing for labour migration has dropped from two thirds to one third of the total number of migrants and the number of women choosing

undocumented migration is reported to have increased even no exact documentation is available. This development was not originally reflected in the project design, it was expected that the capacity building provided to FEDOs would support sharing of information among potential women migrants and the communities in general at the local level. The FBR study was subsequently done on the request of the SLBFE in order to generate knowledge to be shared with decision-makers regarding women using alternate means to migrate due to the FBR.

Recommendation 2:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
ILO	High	Short-term	Medium

The ILO should consider supporting an independent study of the new trends in labour migration, including the issue of women's undocumented migration. Based on this, together with the constituents, it should develop adequate initiatives.

- *To what extent is the project realistic (in terms of expected outputs, outcome and impact) given the proposed intervention logic, time and resources available and the social, economic and political environment?*

It was rather difficult to assess whether the project made sufficient progress towards its planned results, in its totality, as there were 23 outputs to consider, and whereas some had been met to 100% others were at 30% or even 0%. The self-assessment in the last (seventh) TPR of October 2019, indicated that progress was more or less on track, with an average of 78% of planned activities completed, some four months before the end of the project.

Table 1: Implementation progress

Object Number	Completion %age
Objective 1	77%
Objective 2	72%
Objective 3	80%
Objective 4	86%
Overall	78%

Objective 4 presents the highest score. To some extent this might be because of the very active role played by the Regional Migration Specialist in Delhi especially during the first couple of years of the implementation of phase III. With the adoption of the Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration in December 2018, this project also supported the Government of Sri Lanka in drafting key messages for various foras focusing on the implementation of the GCM in the first year after its adoption and at the GFMD Summit Meeting in Quito, Ecuador in January 2020. Objective 2 has the lowest score. Here it should be mentioned that on one of the Outputs (study of in-bound migration) the score is 0%, as it was decided to drop this activity, so this drags down the overall performance under this objective.

A highly dynamic implementation in the last eight months has brought the delivery close to 100% in most outputs, with spending at 92% by the end of the project. This increase in delivery was based on a review of budget against planned expenses and activities, between the ILO CO and the Regional Migration Specialist, as requested by the donor in February 2019 at a time where the delivery rate was less than 25% of the budget with 12 months left.

The process of setting up Special Mediation Boards took longer than anticipated by the project at the start, the initiative was already begun in Phase I, but it required a very long administrative process, led by the Ministry of Justice, to formalise such a board.

The outputs were achievable one-by-one, but when considered in their totality were quite ambitious, as a large number of outputs and activities were identified in the Logframe: 23 and 41, respectively, were divided over the four objectives. This was also especially so in combination with the management set-up. The evaluation finds that the project at the least in the beginning was understaffed and this had a negative impact on the delivery rate. Also, therefore, the design is assessed as highly ambitious. In addition, new activities were added, and some planned outputs were not delivered for various reasons. The implementation was likewise delayed because of one of the implementation partners could not meet its deadlines on delivery.

- *To what extent has the project integrated ILO cross cutting themes (such as protection of labour migrants and their families, tripartism, and gender and non-discrimination) in the design?*

The project paid significant attention to the problems women (especially younger women) who are denied permission for regular migration are confronted with. These women are often choosing irregular migration using “visit”-visa. The irregular status is making them vulnerable and they are often confronted with a huge decent work deficit. The projects focus on pre-departure awareness raising could have a positive impact on the number of irregular migrants both men and women, this together with the projects contribution to improve the agencies compliance with good ethical standards can decrease the decent work deficit the migrant workers often are confronted with, but till now there is no solid evidence of the positive outcome of the intervention in this field.

The GoSL has now in social policy regulations included migrant workers as a vulnerable group. This will open for their access to certain social benefits.

- *Are the indicators of the achievements clearly defined, describing the changes to be brought about? Were the indicators designed and used in a manner that they enabled reporting on progress under specific SDG targets and indicators?*

The indicators described in the PD and Logframe were not particularly precise, as no actual numbers were given for indicators such as the number of workshops, number of reports, percentage of workers, etc. This has already been made more explicit in the TPR's. The

Logframe is to some extent gender-sensitive, with particular attention being paid to women workers in the Development Objective and in the first two project objectives. However, this was not fully developed in the outputs and indicators.

The project supported the Ministry in developing indicators for meeting SDG targets.

- *To what extent does the elements presented in the points above have been articulated in a comprehensive and systemic Theory of change that can guide project implementation towards the project objectives?*

The PD of March 2016, did not have a separate underlying ‘Theory of Change’ (ToC), as such, but it did include a detailed analysis of the background as well as describing how the design of Phase III had been based on the analysis and evaluation of the previous two Phases (I and II), since 2010. In particular, the gaps identified at the end of Phase II, which remained to be addressed, were crucial. They were:

- updating policy commitments
- revising legislation
- reviewing regulatory structures and functions
- enhancing the capacities of key personnel in the labour migration sector, to enhance service delivery at national, district and local levels
- updating and revising guidelines and frameworks
- strengthening the positive contribution of labour migration towards the overall development of the country
- enhancing protection and accountability at destination country level

The justification for Phase III of the project was to address these remaining gaps, through the following four strategies:

- Revising and enhancing governance and regulatory frameworks
- Fostering fair and ethical recruitment
- Enhancing service delivery, monitoring and analysis at the district and local levels
- Mainstreaming the reintegration action plan

These are in turn aligned to the NLMP’s three overarching themes. The project design as laid down in the PD is quite logical and coherent and includes a comprehensive Logical Framework (Log Frame) defining the objectives, outcomes, outputs, indicators and means of verification. However, milestones were missing at this stage, although these were added to the Technical Progress Reports (TPR) later and were even reported on separately.

During a workshop, conducted with the project staff and implementing partners by the evaluators, the logic of the intervention was discussed, and the participants agreed that the ToC, below, expressed their view of the project’s logic:

- if NLMP is implemented,
- if good governance is in place,
- if women and men migrant workers and their families are protected and empowered, and
- if decent work for male and female migrant workers is promoted,
- then the benefits of labour migration will be maximised, and decent and safe labour migration will be in place.

This suggested ToC is fully in line with the rationale laid down in Logframe.

- *To what extent the partnership of the ILO and collaborating organizations (IOM and HELVETAS) were effective to achieve the stated objectives?*

The cooperation with IOM and HELVETAS has been successful and has contributed to achieve the objectives, especially the local capacity building supported by Helvetas has had a positive impact. It is however felt that the two organizations were involved in their specific parts of the project only without a view of the overall project targets, ex. if contribution was made to a document was the focus on the specific chapter of concern and not the document as a whole. No synergies between other projects implemented by the two organizations and the LM project were reported. One informant reported that the donor aimed at concentrating on the strength of each individual partner organization to enable the partners to benefit from each other's strength.

5.4 Intervention's Progress and Effectiveness

- *What progress has been made towards achieving the overall project outputs/objectives/outcomes, identifying factors affecting project implementation (positively and negatively)?*

The project has contributed significantly to promoting the process of updating the legislative framework needed for securing safe migration. The improved legislation and its better implementation will contribute to better protection of migrant workers and their families and minimize the decent work deficit. The strong commitment from the Ministry and the SLBFE had a positive impact during the implementation and can secure sustainability of the initiatives taken.

The project has contributed well to meeting its Development Objective: "Promote effective implementation of the National Labour Migration Policy resulting in better protection of women and men migrant workers and their families increased development benefits". The evaluation finds that the complex of interventions both within the current phase and previous phases have been effective in promoting the different parts of the NLMP. The discussions during the current review has raised some issues that need further improvement ex. the issue

of female migrants’ access to regular migration. The LM project has created the basis for a number of initiatives, which are all ready to take off, their implementation can lead to significant progress in meeting the development objective, but securing this is out of the hands of the project as it depends on the governments and the labour migration sectors political will.

A positive outcome of the project is that recruitment agencies and their intermediaries are now considered as important stakeholders in LM, whereas earlier they were neglected or even seen as dubious elements in the LM industry.

Recommendation 3:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
SLBFE	Medium	Long-term	Low

SLBFE to institutionalise the training for licensed recruitment agencies (ethical recruitment) and also run periodic training programs for personnel in recruitment agencies, to update them about current issues in relation to LM. This should be followed by the establishment of correct monitoring mechanisms, to be put in place by the SLBFE to monitor the process of LM.

The capacity building of government officials is seen as very positive by all stakeholders, as this will have a stronger element of sustainability because of the availability of resources to continue the activities beyond the project. It is reported that the partners can already feel a higher level of competence among governmental officials. Conducting trainings for Licenced Foreign Employment Agents (LFEAs), would in turn increase their capacity as well.

The contribution to the development of SoPs for the CoEC was highlighted, as a major achievement of the project, by many stakeholders. It was felt that, moreover, initiatives had already been taken to reflect these in the labour legislation. A major task for all the constituents will be to secure the implementation of the CoEC. The M&E report developed by IOM within the framework of the project can be a valuable tool in this process.

The Operational Manual and the training given to the Labour Attachés prior to their dispatchment increased their capacity to handle the departure process of the migrant workers, who are victims of abuse or exploitation, or otherwise are facing problems. However, it was reported that their capacity to validate the receiving employer was relatively weak and in practise concentrated on the availability of accommodation for arriving migrants. The revised OM guidelines to vet foreign recruitment agents can improve the capacity of Labour Attaches already on the short term. The evaluation finds however that the Labour Attaches still will be challenged when it comes to assessment of offered working and employment conditions.

Recommendation 4:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
GoSL	Medium	Long-term	Low

The capacity of the LA’s to validate employers should be increased to ensure that both accommodation, employment and working conditions are in compliance with generally accepted standards.

The CoEC is only used, as a guideline by the agencies, to a small extent. Even though it has been in place since 2013 monitoring of compliance has however, not been enforced. A discussion on how to bring the CoEC forward is ongoing, but the SLBFE’s involvement with the active agencies organizations in this process is reported to be insufficient.

Recommendation 5:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
ILO and GoSL	High	Short-term	High

The evaluation recommends to secure a maximum involvement of the industry in the further updating of the CoEC. This is to ensure that it meets the needs of the industry and creates an ownership. The ILO’s relevant projects should support this process and technical assistance be provided. The original idea of linking compliance to obtaining/renewal of licenses should be considered.

- *Has the management and governance structure put in place worked strategically with all key stakeholders and partners in Sri Lanka, ILO and the donor to achieve project goals and objectives?*

The Recommendations from the Mid-Term Evaluation were reported to have been very help full. The government followed up on the Recommendations made to it.

Likewise, the ILO did follow up on the recommendation except for one concerning a stronger involvement of trade unions.

In both the project’s design and implementation, the donor had a strong hands-on approach. The partner choice was made by the donor and also activities were directed by the donor to a large extent. Furthermore, coordination with other stakeholders concentrated on the donor’s partners. This approach was rather unusual (both for the ILO and for the donor, which in other countries is reported to have a more traditional donor approach).

The original Project Advisory Committee was on the request of the donor changed to a Program Advisory Committee, in Phase II, and from covering the ILO LM project alone it became a forum where all (11) the SDC partners reported to the government on progress in their respective interventions. In this way, the government got all reporting concentrated into one forum. However, for the ILO LM project, this meant that the political guidance of the project suffered. The Project Advisory Committee was not replaced by a steering committee or similar.

Cooperation between the ILO and the IOM was initiated by the donor and it did materialise within the concrete project activities, but cooperation beyond the lifetime of the project is yet to be realized.

The project design identified 4 Objectives, 4 Outcomes, 23 Outputs and 41 Activities. This led to the complexity of the programme and the sheer number of tasks to be undertaken by the project staff being underestimated at the design stage. The project staff consisted of one full-time National Programme Coordinator (NPC) from July 2016 and, from June 2017, a full-time Administration/Finance Assistant. In August 2019, the team was joined by a Project Assistant. This set-up overburdened the staff with all of the technical, coordinating, networking, administrative and monitoring tasks that resulted from such a complicated design.

The ILO Country Director played a crucial role in guidance and monitoring. The Labour Migration Unit within the ILO's country office brought together the key staff of the four projects, as well as the ILO's Regional Migration Specialist and the Country Director. The position of Regional Migration Specialist was only established in 2016, in the ILO's DWT-Office in New Delhi, but was very much beneficial to the project. It may well have contributed to the high percentage of achievements under Objective 4. Initially his tasks within the LM project were especially focussed on this objective, but in later stages of the project his tasks were broadened to cover other objectives as well.

- *Has the knowledge sharing, and communication strategy been effective in raising the profile of the project within the country and among the cooperating partners?*

The project has together with other SDC funded projects achieved a high level of visibility at the government level. At the local level it is the local implementing organizations who are known rather than the ILO. The sub-contracting of activities has led to a situation where the implementation and the results achieved were out of the control of the project. The sub-contracting might have been necessary because of the high number of activities foreseen in the Log Frame, but it might have had an impact on the possibility of monitoring and profiling of the ILO. The SDC partner forum became a positive platform for knowledge sharing during the lifetime of the project.

- *To what extent is the monitoring and evaluation system results-based and to what extent is it being used to take management decisions?*

During the review of the progress reports, the evaluation found that some of the original outputs in the LFA were stated in a different manner to the progress reports. The major difference found, between the outputs mentioned in the progress reports and what is mentioned in the log frame, is that the progress reports have limited the output to completing an activity whereas the measurements in the Logframe go beyond the outcomes. For the evaluation, this was further complicated by the fact that no institutional memory is left within the ILO's CO, concerning the project's origin and implementation. The institutional memory is now with some of the implementing partners.

Reporting has been adequate and closely followed the SDC requirements, as laid down in the Agreement between the SDC and the ILO in April 2016.

By the end of the project staffing was increased and the ILO CO intervened to optimize delivery from the project partner. This combined with good political and practical backing from the Ministry and SLBFE lead to an acceptable delivery towards the end of the project.

- *Assess how contextual and institutional risks and positive external to the project factors have been managed by the project management?*

On the whole, risks were correctly assessed and made explicit in the Logframe. However, the impact of the local elections, in February 2018, and the aftermath of changing ministerial structures and key staff, was not really foreseen. Therefore, it was particularly important that good contacts were maintained between the Ministry, the Bureau and the ILO during that period of change.

There were several external factors that delayed the achievement of outputs, in particular:

- The local elections, of February 2018, and its aftermath of changing ministerial structures and transferring key staff; e.g., there were four different Secretaries in the past year
- The lack of coordination between ministries, which included a large number of ministries covering Foreign Employment, Labour, Skills, Justice, Foreign Affairs, Home Affairs, Women and Child Protection, and the (Board of) Investments, etc. This made it difficult, for example, to conduct the NAC. In addition, other problems were that not all the relevant ministries were included in the NAC, and the focal points were regularly transferred.
- There was a delay in the recruitment costs survey to be conducted with the Dept of Census and Statistics, because the methodology was jointly designed by the WB and the ILO in Washington DC; so, progress was beyond the control of the Colombo CO
- The IOM faced delays in approaching the recruitment industry, among other things because this industry is spread over the island and faces an image problem. Because of this, it took more time than anticipated to gain the trust of the companies.
- There was delay in the decision making concerning the development of a web-based platform to facilitate the FEDO's reporting.
- The 2019 Easter terror attack also contributed to delaying the implementation.

The following had a negative impact on meeting the projects objectives. As far as it could be established within the relatively short time span of the evaluation field mission, two unforeseen effects could be identified. Firstly, one of the original project outputs (Output 1.5) was to review the structure of the SLBFE, but the Ministry concluded that this was an activity that should be undertaken internally and without involvement from outside. This could have been foreseen in the design. The rejection of the review had a negative impact on meeting Objective 1. However, should the SLBFE decide to move forward with a review of its structures the development can be considered as positive, because it concerns a regular activity inherent to a government institution, which by own resources engage in a possible reform process and by this contribute positively to meeting Objective 1.

Secondly, the FBR regulation, introduced in 2013, making it more difficult for women with children under five years of age to migrate via regular channels, was the subject to a study under the LM project. The study showed that the FBR was at least partly responsible for a substantial decline in the number of registered women migrating. This is a hotly debated issue, with competing views, especially as it focusses on the wellbeing of children and families in general as opposed to the freedom of women to make their own decisions about whether to migrate. The FBR has a negative impact on the possibilities of meeting Objective 1 and 2. The unplanned result was that a committee of five ministers was given the task of making a proposal, either to repeal the FBR or to modify it. Their recommendation was to repeal the FBR and to put a Family Care Plan in place instead. However, the President dismissed this proposal.

With the high number of outputs and activities it is hard to single out which activities have contributed most to meeting the Development Objective. The evaluation finds that the achievements comes from the total sum of activities implemented not only within phase III but over all three phases. The labour migration has over the years been attended to from different angles and all this has driven the progress forward. There is however still a long way to go before the Development Objective is achieved. In short it can be said that the long-term and complex approach has contributed to the improvements in place and created the basis for further improvements towards safe migration. The evaluation further finds that if labour migration to a bigger extend had been seen as an integrated part of an overall employment policy/strategy then the progress could have been stronger and more migrant workers would have benefitted from minimized decent work deficit.

5.4.1 Achievements concerning Objective 1 – Outcome 1:

The Project allocated significant efforts in meeting its Objective 1: “To improve the policy, legislative and regulatory frameworks and processes that govern labour migration to reflect and respond to current contextual situations and needs that further safeguarding the rights of women and men migrant workers and families” and its Outcome (each Objective had only one Outcome): “Governance and regulation of labour migration improved through enhanced policies and effective implementation of the National Labour Migration Policy”.

The supported reforms and new practises met some of the gaps disclosed during the previous phases of the project but might not in full have reacted to some of the new challenges. In this way the first part of the objective was met, but the second part to a lesser extent. The project did not in full react to the changes in labour migration trends especially the significant decrease in regular female labour migrants, likewise it did not react to the increase in in-bound migration.

Under Outcome 1 the project has contributed to the government’s revision of the NLMP and the SLBFE Act to be more in line with developments/ changes in international labour migration and national development taking into consideration the needs / requirements of the labour migrants and their families. The documents are in the final stages of being submitted to the Cabinet.

NLMP was revised and the focus was to bring it in compliance with international labour standards. Global Compact and other international recommendations and SDG too were included in the policy and action plans. Key performance indicators are also aligned to these. This will help the government to report on the progress.

A new core area is the inclusion of Skills development as the fourth area of intervention. It focusses on low skilled, semi-skilled, and also higher skilled workers. In the case of contractual migration

for lower skills, upon their return there will be a system for recognition of their merits and prior learning which will enable them to get a better paid job in Sri Lanka or abroad.

Governance: The new policy is also regularizing the labour migration intermediaries and sub-agents.

Protection/Welfare: Since 1985 there are many welfare programs, but it was difficult for migrants and their families accessing them. The new policy has proposed measures which will enable the migrant communities to access welfare programs through the Divisional Secretariat. The information will be disseminated through civil societies and migrant societies.

Complaint Handling mechanism through the District LM mediation boards is included.

It proposes a special mechanism to monitor the code of ethical conduct of recruitment agencies. The action plan recommends two ways – one is through self-evaluation and the other is by an independent audit team, an external party comprising of Ministry representative, SLBFE representative and recognized person from private sector.

Migration and Development: The sub-section Return & Reintegration had not been implemented by SLBFE and it is emphasized that it should be realized. It also emphasizes about the overseas Sri Lankans not only for their investment but for their skills, technology and knowledge transfer and the need of the government to facilitate/link it.

In the Remittance Management section, it proposes to the Central Bank and the Banking sector to establish special mechanism to promote remittance through proper channels. Remitters should be given special concessions (import of duty-free vehicles, tax benefits etc.)

In promoting the revision of policies, the project undertook the following concrete interventions it was reported:

- Work on the revision of the NLMP progressed with an overview on migration for employment and in consultation with the National Skills' sector.
- All steps were discussed within the Expert Group that was set up especially for the revision. It comprised a diverse group of experts, representing a range of expertise, experience and interest (government, universities, national and international NGOs, and UN organisations, etc.).
- The background papers that fed into the policy revision process were completed, dealing with global, regional and national trends in labour migration, changes in migration profiles of Sri Lankans, policy coherence of migration for employment, international frameworks and mechanisms on labour migration, and the increase of inbound migration.
- Consultations and a desk study were completed for the revision of the SLBFE Act (1985). The SLBFE has completed a draft amendment; its key functions are: licencing of recruitment agencies, training for MW, registration of MW, complaint management mechanism, welfare activities and law enforcement.
- Investigation of the regulation on the Family Background Report (FBR) was completed and recommendations were put forward to GoSL.

Capacity building of Licensed Foreign Employment Agents (LFEAs) was completed for 326 out of a target of 400 agencies, on ethical recruitment practices and on the operationalisation of the Code of Ethical Conduct (CoEC). The training was conducted by

trainers trained within the current project. This component was implemented by the IOM. The IOM also introduced the SOP and M&E report during this training period, alongside the curriculum. IOM established a group of experts consisting ILO, UNWomen, SLBFE, Ministry, recruitment agents representatives, CSOs and others, provided inputs to the SoP, Training Manual and M&E guideline.

- A survey and study on sub-agents/intermediaries in the recruitment industry was undertaken jointly by the IOM and the Institute of Policy Studies to assess whether they can be regulated. This was a detailed study, based on a sample survey of 405 recruitment intermediaries, from all over the country. Qualitative data was collected from many of the relevant stakeholders. One of the conclusions was that 80% of sub-agents would actually prefer to be regularised. A task force was created to come up with procedures for registering of the recruitment intermediaries in Sri Lanka.
- The IOM developed guidelines for selecting foreign recruitment agencies in the Operational Manual (OM) for Labour Attaches of the Sri Lankan Diplomatic Missions by IOM. Including a checklist to ensure the integrity of the host country agencies during the recruitment process.

It can be concluded that Outcome 1 was met to a large extent and all what depended of the project was done. The transformation of the revised policy into practise is out of the hand of the project.

5.4.2 Achievements concerning Objective 2 – Outcome 2:

The Objective 2: “To protect the rights of and empower women and migrant workers and their families” of the LM project and its Outcome: “Rights of men and women migrant workers and their families protected through effective policy implementation” have received attention from the project, but the evaluation could not identify any document improvements. The number of complaints from migrants have gone down, but as explained elsewhere in this report this might be caused by other developments. It cannot be stated that the Objective was met, but the capacity building and other initiatives as listed below can have created the basis for a better protection of the rights of migrant workers. It is reported that the labour attaches have become more competent but no evidence that it has resulted in better protection. The pre-departure training can have empowered the migrants departing through regular channels to protect their own right. THB and GBV has been included in the new OM, this can be seen as positive, but the evaluation is concerned, that this is not followed by development of psycho-social competency in the diplomatic mission or an immediate referral mechanism. The victims would have serious traumas which need professional assistance. The project did not deliver on these aspects of migration.

The following initiatives were taken to protect the rights of and empower women and migrant workers:

- Helvetas in collaboration with the Project, completed a Training Manual and Resource Pack for the approximately 1,000 foreign employment development officers (FEDO’s), and trained them using the materials. The FEDOs function under the Divisional Secretaries, with

a supervising and coordinating role at the District Secretariat. They report to Ministry of Foreign Employment and Divisional Secretary. They help the SLBFE in the pre-departure training of potential migrant workers, FBR monitoring, and the reintegration of returning migrants, including support for ‘family development plans. All FEDOs in the 13 districts, of whom the majority were women, were trained. The training was greatly valued by the FEDOs interviewed in Kurunegala, as it helped them in their daily work.

- The SDC’s partner CSOs, hosted training programmes in their respective districts that provided constructive and practical feedback on the manual, resource persons and logistics by the trained FEDOs.
- Three notifications were gazetted by the MoJ, concerning the initiatives on grievance handling, in order to establish a pilot Special Mediation Board (SMB) on migration in Kurunegala.
- Community Mediation Boards are quite common in Sri Lanka and they are being used at community level, for land disputes and, in particular, after the tsunami of 2004. TAF has acquired vast experience in organising such SMBs, since 1988. For this reason, it was chosen as the implementing partner for this part of the project.
- Revision of the Operational Manual (OM) for Labour Attaches of the Sri Lankan Diplomatic Missions with the SLBFE, ILO and UNWOMEN, bringing in the gender aspects including ‘violence against women’ and the position of domestic workers. The manual was revised to introduce human trafficking and gender-based violence. It discusses how to identify victims, how to treat them, sheltering of women, the reporting mechanism to host country, Foreign Ministry and SLFEB. Since there are no psycho-social counsellors in the mission, it spells out the requirement to have a directory of overseas Sri Lankan in the host country to get counselling, legal assistance etc. It also discusses about the safe houses and the running of them. There were no reports on improved grievance handling in the diplomatic missions. It should be noted that this might be because that the instrument is still relatively new. The LA is however reported to have welcomed the OM.
- Sri Lanka is said to be the first country within the Colombo Process to come up with an Operational Manual.
- Sections on migrant workers were added to the National Action Plan (NAP) on prevention of Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV), which was approved by the Cabinet in 2016.
- Technical inputs were provided to be included in the sections on foreign employment in the draft Youth Employment NAP and the National Human Rights Action Plan.

5.4.3 Achievements concerning Objective 3 – Outcome 3:

Overall the LM project has contributed to a limited extend to meeting the Objective 3:” To maximise the benefits of labour migration” and its Outcome:” Benefits of labour migration optimized through improved coordination and practice”. The successful labour migrants will of cause contribute to the countries, communities, families and personally benefits of migration and the project has contributed to a number of initiatives for better pre-departure procedures even some ex. the FBR is questionable. The reintegration efforts can have a positive effect and increase benefits of labour migration, but the more perspective improvement would be to develop the full potential of the skills recognition (skills passport) initiative. If this is scaled in a way so that it scure also international recognition, then it will on the one hand encourage some potential migrant workers to seek job in Sri Lanka rather than return to migration and on the other hand those who chose to migrate will have good chances for getting better paid jobs.

The following initiatives were taken in this field of intervention:

- Resource Directories were prepared for FEDOs to support reintegration and were printed and disseminated to five districts; Kurunegala, Ratnapura, Galle, Kilinochchi and Batticaloa (selected on the basis of criteria, such as high migration districts, ethnic balance and conflict affected districts).
- The interviewed SDC Partner CSOs reported that they were undertaking work at the local level, directly with migrants, and dealing with four subject areas: access to information; legal support for grievance; psycho-social support; and remittance management and re-integration, among others, through income generating activities.
- The Review of the Reintegration Plan of the ‘Sub Policy and National Action Plan on Return and Reintegration of Migrant Workers’ was completed with the SLBFE and inputs from other stakeholders.
- Set up the Reintegration Unit within the SLBFE.
- A study was made on the remittance sending behaviour of migrant workers and on the obstacles for remittance sending, in order to support the Colombo Process (CP).

5.4.4 Achievements concerning Objective 4 – Outcome 4:

The project Objective 4: “To document and share experiences, best practices and lessons at national, regional and global level” and its Outcome: “Increased contribution to national, regional and global discourse on migrant workers” is proberly the objective which was met to the biggest extend especially the international profile of Sri Lanka has been promoted and Sri Lanka has actively contributed with its experiences in various international fora. Nationally has labour migration become a high-profile issue both in the public and on the political agenda. The project has contributed actively to both processes.

The following initiatives were taken in this field:

- Policy Briefs were published on various subjects, such as: the NLMP, skills’ recognition and one on FBR.

- A large International-Regional Technical Meeting was held concerning an International Labour Migration Statistics (ILMS) database for South Asia.
- Support was provided to the Ministry/the SLBFE on developing the indicators for different SDG targets.
- Sri Lanka’s experiences were shared through CP, ADD, Global Forum on Migration and Development and the Global Compact on Migration (GCM).
- Coordination and organisation of various meetings, such as for NAC, PAC, NSCRR and PEP, but meetings were not held regularly except the PEP meetings.

As concerns the dissemination of the publications, produced under the project, such as the Policy Briefs, the ILO identified a two-page ‘Dissemination Strategy’, which included target groups at the international level (such as CP, ADD, GCM, ILO Geneva, ILO Asia-Pacific and other websites) as well as at national level (NAC, PAC, NSCRR, PEP, Donor Community through the UNs Development Partner Forum, etc.). However, dissemination was lagging behind somewhat, partly because the NAC, PAC and NSCRR – whose members are the key project stakeholders – were not held for a longer period of time. Informants only referred to the Briefs in a limited manner. Informants also expressed the feeling that the Briefs seemed like stand-alone documents, which would have benefitted from follow-up discussions among the stakeholders.

A number of regional and global platforms are in place and it is relevant that Sri Lanka actively participates in these activities, as it is a large sending country. It has already played an active role in the different fora and taken responsibility upon itself, over many years.

Recommendation 6:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
ILO and GoSL	High	Short-term	High

Sri Lanka should continue its active participation in the international fora post project. The ILO should secure continued technical support for the GoSL in their international activities.

The project management decided not to implement a number of planned activities, because the implementation was confronted with challenges or changed contexts, such as:

1. One of the important NLMP objectives was to enhance skilled migration, but recent research by CDS indicates that during recent years there has been an almost 50% decrease in skilled migration.
2. A report looked at the legal environment with regard to the ratification of Conventions 97, 143 and 181 especially looking at the SL Constitution, Immigration and Emigration laws etc.
3. No follow-up to study by ILO/WB on migration costs by neither the project nor the ILO/Department of Census and Statistics. No one has taken the responsibility for its

continued research and the Department has informed that they do not have the resources to follow these data.

4. There is a need to develop a mechanism to monitor the impact of the training related to the CoEC of recruitment agents.
5. There was no capacity building programme for DOs and Ministry officials on data collection, analysis and generation of family development plans
6. Several follow-up activities on SMB's and on Grievance handling did not take place because of delays and change of strategy.
7. The centralized grievance handling was abandoned, because legal barriers made it impossible. It was proposed to replace this activity with support to the nine Provincial Centres, which are being established by the SLBFE, after some delays.

Below more detailed information on some interventions which delivered inputs to more Outcomes:

Informants felt that more attention should have been paid, when nominating officers for training, and in selecting people with training capabilities. That a person is a high-ranking officer does not automatically mean that they are a good trainer.

It can be concluded that the effectiveness of the information dissemination and the cascading of training depended on the Divisional Secretariat's Foreign Employment Development Officer's (FEDO) competency and capacity. This was derived from the interviews, which indicated that in places where there was a senior person with training capabilities, and/or the interest to identify such a person and delegate the work, the cascading of the training happened successfully. However, where there was no such person/s, with commitment or interest to carry out training, the cascading of the training was less successful. This indicates that the activities have still not been institutionalized in full, but rather they depend on individuals' initiatives. In the district of Kurunegala which is listed as one of the high migration districts, a monthly average of 18-20 women per division seek employment overseas. The FEDOs visit their houses and assess the family situation to complete the FBR. Based on observations, in some instances the FEDOs have explained to potential migrants whose family members especially children become vulnerable owing to mother's departure about the risks they might have to face in host countries and the effects of their departure on the family and specially on children. Some have given up their intention to migrate abroad for employment and instead got the help of the FEDOs to be engaged in income generation activities. This assistance given through the Divisional Secretariat is accessible for the most vulnerable families only, where the departure of the mother might negatively impact the well-being of the family, especially the children.

It was observed that after the introduction of the Family Background Report (FBR), an additional layer of government officers was now required to verify this. Hence, there was an additional level of interest from the FEDOs in this information, since they informed that even though they were asked to verify the information provided in the FBRs, they were not given any

sensitisation on the subject. For this reason, the information booklets and the sensitisation programs, conducted by the ILO, had become very useful for them.

According to the top management of the SLBFE, the role of the FEDOs at the field level is the dissemination of safe migration knowledge to the community. They also look after the monitoring, supervising and support of migrant-worker-related affairs, concerning promotion, protection, welfare and supporting reintegration. However, the FEDOs who were interviewed were of the opinion that their role was more confined to the enforcement of the FBR.

The FEDOs get only little training on psychological and social support. They do not feel they are equipped to give counselling on issues linked to these issues, even though they are in demand. There is also a lack of training in financial literacy for migrants and their families, beyond technical issues linked to transfer of remittances.

Recommendation 7:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
Ministry	Medium	Long-term	Medium

The Ministry is recommended to review the training of FEDOs and to include more training on counselling on socio-psychological issues, as well as on financial literacy for the families receiving remittances.

The project already planned (in Phases II and III) to support the implementation of the Code of Ethical Conduct (CoEC) for Licensed Recruitment Agents that was prepared in Phase I of the project. Whereas holding a series of sensitisation programs was the responsibility of the project, a significant proportion of the responsibility for implementing this CoEC lay with the ALFEA. Besides carrying out awareness programs about the CoEC, ALFEA’s responsibilities included getting the membership to sign a proclamation on adhering to the CoEC.

The project had planned sensitisation workshops for the Licensed Recruitment Agents throughout the country, with the collaboration of the ALFEA. However, due to the SLBFE and ALFEA’s delays in coming to an agreement on its implementation, the sensitisation workshops started late. The sensitisation workshops were aimed at introducing the CoEC to its users, in order to enhance professionalism, responsibility, accountability and to promote transparency in business activities, to ensure safe and secure employment for migrant workers from Sri Lanka.

The standard package of information, which consists of a guidebook, flip chart/desk calendar, CDs with documentaries and specific audio visuals posters and leaflets on pre-departure decision making – in both Sinhala and Tamil – were successfully developed by the project. The content of these materials was appreciated by the experienced top officials of the SLBFE, the ALFEA and others who had long experience in this sector. Furthermore, they mentioned that even though the information package did not contain any new information, but rather was a collection of information that was already there for the SLBFE and the ALFEA’s members, the intervention had succeeded in getting the information properly organised, improved, and printed with an attractive and user-friendly layout.

Recommendation 8:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
SLBFE	Low	Long-term	Medium

It is suggested that the information booklet and other materials developed by the project should be distributed to all offices, as well as updated and re-printed at regular intervals. It should include more information on the return and re-integration aspects.

The original intention was to make CoEC adherence a mandatory clause on the annual registration renewal form for licensees, with the assumption that all licensees were ALFEA members. However, the 2009 amendment to the SLBFE Act changed this and it was not legally possible to make membership of the ALFEA mandatory. Hence, the ALFEA mentions that the amendment of the act, which made it voluntary for employment agencies to join the ALFEA as compared to the earlier version where it was mandatory, created a division among the licenced agencies, which led to the ALFEA's not being in a position to implement the CoEC properly.

It is felt that given this background, it is unlikely that the ALFEA will play a more proactive role in implementing the CoEC.

It is reported that because the ALFEA was not being given the authority to implement the CoEC as originally planned, the signing of the proclamation was also not possible.

Some interviewees expressed the opinion that it would be good if a list of blacklisted agencies in their area could be displayed in the SLBFE district office, so that potential migrants can be made aware of them. One of the interviewees said, "We cannot recommend any agency to anyone, since we are government officers; however, we can help the people and avoid a lot of trouble if a list of blacklisted agencies can be displayed in the office so that they can refer to it".

Recommendation 9:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
GoSL and ALFEA	Medium	Long-term	Low

The blacklisting of agencies, which are in non-compliance, will require strong legal procedures and principles and could have some negative consequences. However, a positive listing of those in compliance could have a positive impact on the agencies' behaviour. It is recommended jointly to establish such a positive list. This could eventually be linked to the Migrant Recruitment Advisor developed through the two other ILO projects, REFRAME and EQUIP.

As mentioned earlier, the development of a Central Grievance Handling System was dropped as it turned out to be too complicated. Even though it was reported by the SLBFE that complaints were down from 6.5% to 3% in recent years, because of the implementation of the FBR, training and awareness, and workplace identification, there is a need to optimise grievance handling. New ideas for an efficient referral mechanism may need to be considered along with a strong emphasis on the de-centralisation of grievance handling mechanisms. Based on conducted interviews the evaluation finds that the decrease in the percentage of contracts where the worker file a complaint

might be rooted in the fact that less women are departing for domestic work through the regular channels. The main source of complaints has historically been domestic workers. The many women now using irregular means of migration are not covered by the complaint mechanism. The real figure of cases where a complaint could have been filed might therefore be higher than the 3% reported by SLBFE.

After conducting an initial feasibility study, TAF compiled and documented the design, functions and mandate of the SMBs already in Phase II. Furthermore, TAF developed a mediators’ resource book and held a mediator ToT for 35 mediator trainers from the MoJ and developed a media plan and awareness-building plan which resulted in the production of leaflets, posters and video clips, targeted at different segments of audiences all this in Phase II. TAF conducted another ToT for mediators, in Phase III, and as the MoJ has now gazetted the decision of establishing an SMB on migration, specified the geographic location and detailed the qualification of the mediator cadre, there is a good chance that a pilot SMB will be functional in the not too far future.

The Ministry informed the evaluation team that one of biggest drawbacks to implementing the policy on returning migrants is that there is no current mechanism for the SLBFE to reconnect with migrants who return back to the country. The FEDOs believe a key component of the reintegration strategy should be to carry out more education about financial management, livelihood development and skills for the families of departed workers. On their return socio-psychological support might also be needed. The FEDOs find that this is not sufficient, and that further sensitisation on financial management and livelihood development should be provided. This is in addition to the migrants being briefed on financial management, at a pre-departure stage, in a half-day session run by the banks, which mainly focuses on how to send remittances.

The sub-policy should identify the skills and knowledge that migrant workers gained from their work outside the country, and upgrade the level of their certificates; thus, facilitating their seeking better jobs next time they leave the country, or even within the country. Skills’ passports are seen by many as the way forward on this. It was noted by constituents that the returning migrants should not only be pushed in the direction of self-employment, but also towards the many vacancies available to skilled workers inside the country.

Recommendation 10:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
GoSL and ILO	High	Long-term	High

It is recommended that skills’ recognition and certification be institutionalised by the application of international standards. Market intelligence should be developed to identify the market needs and standards of receiving countries. Long- and short-term requirements should be identified. These initiatives should be seen as a part of a comprehensive national employment strategy.

5.4.5 Effectiveness of management arrangements

Key stakeholders were brought together under this project. However, their understanding of their role, in implementing activities in relation to the attainment of the overall objective, was not clear.

The EQUIPE & REFRAME projects complemented the LM project and the establishment of the LM Unit in the CO increased interaction between staff and helped to optimise the outcomes. The ILO now approaches partners, as one, and with the same agenda. However, the Unit has an ad-hoc character, although a concept note was developed for its functioning.

Recommendation 11:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
ILO	Medium	Long-term	None

The ILO should consider nominating a person from among relevant project staff to be in charge of the LM Unit, to secure coordination and the institutionalisation of the Units' work, as per the concept note.

5.5 Efficiency of Resource Use

- *Have resources (financial, human, technical support, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the project outputs and specially outcomes?*

The project initiatives generally appear to have delivered value for money. This was confirmed by the key interviewed stakeholders, including the donor and key government organisations. From the start of the project, in April 2016, until June 2018, expenditures had reached only 25% of the total project budget of over 1.5 million USD. Table 2, below, gives an overview of the project's expenditures and allocations.

Table 2: Overview of Expenditures for the period of April 2016 to February 2020

Budget Line (BL)	Total Budget USD	Total Budget %	Actual spending USD	Actual spending %
International Consultants	60,084.00	4%	60,084.00	100%
Administrative Support	66,349.00	4%	58,134.00	88%
Travel/Mission Costs	23,137.00	2%	18,835.00	81%
Evaluation	49,632.00	3%	44,659.00	90%
NPC	150,650.00	10%	143,147.00	95%
National Consultants	112,887.00	7%	104,552.00	93%
Sub-Contracts (various)	340,290.00	22%	288,170.00	85%
Sub-Contract (IOM)	417,651.00	27%	417,649.00	100%
Seminars & Fellowships	133,438.00	9%	113,309.00	85%

Equipment & Sundries	21,982.00	1%	19,776.00	90%
Programme Support	149,657.35	10%	133,696.00	89%
Prov. for Cost Increase				
TOTAL (%)				
Row % of total				
TOTAL Abs. in USD	1,525,757.35		1,402,011.00	92%

Sources: Project Finance/admin Officer 26.02.20

The resources and inputs (funds, expertise, and time, etc.) were generally allocated and used strategically, to achieve the planned results; however, some imbalances were noted. The budget item, Sub-Contracts, took 49% of the total budget (cf. Table 1), with the IOM subcontract alone accounting for one third of the total budget. The remainder covered a series of activities (for example, with CENWOR, IPS, TAF, CEPA and Migrant Forum Asia). At the same time, the costs for the project staff can be considered relatively low, at 14%. International and national consultants took up an additional 4%.

Another imbalance is that whereas the IOM-subcontract consumed a substantial one third of the budget, it only produced three out of the twenty-three outputs identified in the Logframe.

- *Were the project's activities and operationalization in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the work plan? If not, what are the factors that hinder timely delivery and what are the counter measures taken to achieve project outcomes and impact during the life of the project?*

Regarding the forty-one activities, some were delivered in a timely manner, some were delayed and others were not started at all. For example, the IOM subcontract was delayed and only roughly 25% of the budget had been spent by January 2018, whereas the deadline for this component was December 2018. By July 2018, this figure was 46%, with the remaining 54% to be spent in the period of August 2018—December 2018.

The majority of the IOM's budget was allocated to operational expenses (56%) and staff expenses accounted for a further 25%. When compared to the project staff expenses from the ILO (14%; see Table 1) this is substantially higher. This work was also done by a two-member team and a part-time supervisor.

A list of 32 trainers for training of special mediators was created. These mediators would offer independent mediation after they had been trained within the framework of the project. By the end of Phase II, a group of 35 mediators had been trained, but because of delays they never began working. Currently, the mediations' legal status is in place and funding is secured, but the realisation is out of the hands of the ILO.

At the time of the MTE, only 35% of the allocation had been spent (mainly because of external factors), and mid-2019 it was up to 50%. Now, at the end of the project, delivery has reached 92%. The efforts to speed up the implementation in the last period of the project were very successful. It is the evaluation team’s impression that the budget was well administrated, and generally funds were spent as per budget.

Recommendation 12:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
ILO	Medium	Long-term	None

The ILO is recommended to strengthen its project budget monitoring system to ensure that there is a timely delivery, as per the implementation plan and also by implementing partners.

The evaluation noted that activities on C189 and skills’ development (skills’ passport) which were not foreseen in the Project Document, Logframe and budget were implemented in agreement with the donor, but without amending the Logframe.

A significant amount of money was spent on a symposium for Sri Lankan labour attaches from selected destination countries. The symposium was conducted in Malaysia, with high additional costs. A justification for conducting the symposium in Malaysia and not in Sri Lanka is missing.

Financial release procedures and actions by the donor were taken care of in a timely manner and did not influence the project’s implementation in any way.

- *To what extent did the project leverage resources to promote rights at work for women and men migrant workers, gender equality and non-discrimination?*

As far as the project in itself was focused on promoting rights at work for migrant workers the resources allocated were practically all spend on direct and in-direct promotion of workers’ rights.

The *primary* clients or beneficiaries of the LM project were given in the PD and they included, in particular, the Ministry, the SLBFE, several other Ministries, employers’ organisations (EFC), Trade Unions, the SDC and the wider donor community, as well as the various ILO offices. Secondary clients or beneficiaries were the other key stakeholders, including the migrants themselves. Under this perspective, the value of the project, or the percentage of the budget that actually reached the beneficiaries is high, as the project worked very closely with the Ministry and the SLBFE, as well as with the SDC and its partners. In addition, the project had specific activities with several other ministries and with the EFC. The migrants themselves benefited indirectly, especially through the work of the FEDOs, who were trained throughout the project.

5.6 Likelihood of Sustainability

- *To which extent are the results of the intervention likely to have a long term, sustainable positive contribution to the DWCP, SDG and relevant targets? (explicitly or implicitly)*

On the basis of the achievements discussed in the above, and those of previous two phases, it can be concluded that the project has made good progress in achieving its planned long- and medium-term outcomes. When the Phase I started labour migration was not high on the political agenda; today it is an issue which is discussed broadly in society and which has high political attention. The long-standing focus – more than 10 years - from ILO on the subject has according to stakeholders played an important role in contributing to setting the agenda and even many political changes, the ILO has through the constant focus contributed to achieving this change. This new situation creates a foundation that secures that the challenges coming from labour migration can be met in a constructive manner, while creating fair solutions for all.

Overall the projects have over the years contributed to minimize the decent work deficit as foreseen in the DWCP and also contributed to meeting the SDG targets.

Decent work for migrant workers should be seen both from the angle of home country and destination country. Improvements are reported in Sri Lanka whereas less progress is reported in host countries. Here a significant decent work deficit is reported, and it is also the responsibility of the sending country to secure, that safe migration is covering the whole migration cycle.

The increased capacity of staff (FEDOs) in the SLBFE and their willingness to continue upgrading cadres provides a good possibility of sustainability.

The increased professionalism among recruitment agents may increase the benefits of their business and this would also increase their interest in capacity building in the longer term.

The establishment of the SMB, under the Mediation Boards Commission, secures financial and institutional sustainability. It has been a long journey to reach this goal, but now a solid foundation is in place and there is a reported political will to ensure that the SMBs on migration become operative.

The SDC Partner CSOs also have direct contact with some of the migrant workers, partly on the workers' own initiatives and sometimes referred to the CSOs by FEDOs. The CSOs often liaise with the local government officers (FEDOs and others) on behalf of the workers. Thus, by using the established channels within the government and the CSO structures, the migrants are contributing to the sustainability of the initiatives in an indirect way.

The evaluation recommends to secure a maximum involvement of the industry in the further updating of the CoEC. This is to ensure that it meets the needs of the industry and creates an ownership. The relevant ILO's projects should support this process and technical assistance be provided. The original idea of linking compliance to obtaining/renewal of licenses should be considered.

The durability of the planned results differs substantially among the various project components. These will be assessed below, following the Phase III objectives.

As a whole, the achievements under *Objective 1* are relatively durable, especially because most of them are embedded in the structures and policies of the Ministry and the Bureau. Regarding the revision of the NLMP, it is very durable provided all of the remaining steps are completed.

The revision, i.e. the third Amendment of the SLBFE-Act (1985) is another durable result, as it was according to SLBFE completed for final endorsement.

The capacity building of recruitment agencies on ethical recruitment is a very durable result, which has the potential to be scaled up or replicated by other partners (e.g. by the ALFEA in cooperation with the Ministry) if commitment is in place.

Some other activities, such as the investigation into the regulation of the FBR, the research on migration costs and the survey of sub-agents in the recruitment industry are mainly preparatory steps, to be further built upon in the future if the political momentum should materialise.

The achievements under *Objective 2* show a clear durable character, with the FEDO training manual and resource pack and the training of FEDOs being concluded. The revisions of the OM for labour attaches, once adopted and inserted, will need to be monitored for actual use in the work of attaches. The establishment of a pilot SMB in Kurunegala is expected to be durable, through the Ministry of Justice it was included in the Mediation Board Commission and by this financing should be in place onwards. Lastly, the inclusion of sections, on migrant workers/foreign employment, in several NAPs is also durable, especially as concerns the prevention of SGBV, which is a problem especially for domestic workers.

Among the *Objective 3* achievements, the existence of the new Reintegration Unit is not only a sign of durability but also of the concrete institutionalisation of political will on the side of the government in relation to issues of labour migration. The completion of the Resource Directories for FEDOs, and its dissemination to five districts, is another important step for which plans need to be developed, for scaling up, in the near future. The completion of the review of the national sub-policy on return and reintegration needs to be followed up with monitoring on how it is implemented and how stakeholders can coordinate and take responsibility. Lastly, the SDC Partner CSOs, at the local level, are undertaking important supportive work for the migrant workers themselves and their cooperation with FEDOs and other local government staff is important and influential. However, their activities remain dependent on outside funding.

Lastly, the achievements under of *Objective 4* are also varied. The Policy Briefs that were published are tangible project outputs which contribute to visibility, although they constitute only preparatory steps towards possible durability. The same can be said of the international meetings and consultations held on the ILMS database for South Asia, and on the sharing of Sri Lanka's experiences through the CP, the ADD and the GCM. The support to the Ministry on developing indicators for SDG targets has an obvious sustainable purpose.

The Government of Sri Lanka has been deeply involved in several international regional consultative processes, such as the CP, the ADD, the GCM, GFMD and the ILMS meetings. Not only have many of these meetings been organised in the country itself, but Sri Lanka was the first Chair of the Colombo Process (CP) in 2003 and was again the chair from 2013—2016. This degree of involvement has been beneficial to the national government in several areas, for example for consultations with receiving countries (ADD) on specific issues and problems relating to migrant workers. Sri Lanka also took Chair of the ADD in a period. In addition, the revision of the Operational Manual (OM) for labour attaches at Diplomatic Missions is another example of the attention paid by the government to labour migration.

There are a number of indicators that show that the outputs of the project can be expected to be sustained over the mid- or longer term. The revised policy and regulatory framework (in particular the NLMP, the SLBFE Act, and Sub-Policy) will have to be followed by all government organisations, in the years to come. The capacity building efforts also are a sustainable output, and the developed training courses and manuals can be used to upscale the training. Part of them will be upscaled by the Ministry/the SLBFE. In addition, the Reintegration Unit at the Bureau is a clear example of the institutionalisation of project components.

Overall ownership of the project has been relatively high, from the beginning, at the Ministry, which was oriented towards the implementation of the NLMP. The changes among GoSL officers, responsible for labour migration/foreign employment, provided some challenges, when it came to ownership. The project objectives fit well with the national priorities in the NLMP, which the GoSL owns and uses to guide all of its work on labour migration. As the SLBFE was heavily involved in the implementation of the project, ownership here is substantial. Regarding the Ministry of Labour, the official counterpart of the ILO in the country, it was involved in NAC and PAC meetings and on the issues of the possible ratification of ILO Conventions (especially C.97 and C.189), although it has not developed ownership of the project. Foreign employment has recently come under the aegis of the Ministry of Labour and this has the potential to create a momentum.

5.7 Impact:

- *What level of influence is the project having on reduction of the decent work deficits for women and men migrant workers and their family members in NLMP and other areas of policies and practices at national and subnational levels?*

Overall, the major impact of the program is that it has contributed to review and implementation of the policy on labour migration, promoting safe migration and assisting institutional capacity building in such a way that safe labour migration has become a natural and integrated part of the social, economic and political context in Sri Lanka. It was clearly indicated by the migrant returnees belonging to pre-NLMP period that the struggle/hardship they had to undergo to return back when the employment conditions in the host country were intolerable, was significantly different from recent returnees who faced similar situations as they were informed prior to their departure about the procedures in case of eventualities and hence their return was better than the former group. They were briefed

and also provided with information package which spelt out the contact details of the Sri Lankan mission in the host country, according to the interviewed migrants this change bring them in a new stronger and safer situation.

- *Is the project contributing to expand the knowledge base and build evidence regarding the project outcomes and impacts?*

The capacity building of Labour Attaches and the institutionalization of this capacity building can be expected to have a long-term impact on the promotion of safe migration and by this contribute to the minimization of the decent work deficit. It should however be recalled that the mandate of the Las is limited as they cannot relate to employment and working conditions.

The return and reintegration of labour migrants has traditionally and also with the LM project been concentrated on returning migrants who are victims of abuse and exploitation or otherwise have not been successful and this work is of cause important and has a good impact for securing decent return to the community and the labour market.

It is the evaluation teams' well-founded expectation that the policies and practices developed, and the enhancement of the capacity building tools and capacities will – for the most part – continue to contribute to improving safe migration and minimize the decent work deficit for migrant women and men, well beyond the project's lifetime.

5.8 Cross-cutting issues:

- *What are so far the key achievements of the project on gender equality and women's empowerment?*

Concerning integrated gender equality, it was assessed that most stakeholders are aware of the importance of including gender mainstreaming in project implementation and are making efforts to have women included among the participants in workshops and training courses as well as securing that issues of specific concern for women is included in training and awareness raising activities. As indicated above, labour migration dominated by female migrants for a long period of time, and in recent years the concern has shifted to the reasons why the number of registered female migrants is decreasing so rapidly. Therefore, great attention has been continually focussed on gender issues in this area. A major issue of concern has been the FBR which effect women in particular. The LM project contributed through a background paper to the discussion at the highest governmental level of a possible withdraw of the FBR.

- *Has the use of resources on women's empowerment activities been sufficient to achieve the expected results?*

Gender issues have received substantial attention in the design, as well as during the entire implementation of the project. This can be partly explained by the fact that earlier a large majority of the yearly departures of migrant workers were female (on average around two-

thirds). The number of registered female migrants declined rapidly, to 50% in 2010 and then to 34% in 2015. As a result, concern has shifted to the reasons behind this trend and the role played in it by the various regulations (e.g. the FBR). There has also been a decline in remittances, as unskilled women tend to send home a larger percentage of their incomes than other migrants. Some stakeholders indicated that there should be more focus on gender issues, especially in the NLMP, because there were, for example, no solid recommendations on gender mainstreaming in its NAP.

- *To what extent is the M&E data supporting project decision making related to gender?*

The delays in the implementation had a negative impact on the use of the use of M&E data, as it especially in last eight months of the project was run against time to secure that as many as possible of the planned activities could be implemented often without looking very much back. The detailed data collection from the field was also challenged to a certain extend.

- *Has the project addressed other vulnerable groups, such as people living in poverty, youth and informally employed, if so which ones?*

The CSOs involved with community project activities are very much aware of the challenges the left back families are confronted with. Left back husbands are confronted with specific challenges when they have to be responsible for the household and take care of the children. A situation they are not prepared for and in many cases, it ends up in the husbands requesting the return of their wives. The CSOs are helping the families to prepare for this challenge.

The project has had a strong gender profile in all activities - female domestic workers, family background, re-integration, pre-departure training and others. The activities are in general aiming at empowering women both pre-departure and after return. Some informants even mentioned that the focus had been so much on women, that the male migrants maybe had been forgotten a little.

It should be noticed that the domestic workers' report, developed within the project, was not foreseen in the original PD but thanks to donor flexibility it was taken on board to promote the ratification of C189. The view of the GOSL is that they should ratify the C189 themselves before they raise the issue on domestic workers with governments in destination countries.

Concerning the other cross-cutting issues the attention paid by the project to the issues differs as explained below:

Non-discrimination: The GoSL decided to include migrant workers in its list of vulnerable groups, opening up access to a number of social benefits for this group. The ILO as a whole not limited to the current project contributed to the debate on social security and inclusion of vulnerable groups.

Promotion of international labour standards: The ratification of ILO Conventions on migrant workers (e.g. C97, C143 and C181) and on domestic workers (C189) is under discussion with the Ministry of Labour. Regarding C189, appropriate legislation is currently being developed and once it is endorsed, Sri Lanka might move towards ratification. The project contributed to the latter through the domestic workers report. When it comes to the ratification of the three “migration” conventions then the contribution comes from the sum of all the ILO interventions over the last 12 years, but also from analysis of the existing legislation and the gaps it has in relation to international labour standards.

Tripartite processes: The project worked very closely with a series of government organisations and, in particular, with the Ministry responsible for foreign employment and the SLBFE also worked, although to a lesser extent, with the Ministry of Labour, but there was much less involvement with the other tripartite partners. There is a clear feeling of ownership of the project activities on the side of the Ministry and of the Bureau, but not with employers organizations and trade unions.

Constituents’ capacity development received substantial attention at different levels, for example from the Ministry, through the ILO’s courses in Turin, from the SLBFE, and from Local Governments (e.g. FEDOs).

Compared to most other ILO projects, the involvement of the workers and employers’ organisations in project implementation was limited. The employers’ organisation, EFC, played a role in only a few selected activities.

Recruitment agents are well represented in the SLBFE Board (4 out of the 11 members). The ALFEA is not an employers’ organisation *per se*, as the members are mediators, whereas the real employers are located in the destination countries. The ALFEA is by far the biggest association of recruitment agents, with around 400 registered members (down from 700 at the start of the project) whereas an estimated 1,000 agents are registered at the SLBFE; however, many of them are no longer in active business.

The trade unions were only invited to meetings and workshops to provide their input. Generally, it must be noted, though, that TU-membership among labour migrants is very small. The capacity building of trade unions, concerning labour migration issues and how to incorporate that into their organisations work, could have been paid more attention. In Phase II safe migration sensitization sessions were conducted, but this was not followed-up in Phase III.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1 Conclusion

The Relevance of the Labour Migration project has been high. The objectives and outcomes of the project are very consistent with the beneficiaries’ requirements, as the project was intended

to support the implementation of the NLMP and the protection of the migrant workers and their families while overseas and upon their return.

Seen individually, the outputs were achievable, but considered in their totality quite ambitious, as large numbers of outputs (23) and activities (41) were identified in the Logframe.

The project was coherent with policy developments nationally and internationally and the design was valid even it did not open in full for the active involvement of all three constituents.

Several external factors delayed the achievement of outputs, such as the local elections of February 2018, and their aftermath, as well as a lack of coordination between ministries. The implementation was also challenged by structural changes at the ministerial level. Compared to many other ILO projects, the involvement of the workers and employers' organisations, in project's implementation, was limited.

The project has contributed well to meeting its Development Objective: "Promote effective implementation of the National Labour Migration Policy resulting in better protection of women and men migrant workers and their families increased development benefits". The evaluation finds that the complex of interventions both within the current phase and previous phases have been effective in promoting different parts of the NLMP. Experienced migrant workers report a clear improvement in the conditions under which migration took place 15 years compared to today's migration practises. This should prove that progress towards meeting the Development Objective is underway.

The Project Objective 1: "To improve the policy, legislative and regulatory frameworks and processes that govern labour migration to reflect and respond to current contextual situations and needs that further safeguarding the rights of women and men migrant workers and families" and its Outcome (each Objective had only one Outcome): "Governance and regulation of labour migration improved through enhanced policies and effective implementation of the National Labour Migration Policy" called for review of the legislative basis for labour migration policy. The project contributed actively to the review and the discussions during the review of the NLMP raised some issues that need further improvement ex. the issue of female migrants' access to regular migration.

With up-dated policy, a policy better in line with international labour standards, and the governance instruments in place efforts should be made to secure the implementation of the policy. It will be important to follow possible new trends in the migration and be open for additional reforms and adjustments as the migration patterns change.

Efforts to meet the project Objective 2: "To protect the rights of and empower women and migrant workers and their families" and its Outcome: "Rights of men and women migrant workers and their families protected through effective policy implementation" was very much concentrated on the support to the SLBFE and community CSOs. The SLBFE which plays a key role in securing safe migration has thanks to the project increased its capacity and have got instruments to further increase this capacity. In this connection it is extremely positive that the SLBFE is well funded and do have own resources to continue the initiatives started within the project.

The CSOs do a lot of efforts to support the communities and secure the linkage between the authorities and the migrant and their families. The evaluation was presented for some of the income generating activities initiated by the CSOs and it is questionable if these activities will give the participants a decent income. ILO could contribute to the financial empowerment of these communities making its employment generation expertise available for the CSOs and the communities.

The CoEC has been established, but its potential for protecting migrant workers against abuse and exploitation is still not used in full. There is a lack of cooperation/trust between the ALFEA and the Ministry/SLBFE and as long this is not re-established it will be difficult to mobilise the full potential of the CoEC. The membership of ALFEA has decreased significantly so that it today represents less than half the agencies. The implementation of the CoEC would benefit from having a well-organized sector with one or a few representative organisations representing the industry. The evaluation team did not find the justification for not making the application of the CoEC mandatory for all licensed agencies.

Project Objective 3:” To maximise the benefits of labour migration” and its Outcome: ”Benefits of labour migration optimized through improved coordination and practice” was less successful than other parts of the project. There might be a number of subjective and objective reasons for this. Firstly, was more attention paid to the legislative and policy development aspects of the project. Secondly are there some changes in the migration pattern that goes against the political intention of the GoCL. The policy is to increase the number of skilled migrant workers, however, over recent years has the number of departing skilled workers decreased by 50%, the reasons for this are surely multiple. The evaluation finds the project could have, using the strong expertise in the ILO on employment and skills development, advised the government in finding a way forward. Here also taking into account the importance of remittances to the national economy, it is the experience that skilled (male) workers are sending relatively less money back to their families than low-skilled (female) workers,

It is the evaluations view that the labour migration policy would benefit from being seen as a part of national employment strategy. This not at the least having in mind the challenges the Sri Lankan labour market is confronted with because of a large number of vacancies in the industry being filled with in-bound migrant workers.

Securing increased benefits for migrant families is important but the project did not pay very much attention to this. In the pre-departure training the migrants are learned how to transfer money to Sri Lanka but the families are not trained on how to spend and save money. The families would surely benefit from improved financial literacy, which could help them to establish a family budget and by that plan their spending and possible savings by doing so the families benefit from migration would increase.

Under project Objective 4: “To document and share experiences, best practices and lessons at national, regional and global level” and its Outcome: “Increased contribution to national, regional and global discourse on migrant workers” the project had a strong contribution to the government’s

effort to build up a regional and international profile, what it did with good success. Sri Lankan has taken prominent positions in international fora.

It was foreseen that the project should help to build up capacity in the government on the international relations but in practise the assistance was limited to providing inputs and talking points prior to international meetings.

There is a clear feeling of ownership of the project activities, from the Ministry, but no such feelings of ownership were observed among the employers and worker’s organisations. As the SLBFE was heavily involved in the implementation of the project, ownership here is also substantial. This applied much less to the Ministry of Labour, which was involved mainly through the NAC and PAC meetings.

At the national level the project contributed significantly to lifting migration related issues on the political agenda and in the society in general. This can have a positive impact on the policy implementation in the years to come.

6.2 Recommendations

Recommendation 1:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
ILO and constituents	High	Short-term	High

It is recommended to include both in-bound and out-bound migration in a comprehensive long-term employment strategy. Such a strategy should be developed, after a detailed study has been made of the benefits and the challenges of migration and the changes in employment structures for the country in general, and the employers and workers in particular. The strategy should be developed on the basis of tripartite consultations. There is a good momentum for developing this as both foreign employment and labour are under the same Ministry.

Recommendation 2:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
ILO	High	Short-term	Medium

The ILO should consider supporting an independent study of the new trends in labour migration, including the issue of women's undocumented migration. Based on this, together with the constituents, it should develop adequate initiatives.

Recommendation 3:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
SLBFE	Medium	Long-term	Low

SLBEF to institutionalise the training for licensed recruitment agencies (ethical recruitment) and also run periodic training programs for personnel in recruitment agencies, to update them about current issues in relation to LM. This should be followed by the establishment of correct monitoring mechanisms, to be put in place by the SLBFE to monitor the process of LM.

Recommendation 4:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
GoSL	Medium	Long-term	Low

The capacity of the LA's to validate employers should be increased to ensure that both living, employment and working conditions are in compliance with generally accepted standards.

Recommendation 5:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
ILO and GoSL	High	Short-term	High

The evaluation recommends to secure a maximum involvement of the industry in the further development of the CoEC. This is to ensure that it meets the needs of the industry and creates an ownership. The ILO's relevant projects should support this process and technical assistance be provided. The original idea of linking compliance to obtaining/renewal of licenses should be considered.

Recommendation 6:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
ILO and GoSL	High	Short-term	High

Sri Lanka should continue its active participation in the international fora post project. The ILO should secure continued technical support for the GoSL in their international activities.

Recommendation 7:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
Ministry	Medium	Long-term	Medium

The Ministry is recommended to review the training of FEDOs and to include more training on counselling on socio-psychological issues, as well as on financial literacy for the families receiving remittances.

Recommendation 8:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
SLBFE	Low	Long-term	Medium

It is suggested that the information booklet and other materials developed by the project should be distributed to all offices, as well as updated and re-printed at regular intervals. It should include more information on the return and re-integration aspects.

Recommendation 9:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
GoSL and ALFEA	Medium	Long-term	Low

The blacklisting of agencies, which are in non-compliance, will require strong legal procedures and principles and could have some negative consequences. However, a positive listing of those in compliance could have a positive impact on the agencies' behaviour. It is recommended jointly to establish such a positive list. This could eventually be linked to the Migrant Recruitment Advisor developed through the two other ILO projects, REFRAME and EQUIP.

Recommendation 10:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
GoSL and ILO	High	Long-term	High

It is recommended that skills' recognition and certification be institutionalised by the application of international standards. Market intelligence should be developed to identify the market needs and standards of receiving countries. Long- and short-term requirements should be identified. These initiatives should be seen as a part of a comprehensive national employment strategy.

Recommendation 11:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
ILO	Medium	Long-term	None

The ILO is recommended to strengthen its project budget monitoring system to ensure that there is a timely delivery, as per the implementation plan and also by implementing partners.

Recommendation 12:

Addressed to	Priority	Time frame	Resources
ILO	Medium	Long-term	None

The ILO should consider nominating a person from among the relevant project staff to be in charge of the LM Unit, to secure coordination and the institutionalisation of the Units' work, as per the concept note.

Appendix1 ToR - attached separately

Appendix 2 Lessons Learned and emerging good practise

ILO Lesson Learned Template	
<p>Project Title: Final Evaluation Promoting Decent Work through good governance, protection and empowerment of migrant workers: Ensuring the effective implementation of the Sri Lanka National Labour Migration Policy – Phase III</p> <p>Project TC/SYMBOL: LKA/15/02/CHE</p> <p>Name of Evaluator: Sten Toft Petersen (International Consultant), Rachel C. Perera (National Consultant)</p> <p>Date: February 2020</p> <p>The following lesson learned was identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson may be included in the full evaluation report.</p>	
LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	<p>A project advisory or steering committee is needed especially for complex projects.</p> <p>An important lesson learned from the LM policy project is that there is a need for a body to oversee and advise during project implementation. This to avoid that a project becomes personalized and to secure higher level of ownership among constituents and other stakeholders. The relevance and outcomes of a project will be strengthened when such a mechanism is in place.</p> <p>It is strongly recommended to have a steering committee that meets regularly; overseeing and advising the individual project to give political guidance and also contributing to creating a local ownership to the intervention.</p>
Context and any related preconditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the Project Document the establishment of a Project Advisory Committee was foreseen, this was later changed to a Programme Advisory Committee covering more projects.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Donor and ILO
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a danger that the project becomes personalized and focused too much on activities rather than outcomes if no advisory body is in place.

Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	- An advisory body can contribute to increase ownership among constituents.
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	- If the structure of the project management is changed during the lifetime of a project, it should be secured that advisory bodies are in place at any time.

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Final Evaluation Promoting Decent Work through good governance, protection and empowerment of migrant workers: Ensuring the effective implementation of the Sri Lanka National Labour Migration Policy – Phase III

Project TC/SYMBOL: LKA/15/02/CHE

Name of Evaluator: Sten Toft Petersen (International Consultant), Rachel C. Perera (National Consultant)

Date: February 2020

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

LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	<p>Securing maximum involvement of constituents on high profile labour market policy issues.</p> <p>Labour migration is an issue of objective interest for all three constituents. If involvement of constituents is not clearly spelled out in the project design and its management structure in such a way that it invite maximum participation from constituents, in accordance with normal ILO practises, there is a risk that it is not going to materialize.</p> <p>Having in mind the mandate of the ILO it is of the highest importance to secure the active involvement of all three constituents especially on such important labour market political issues as labour migration both out-bound and in-bound.</p>

Context and any related preconditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the Project Document involvement of the social partners was foreseen and in the MTE Report this was again recommended as high priority. The trade unions were not involved and the employers only to a very limited extend. The reason for this can be found in the fact that besides invitations to participate in meetings no activities were foreseen with the social partners in the project design. - Out-bound migration is seldom an issue of high priority of the social partners. Therefore, it is necessary to take additional steps to make them interested in the work of the project. In the current situation in Sri Lanka where there in certain sectors is a workforce deficit, which is covered by in-bound migration both employers and trade unions have an obvious interest in getting involved in labour migration issues. - It should be noted, that TU-membership among labour migrants is very small. The capacity building of trade unions, concerning labour migration issues and how to incorporate that into their organisations work, could have been paid more attention. In Phase II safe migration sensitization sessions were conducted, but this was not followed-up in Phase III.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ILO and constituents
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If an ILO project especially on such a high-profile issue as migration does not actively involve the social partners, the specific role and mandate of the ILO can be questioned.
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - History shows that the stronger involvement of the social partners in labour market policy the stronger and more sustainable are the outcomes and the impact.
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It must be secured that project design invite the social partners to active participation in the implementation.

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Final Evaluation Promoting Decent Work through good governance, protection and empowerment of migrant workers: Ensuring the effective implementation of the Sri Lanka National Labour Migration Policy – Phase III

Project TC/SYMBOL: LKA/15/02/CHE

Name of Evaluator: Sten Toft Petersen (International Consultant), Rachel C. Perera (National Consultant)

Date: February 2020

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

LL Element	Text
Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	<p>Labour migration in- and outbound should be seen as part of a broader employment strategy.</p> <p>The influence of labour migration on the Sri Lankan labour market is very high this becomes even more evident with the increasing regular and irregular inbound labour migration. The migration has both positive and negative impact, it is therefore important to make strategical choices to minimize the negative and maximize the positive impact. Inbound migration can be a sensitive issue especially for the workers side, their involvement in the policy development is therefore extraordinary important.</p>
Context and any related preconditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project did foresee to take initiatives to improve the regulations and practises in relation to in-bound labour migration these initiatives did however not materialize due to lack of time towards the end of the project.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GOSL
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The in-bound labour migration especially the irregular migration can create tense and even hostile relation between local work force and the arriving workers. - Sri Lankan trade union have been actively fighting against in-bound labour migration.

<p>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If labour migration is regulated in a way that is seen as fair by the national workers and their trade unions, then inbound migration can have positive outcomes.
<p>ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - N/A

ILO Emerging Good Practice Template

Project Title: Promoting Decent Work through good governance, protection and empowerment of migrant workers: Ensuring the effective implementation of the Sri Lanka National Labour Migration Policy – Phase III

Project TC/SYMBOL: LKA/15/02/CHE

Name of Evaluator: Sten Toft Petersen (Team Leader), Rachel C. Perera

Date: February 2020

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

GP Element	Text
<p>Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)</p>	<p><i>The original planned Project Advisory Committee was during the project lifetime changed to a Program Advisory Committee where the different projects being implemented by the same donor met with high ranking government officials for presentation of progress and discussion of way forward. This kind of umbrella meeting made it possible for the government to get a full picture of all interventions during one meeting instead of numerous separate meeting. As the government will be represented by high ranking officers, it opens the opportunity for the individual projects to present their work and ideas to a political level, they would normally not have access to, this again has the potential to increase impact of the achievements of outcomes. All stakeholders involved in the PAC discussion praised the format.</i></p>
<p>Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability</p>	<p><i>In the current case was the PAC limited to interventions funded by one donor. The effect would be even better if it covered all donors providing funding in a specific field of intervention.</i></p> <p><i>It should however be noted that the Program Advisory Committee in no way should replace a Project Advisory Committee/Steering Committee for the individual project. The committees closer to the project help to secure ownership among implementing staff and secure a stronger and timely delivery as well as the adjustment of the intervention during the project's lifetime based on the recommendations from the Programme Advisory Committee.</i></p>

Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	<i>This set-up allows for the government to get a quick overview over all projects and it provides a forum for implementing organizations to learn about other projects being implemented with support from the donor.</i>
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	<i>Minimizing overlapping and contributing to better coherence.</i>
Potential for replication and by whom	<i>There is clear potential for replication of this exchange set-up in other settings, it is especially relevant in countries where a number of donors are supporting projects in the same field of intervention.</i>
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	<i>This Good Practice (GP) is linked to ILO's Strategic Plan for 2018–21, in particular related to "Strengthening effective and efficient use of ILO resources.</i>
Other documents or relevant comments	<i>Technical Progress Reports (TPR)</i>

Appendix 3 Recommendations

Evaluation Criteria	Recommendations	Relevant Stakeholders (Recommendation made to whom)	Priority of importance	Time frame for the implementation	Resource implications to implement the recommendations
Relevance	1) It is recommended to include both in-bound and out-bound migration in a comprehensive long-term employment strategy. Such a strategy should be developed after a detailed study of the benefits and the challenges of migration and changes in employment structures for the country in general and the employers and workers in particular. A strategy should be developed on the basis of tri-partite consultations. There is a good momentum for developing this as both foreign employment and labour are under the same Ministry.	ILO and its constituents	High	Short-term	High
Coherence and validity	2) ILO should consider supporting an independent study of the new trends in labour migration including the issue of women's undocumented migration and based on this together with the constituents develop adequate initiatives.	ILO	High	Short-term	Medium
Effectiveness	3) SLBEF to institutionalize the training for recruitment agencies (ethical recruitment) and also run periodic training programs for personnel in recruitment agencies to update them about current issues in relation to LM. This to be followed by establishment of	SLBEF	Medium	Long Term	Low

Evaluation Criteria	Recommendations	Relevant Stakeholders (Recommendation made to whom)	Priority of importance	Time frame for the implementation	Resource implications to implement the recommendations
	proper monitoring mechanisms to be put in place by SLBFE to monitor the process of LM.				
	4) The capacity of LA's to validate employers should be increased to ensure that both living, employment and working conditions are in compliance with generally accepted standards.	GOSL	Medium	Long-term	Low
	5) The evaluation recommends to secure maximum involvement of the industry in the further development of the CoEC, this to secure that it meets the needs of the industry and to create an ownership. The relevant ILO projects should support this process and technical assistance be provided. The original idea of linking compliance to obtaining/renewal of licenses should be considered.	ILO and GOSL	High	Short-term	High
	6) Sri Lanka should continue its active participation in the international fora also post project. The ILO should secure continued technical support to the GOSL in their international activities.	ILO and GOSL	High	Short-term	High
	7) The Ministry is recommended to review the training of FEDOs and include more training on counselling on socio-psychological issue as well as on financial literacy also for families receiving remittances.	Ministry	Medium	Long-term	Medium

Evaluation Criteria	Recommendations	Relevant Stakeholders (Recommendation made to whom)	Priority of importance	Time frame for the implementation	Resource implications to implement the recommendations
	8) It is suggested that the information booklet and other material developed by the project should be distributed to all offices as well as updated and re-printed at regular intervals and to include more information on the return and re-integration aspect.	SLBFE	Low	Long-term	Medium
	9) A blacklisting of agencies which are in non-compliance will require strong legal procedures and principles and can have some negative consequences. A positive listing of those in compliance could however have a positive impact on the agencies' behaviour. It is recommended jointly to establish such a positive list. This could eventually be linked to the Migrant Recruitment Advisor developed through the two other ILO projects, REFRAME and EQUIP.	GOSL and ALFEA	Medium	Long-term	Low
	10) It is recommended that skills' recognition and certification be institutionalised by the application of international standards. Market intelligence should be developed to identify the market needs and standards of receiving countries. Long- and short-term requirements should be identified. These initiatives should be seen as a part of a comprehensive national employment strategy.	GOSL and ILO	High	Long-term	High

Evaluation Criteria	Recommendations	Relevant Stakeholders (Recommendation made to whom)	Priority of importance	Time frame for the implementation	Resource implications to implement the recommendations
Efficiency of Resource Use	11) The ILO is recommended to strengthen its project budget monitoring system to ensure that there is a timely delivery as per implementation plan also by implementing partners.	ILO	Medium	Long-term	None
Effectiveness of Management Arrangements	12) ILO should consider nominating a person in charge of the LM Unit to secure coordination and an institutionalising of the Units work as per the concept note.	ILO	Medium	Long-term	None

Appendix 4 Field Mission Schedule

FEBRUARY 10-19, 2020

Date & Time	Name/Designation & Institution	Venue of meeting & Contact details
February 10, 2020 (Monday)		
9.15 – 10.00am	Meeting with Ms. Simrin, Country Director/ILO	UN Compound Baudhaloka Mawatha, Col-7
10.15-11.15am	Meeting with Ms. Nayana Godamunne	ILO Conference room
11.15am- 12.45pm	Meeting with project staff of related ILO projects	ILO Conference room
1.30-4.00pm	Outcome Harvesting Workshop with key implementing partners	ILO Conference room
4.00pm	Ms. Padmini Ratnayake, Consultant (Labour Migration Policy)	ILO Conference room 0718398225
February 11, 2020 (Tuesday)		
9.30am	Mr. Sarat Dash, Chief of Mission of Sri Lanka & Maldives, IOM joined by Mr. Shantha Kulasekera & Ms. Amritha	9 th Floor, IBS Building 80A Elvitigala Mawatha Colombo - 8
12.00-1.00pm	Mr. Kanishka Weerasinghe, Director General, Employers Federation of Ceylon	386, J3 Old Kotte Road Rajagiriya 0773952701/0112867943
3.00pm – 4.30pm	Ms. Madhushika Lansakara, Senior Program Officer, Swiss Development Cooperation	Swiss Embassy 63, Gregory's Road Colombo-7
February 12, 2020 (Wednesday)		
10.00am- 11.15am	<u>Sri Lanka Bureau of Foreign Employment (SLBFE)</u> Mr. W.M.V. Wansekera, General Manager Mr. Mangala Randeniya, Dep. General Manager (Training) Mr. W. Leelarathne, Dep. General Manager (Social Development & Conciliation)	234, Denzil Kobbekaduwa Mawatha, Battaramulla (near CEA, Coconut Board) 0716833490/0112864110 0716833494/0112884771 0716866354/0112882229
12 noon- 1.00pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marimuthu, Vice President (Admin & Legal), Ceylon Workers Congress Mr. Leslie Devendra, General Secretary, Sri Lanka Nidahas Sevaka Sangamaya 	ILO Conference Room 0718527270/0112301358/0112574524 0777331053/0112866522
4.00pm	Dr. Ramanie Jayasundere, Director – Gender & Justice, The Asia Foundation	Bagatalle Road, Colombo-4 077514411/0112058702

February 13, 2020 (Thursday) – Field Visit – Gampaha District

2.30pm	Diriyaliya Migrant Group – Caritas Sri Lanka – Focus Group Discussion – 13 women (returnees & migrant worker family members)
5.00pm	Migrant worker society, Negombo – Caritas Sri Lanka – Focus Group Discussion – 9 women (returnees & migrant worker family members)

February 14, 2020 (Friday) – Field Visit – Kurunegala District

9.00am	Meeting with Foreign Employment Development Officers of Kurunegala Divisional Secretariat
10.30am	Meeting with Foreign Employment Development Officers of Mawathagama Divisional Secretariat
12.30pm	Ganewaththa Migrant Development circle – Focus Group Discussion – 16 women (returnees & migrant worker family members)

February 15, 2020 (Saturday)

10.00am	Mr. Selvaratnam, Assistant Secretary, Association of Licensed Foreign Employment Agencies (ALFEA)	44/6 Battaramulla Road Etul Kotte 0777533155/0112866522
---------	---	---

February 17, 2020 (Monday)

9.00-10.30am	Ms. Cloudia Paixao, Program Advisor, Helvitas	2/1 Layards Road Colombo 5 0761741515/0112504561
2.30pm	Ms. Yamuna Perera, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Labour Relations	34, Narahenpitiya Road Nawala 0773795825/0112330538

February 18, 2020 (Tuesday)

Meeting with Ms. Nayana Godamunne, NPC

February 19, 2020 (Wednesday)

9.30-11.30am	ILO Country office debriefing	ILO Conference room
1.30-3.30pm	External Stakeholder meeting	ILO Conference room

Appendix 5 LIST OF PEOPLE / ORGANIZATIONS MET

Government

Ministry of Labour, Foreign Employment & Skills Development

Ms. Yamuna Perera, Additional Secretary

Sri Lanka Bureau of Foreign Employment (SLBFE)

Mr. W.M.V. Wansekera, General Manager

Mr. Mangala Randeniya, Dep. General Manager (Training)

Mr. W. Leelarathne, Dep. General Manager (Social Development & Conciliation)

Swiss Development Cooperation

Mr. Benil Thavarasa, Regional Program Manager-Migration & Development, South & South East Asia

Ms. Madhushika Lansakara, Senior National Program Officer

International Labour Organization

Ms. Simrin Singh, Country Director

Ms. Nayana Godamunne, NPC

Mr. Kalaiventhan Sinnathamby, Project Assistant

Ms. Sharon Wijeyegoonawardena, Finance Assistant

Mr. Asitha Seneviratne, Program Assistant for CO-M&E

Ms. Thilini, NPC-EQUIP

Mr. Jesse Mertnes, Technical Officer-REFRAME

Ms. Padmini Ratnayake, Consultant (Labour Migration Policy)

International Organization for Migration

Mr. Sarat Dash, Chief of Mission

Mr. Shantha Kulasekera,

Ms. Amritha Muttiah – Project Coordinator

Trade Unions

Mr. Leslie Devendra, General Secretary-SL Nidahas Seveka Sangamaya

Mr. Annamalai Kathiresan, CWC

Helvetas

Ms. Cloudia Paixao, Program Advisor

Mr. Ajith Kaluarachchi, Project Officer-Training & Facilitation

The Asia Foundation

Dr. Ramanie Jayasundere, Director-Gender & Justice

Association of Licensed Foreign Employment Agencies (ALFEA)

Mr. Selvaratnam, Assistant Secretary

Employers Federation of Ceylon

Mr. Kanishka Weerasinghe, Director General

Field Visit

Gampaha District

Diriyaliya Migrant Group – Caritas Sri Lanka – Focus Group Discussion

Migrant worker society, Negombo – Caritas Sri Lanka – Focus Group Discussion

Ms. Enoka, Field Coordinator – Caritas Sri Lanka

Kurunegala District

Kurunegala Divisional Secretariat

Ms. P.M. Nadeesha Mihirani, Foreign Employment Development Officer

Ms. H.H.M Priyanka Wijesiri, Foreign Employment Development Officer

Ms. H.G.I. Udeni, Foreign Employment Development Officer

Ms. H.M.N.Y Herath, Foreign Employment Development Officer

Mawathagama Divisional Secretariat

Ms. T.G. Nimali, Foreign Employment Development Officer

Ms. R.P.S.K. Chandralatha, Foreign Employment Development Officer

Ms. A.D.A.G. Vijerathna, Foreign Employment Development Officer

Migrant Development Circle – Nelawa Grama Niladhari Division – Focus Group Discussion

Ms. Dharshika, Field Coordinator, CHRCD

Skype Calls

Ms. Swairee Rupasinghe, Former NPC – LM Project

Mr. Shabari Nair, Regional Migration Specialist – ILO New Delhi

Mr. Max Tunon, Technical Specialist, ILO Project Office, Doha (former Regional Migration Specialist ILO Delhi)

De-briefing Session – February 19, 2020

Mr. K. Nikarilkanth, Assistant Secretary - Ministry of Labour, Foreign Employment & Skills Development

Ms. Maheesha Nawamali, Development Officer-Ministry of Labour, Foreign Employment & Skills Development

Ms. Madhushika Lansakara, Senior National Program Officer - Swiss Development Cooperation

Dr. Ramanie Jayasundere, Director-Gender & Justice - The Asia Foundation

Ms. Cloudia Paixao, Program Advisor – Helvetas

Ms. Amritha Muttiah, Project Coordinator - International Organization for Migration

Mr. Dasun Kodithuwakku, Project Coordinator – Employers Federation of Ceylon

Mr. M. de Silva, Advisor – National Trade Union Federation

Mr. B. Skanthakumar, Senior Programme Officer – ILO

Mr. Kalaiventhan Sinnathamby, Project Assistant - ILO

Ms. Sharon Wijeyegoonawardena, Finance Assistant - ILO

Ms. Thilini, NPC, EQUIP-ILO

Mr. Jesse Mertnes, Technical Officer, REFRAME - ILO

Appendix 6 Documents reviewed

Project Documents

- Promoting decent work through good governance, protection and empowerment of migrant workers: Ensuring the effective implementation of the Sri Lanka National Labour Migration Policy – Phase I – September 2010
- Promoting decent work through good governance, protection and empowerment of migrant workers: Ensuring the effective implementation of the Sri Lanka National Labour Migration Policy – Phase II -
- Promoting decent work through good governance, protection and empowerment of migrant workers: Ensuring the effective implementation of the Sri Lanka National Labour Migration Policy –Upscaling & Consolidation - Phase III

Policy

- 2008 National Labour Migration Policy-Sri Lanka

Evaluation Reports

- End of Project Evaluation Report: Promoting Decent Work through Good Governance, Protection and Empowerment of Migrant Workers: Ensuring the Effective Implementation of the Sri Lanka National Labour Migration Policy – Phase I – March 2013
- End of Project Evaluation: Promoting Decent Work through Good Governance, Protection and Empowerment of Migrant Workers: Ensuring the Effective Implementation of the Sri Lanka National Labour Migration Policy - Phase II -
- Mid-Term Project Evaluation - Promoting Decent Work through good governance, protection and empowerment of migrant workers: Ensuring the effective implementation of the Sri Lanka National Labour Migration Policy – Phase III Final Report
- Independent Mid-Term Evaluation – Management Responses from ILO

TCPRs

- TCPR 1 - October 2016
- TCPR 2 – March 2017
- TCPR 3 - October 2017
- TCPR 4 - April 2018
- TCPR 5 - October 2018
- TCPR 6 - April 2019
- TCPR 7 – October 2019

IOM

- IOM’s Final Report to ILO - Promoting Ethical Conduct and Professionalizing the Recruitment Industry: Sri Lanka - July 2019

OTHER

- ILO LM Unit 2020 - Concept Note
- DWCP 2018-2021

Appendix 7 Results against Indicators

Objective	Performance Indicator	Baseline Information	Target	Final Evaluation Findings
Development Objective: Promote effective implementation of the National Labour Migration Policy resulting in better protection of women and men migrant workers and families increased development benefits.	Labour migration policies in place and implemented; laws and mechanisms revised and improved in line with the ILO-multilateral framework on labour migration; fair migration agenda implemented within national frameworks on decent work			The evaluation finds that the complex of interventions both within the current phase and previous phases have been effective in promoting different parts of the NLMP.
Immediate Objective 1: To improve the policy, legislative and regulatory frameworks and processes that govern labour migration in Sri Lanka to reflect and respond to current contextual situations and needs to further safeguarding the rights of women and men migrant workers and families				The project contributed actively to the review and the discussions during the review of the NLMP raised some issues that need further improvement ex. the issue of female migrants' access to regular migration.
Outcome 1: Governance and regulation of labour migration improved through enhanced policies and effective implementation of the NLMP.	Updated NLMP and related guidelines adopted. Revised legislation available. # of recommendations implemented # of complaints against licensed recruitment agencies			With up-dated policy, a policy better in line with international labour standards, and the governance instruments in place efforts should be made to secure the implementation of the policy.
1.1 National Labour Migration Policy and Action Plan which includes return and re-integration is revised and updated.	Revised NLMP available.	NLMP 2008	Updated NLMP	Policy implementation review completed. 9 background papers and 1 study completed. Draft policy focus areas, rationale and strategies identified. National policy held to finalize policy framework, core principles and operational guidelines. Policy framework vetted by expert group. Target met.
1.2 National Advisory Committee (NAC) meetings are held to ensure proper implementation and	Policy approved.	N/A	N/A	NAC history and background provided to Ministry. SLBFE briefed on NLMP review and updates.

monitoring of the NLMP and implementation of Institutional revisions under MFE.				
1.3 Final preparations are in place to ratify migration related Conventions by the GOSL.	Revised technical reports on ratification of C97, C143 and on C181 available.	Report prepared 2012	Technical reports supporting ratification of ILO Conventions related to labour migration	Mapping of gaps in existing legislation against the articles of the three Conventions. Review if the relevant sections of the ILO General Survey on migrant worker instruments. The project delivered what was expected.
1.4 Final consultations of SLBFE Act are completed prior to submission to the cabinet of ministers.	Draft revised Act available.	SLBFE Act (1985) with amendments	Cabinet approve revised legislation	Desk review of legislative recommendations for revision of the Act completed and shared with the Ministry and SLBFE. The LM project facilitated CSO consultations. Further action is out of the hand of the project.
1.5 Study on Domestic Workers to support ratification of C189 and policy formulation	# of recommendations implemented by SLBFE	N/A	N/A	Presentation of Report with recommendations and based on this a policy brief was prepared and disseminated. Further action is out of the hand of the project.
1.6 Policy Guidelines on reduced costs of recruitment and to operationalize them with recruitment agents are available at the MFE.	# of recommendations adopted	N/A	N/A	Efforts were invested in preparation, but the issue was not taken forward because of lack of capacity.
1.7 A Grading System for recruitment agents (RA) is developed and accepted by the MFE.	Grading system established.	Star grading system of SLBFE in 2015	Revised and ethical grading system in place.	Included in the SoP on implementing the CoEC developed by IOM. Target met.
1.8 SoP related to the CoEC for RA is developed and operationalized.	SoP for Recruitment Agents available.	Zero	SoP for implementing CoEC. Monitoring system for CoEC implementation. Standardized Curriculum for RAs. ToT manual.	The SoP has been developed and operationalized. Target met, but efforts still needed to secure implementation.
1.9 Capacities of the RA at national and district levels are enhanced to promote ethical and fair recruitment	Percentage of migrants who have sought services from the trained recruitment agents and are satisfied with the process.	N/A	N/A	326 recruitment agency staff have been trained and certified.

practices and processes in a migrant-friendly manner.	Percentage of recruitment agents who practice ethical and fair recruitment practices.			
Immediate Objective 2: To protect the rights of and empower women and men migrant workers and their families.				All implemented activities had the final goal of protecting the rights of and empower migrant workers. No measurable results are available.
Outcome 2: Rights of men and women migrant workers and their families protected through effective policy implementation.	Percentage of women and men migrant workers having access to information and services at local level.			The SLBFE which plays a key role in securing safe migration has thanks to the project increased its capacity and have got instruments to further increase this capacity.
2.1 Revised and enhanced safe migration information tools/packages are updated and accommodated in training curricular/ manual and in monitoring systems.	Revised and more practical migration information tool/package available.	Safe migration information packages of SLBFE, developed with ILO, safe migration tools developed by other SDC partners.	Safe labour migration trainer guides and trainee resource books available.	Trainings have been conducted in 13 regions. Helvetas has updated and published the training manual. These initiatives were well received in the migrant communities.
2.2 A monitoring system to assess delivery of information and services to women and men migrant workers and their families are developed and institutionalised.	# of key indicators reported to monitor Development Officers progress on service delivery. # of decisions made by the MFE based on reported indicators.	Zero	Monitoring system of FEDOs work at DS level and MW family database established	Database developed.
2.3 Special Mediation Boards (SMBs) for migrant workers are established and set in operation in 5 high migration districts	# of SMBs established. # of complaints in the five districts by sex. At the least 25 disputes handled by a SMB per quarter on average differentiated by sex	Zero	SMB established in Kurunegala. A minimum of 25 disputes of migrant workers or family members being addressed per quarter through SMB.	All preparations and trainings conducted, but SMB not operational.
2.4 Centralized Grievance Referral Mechanism operationalised.	Policy and management document of Central Grievance Referral System available. # Reports on complaints referrals and settlements by the Centralized Grievance Referral Mechanism.	Organizational schematic diagram on CGRS.	Quarterly reports on referral made by each institution and status.	It was found that it legally, practically and politically would be too complicated to establish a centralized system. It was decided to promote a decentralized system instead.

2.4.a Study on in-bound migrant workers.		Background paper for NLMP updating.	Study findings and recommendations available for policy formulation.	Was not foreseen in PD. Included and then dropped again because of lack of time for implementation.
2.5 Operational Manual for Labour Attaches made functional with chapters/guidance/checklist added on securing support of available migrant networks in destination countries and on selection of foreign recruiting agents and supporting return and reintegration.	# of reports submitted. # of cases resolved. # of recruiting agents assessed.	2. Edition of the Operation Manual (2013)	Updated Operational Manual for SL diplomatic missions launched.	All inputs expected from the LM project delivered. Implementation ready for take-off.
2.6 A Certificate Course on International Labour Migration Management - to DOs /is conducted by an institute designated by the MFE. (Output exist in 2 versions.)	Revised Course syllabi and study material available. # of courses conducted.			The course is offered by the NILS and BIDTI.
Immediate Objective 3: To maximise the benefits of labour migration				It is the evaluations view that the labour migration policy would benefit from being seen as a part of national employment strategy.
Outcome 3: Benefits of labour migration optimized through improved coordination and practice.	# of migrant friendly reintegration options readily accessible for returning women and men migrants along with reduced costs.			The project has in different ways contributed to better coordination. Recently the responsibility for labour migration was placed under the Ministry of Labour, this opens up for good options for increased coordination.
3.1 Priority areas under subsection of National Action Plan on Return and Reintegration (NAPRR) are identified and implemented on a basis of 02 per year by the MFE.	# of activities completed in each plan. # of beneficiaries served by employment category and sex. # of actions taken based on monitoring information	Zero	5 activities of reintegration support per year	Activities initiated in 5 districts.
3.2 Migrant workers and family members are included as a vulnerable group in line Ministry annual work plans and strategies and implemented for required results.	# of Ministries with migrant workers as target group in implementation plans. Resources including funds allocated to operationalise plans. # activities completed per sector.	Zero	At least 3 national action plans/sectoral plans identify MWs as a target group.	Migrant workers included in SGBV and GBV NAP in 2016 and in Youth Employment and Human Rights NAPs.
3.3 Guidelines to reduce remittance costs are developed and systems are promoted to encourage savings and investment from remittances.	# study findings available. Guidelines developed	Zero	At least 1 recommendation implemented to	Research conducted. DCS does not have resources for follow-up.

			reduce remittances cost.	
Immediate Objective 4: To document and share experiences, best practices and lessons at national, regional and global level				The project had a strong contribution to the government's effort to build up a regional and international profile on labour migration.
Outcome 4: Increased contribution to national, regional and global discourse on migrant workers.	Policy briefs, policy dialogue by GOSL at national, regional and global level increased.			It was foreseen that the project should help to build up capacity in the government on the international relations but in practise the assistance was limited to providing inputs and talking points prior to international meetings.
4.1 Contributions to national, regional and global discourse on migrant workers are increased.	# of policy briefs produced.	Zero	At the least 5 policy briefs published and disseminated.	5 policy briefs published of these two were targeted on readers in the region.
4.2 Capacity building and on-going support to monitor and report on Sustainable Development Goal Targets related to labour migration are organized for GOSL officers and CSOs	# Capacity building workshops. # GOSL reports to international fora.	Zero	At least 3 capacity building programmes for GOSL staff.	ILO provided technical support in identifying SDG target indicators but no capacity building as such was provided.
4.3 Capacity building workshops and on-going support as needed for timely periodic reporting required by international Conventions and Frameworks related to labour migration are organized for GOSL officials.	# Capacity building workshops. # of reports prepared.	N/A	N/A	No workshops conducted but three officials were supported for capacity building in the ITC.
4.4 Capacity building workshop and on-going support as needed to share policy implementation experiences in regional and international forums are organized for GOSL officers.	# Capacity building workshops. # of reports prepared.	N/A	N/A	On-going support and consultations were provided.
4.5 Partner Exchange Platforms, documentation of process and dissemination of experiences and lessons to influence policy and regulatory environment are shared.	# Partner Exchange Platforms # Partner Exchange Platform reports # Number of issues identified and acted with stakeholder collaboration.	Zero	1 issue advocated for at each PAC (?)	8 SDC PEP were conducted.

Annex I Overview of Stakeholder, Topics and Data Collection Methodologies

Social actors interviewed	Issues to be explored	Proposed activities
Migrant Workers	<p>Changes (outcomes) experienced related to the intervention e.g. with respect to working and employment conditions, or workers' own attitude, knowledge, skills, behaviour, relations to TUs, other workers or employers and agencies</p> <p>Relevance and contribution of the intervention to changes identified:</p> <p>Reasons to report on working conditions and salary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In what way has the situation for migrant workers changed over recent years ➤ What would it take to make the governments interventions even more relevant ➤ Barriers and drivers related to the context, migrant workers themselves or the intervention for using information provided through the project 	<p>Staff and partner workshop</p> <p>Desk review</p> <p>Focus group discussions with workers (women and men)</p>
Governmental Officials	<p>Changes (outcomes) experienced related to the intervention e.g. with respect to implementation of the NLMP.</p> <p>Relevance and contribution of the intervention to changes identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Reasons for engaging with the ILO project ➤ Experiences cooperating with the project and its partners ➤ Usefulness of tri-partite social dialogue in relation to labour migration ➤ Experiences engaging with migration agents ➤ Barriers and opportunities for engaging migrant workers, employers and agencies ➤ Role in follow-up on complaints ➤ Role in increasing migration 	<p>Staff and partner workshop</p> <p>Desk review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p> <p>Focus group discussions with trainees</p>

Trade Unions leaders	<p>Changes (outcomes) experienced related to the intervention e.g. with respect to implementation of the NLMP, or TU representatives' capabilities (attitude, knowledge, skills, relations) to handle migration related issues</p> <p>Relevance end efficiency of the intervention to changes identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Reasons to cooperate with ILO and the social partners on migration ➤ Relevance of the project to trade unions ➤ What would it take to make the capacity building and information provided even more relevant ➤ Barriers and drivers related to the context, workers themselves or the intervention for using information provided through 	<p>Staff and partner workshop</p> <p>Desk review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p>
Employers and their associations	<p>Changes (outcomes) experienced related to the intervention e.g. with respect to employers' attitude, knowledge, or relations to make use of skills availed through the intervention to promote fair migration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Relevance end efficiency of the intervention ➤ Reasons to cooperate with ILO ➤ Relevance of the project to employers ➤ What would it take to make the capacity building and information provided even more relevant ➤ Barriers and drivers related to the context, employers themselves or the intervention for using information provided through the project. 	<p>Staff/TWG workshop</p> <p>Desk review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p>
Migration agency representatives:	<p>Relevance or contribution of the intervention to changes observed with migration agencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ To what extent is the intervention known in the agency community ➤ In what way was the project relevant to agencies 	<p>Desk review</p> <p>Semi-structured interviews</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ What would it take to make it even more relevant for small as well as big agencies ➤ How did the initiative interact with the establishment of the CoEC 	Focus group discussions with trainees
Other stakeholders	<p>Relevance or contribution of the intervention to changes observed by other stakeholders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The projects contribution to improving working conditions ➤ Interaction with other stakeholders ➤ Improvements in conditions for labour migration 	Desk review Semi-structured interviews

Annex II Key Questions for final evaluation

Evaluation Questions	Indicator	Sources of Data	Method
Relevance			
1. Do the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries', global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change? Does it support the goals outlined in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (SDG target 8.8, SDG target 10.7), Programme & Budget outcome7 and Decent Work Country Programme (DWCP) outcome 3.3.?	Project referred to in official documents	Documents and informants	Desk review and interviews
2. Has the project been able to leverage the ILO contributions, through its comparative advantages (including tripartism, labour migration supporting return and reintegration, rights at work for migrant workers, ILO Decent Work Team etc.)?	Beneficiaries report that needs are met and social partners on their involvement	Beneficiaries and social partners	FGD and interviews
Coherence and strategy fit			
3. How well does the intervention fit with other interventions in the country, sector or institution? Is the project coherent with the Government objectives, National Development Frameworks, beneficiaries' needs?	Interaction with other stakeholders	Stakeholders	Interviews
4. How well does the project complement and fit with programmes and priorities of the constituents?	N/A	Constituents	Interviews
5. To what are synergies and interlinkages between the interventions and other interventions carried out by ILO Sri Lanka, Government and social partners in place?	The project is contributing regularly to other interventions and visa versa	TPRs, ILO staff and constituents	Desk review and interviews
Validity of design			
6. To what extent and how does the project strategy address the major root causes of the decent-work deficits of the migrant workers and their families identified for the target group?	N/A	Stakeholders	Desk review, FGDs and interviews

7. To what extent did the problem analysis identify its differential impact on women and men migrant workers and their family members?	Gender disaggregated data available	PD and partners	Desk review and interviews
8. To what extent the project is aligned to the National Labour Migration Policy for Sri Lanka?	Reference is made to the project during meetings on NLMP	Documents, constituents and PAC members	Desk review and interviews
9. To what extent is the project realistic (in terms of expected outputs, outcome and impact) given the proposed intervention logic, time and resources available and the social, economic and political environment?	Level of achievement of objectives	TPR, beneficiaries and partners	Desk review and interviews
10. To what extent has the project integrated ILO cross cutting themes (such as protection of labour migrants and their families, tripartism, and gender and no-discrimination) in the design?	N/A	PD, TPR and ILO staff	Desk review and interviews
11. Are the indicators of the achievements clearly defined, describing the changes to be brought about? Were the indicators designed and used in a manner that they enabled reporting on progress under specific SDG targets and indicators?	The indicator targets met and included in reporting on SDG	PD, TPR and relevant ILO reports	Desk review
12. To what extent does the elements presented in the points above have been articulated in a comprehensive and systemic Theory of change that can guide project implementation towards the project objectives	ToC in place and used in project management.	Project staff and partners	OH staff and partner work shop
Project effectiveness			
13. To what extent the project has been achieving the overall project outputs/objectives/outcomes, and to what extent has the project identified and address the identified factors affecting project implementation (positively and negatively).	Targets set out in the LFA met	TPR, project staff and partners	Desk review and OH workshop
14. Has the management and governance structure put in place worked strategically with all key stakeholders and partners in Sri Lanka, ILO and the donor to achieve project goals and objectives?	Partners and ILO feel an ownership to the project	Partners and ILO staff	Interviews

15. Has the knowledge sharing and communication strategy been effective in raising the profile of the project within the country and among the cooperating partners?	The project is generally known among stakeholders	Stakeholders	Interviews
16. To what extent is the monitoring and evaluation system results-based and to what extent is it being used to take management decisions?	N/A	TPR and project staff	Desk review and interviews
17. Assess how contextual and institutional risks and positive external to the project factors have been managed by the project management?	No delays in implementing the work plan	TPR and project staff	Desk review and interviews
Efficiency of resource use			
18. Have resources (financial, human, technical support, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve the project outputs and specially outcomes?	Resources sufficient and spend in full	Financial reports and TPR	Desk review
19. Were the project's activities and operationalization in line with the schedule of activities as defined by the work plan? If not, what are the factors that hinder timely delivery and what are the counter measures taken to achieve project outcomes and impact during the life of the project?	The project implemented timely and with good technical and political quality	TPR, project staff and PAC members	Desk review and interviews
20. To what extent did the project leverage resources to promote rights at work for women and men migrant workers, gender equality and non-discrimination	Adequate resources available	PD and financial reports	Desk review
Impact Orientation and sustainability			
21. What level of influence is the project having on reduction of the decent-work deficits for women and men migrant workers and their family members in NLMP and other areas of policies and practices at national and subnational levels?	Projects footprints are visible in policies and practices	Constituents	Interviews
22. Is the project contributing to expand the knowledge base and build evidence regarding the project outcomes and impacts?	Achievements of the project are used for learning by stakeholders	Stakeholders	Interviews
23. To which extent are the results of the intervention likely to have a long term, sustainable positive contribution to the DWCP Sri Lanka, and SDGs and relevant targets? (explicitly or implicitly)	Synergies with other projects established and achievement see follow up in other interventions	Constituents and other stakeholders	Interviews

Gender equality and non-discrimination			
24. What are so far the key achievements of the project on gender equality and women's empowerment?	N/A	Documents and women beneficiaries	Desk review, OH workshop, FGDs and interviews
25. Has the use of resources on women's empowerment activities been sufficient to achieve the expected results?	Empowered women report improvement	Women beneficiaries	Interviews and FGD
26. To what extent is the M&E data supporting project decision making related to gender?	All data are gender disaggregated	Documents and project staff	Desk review and interviews
27. Has the project addressed other vulnerable groups, such as people living in poverty, youth and informally employed, if so which ones?	N/A	Reports and stakeholders	Desk review and interviews

Annex III tools potential MW

Guide for Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with potential and returning migrant workers/trainees

Background information

- 1) Date of FGD _____
- 2) Region _____
- 3) Destination countries _____
- 4) Number of participants _____
- 4a) Union members: _____ Not Union members: _____
- 4b) Male _____ Female _____
- 5) Average age (estimate) _____
- 6) Month of latest training/information provided by the project _____

Relevance and contributions of the project

- Do you know the ILO project? Do you know the name of it?
- Do you know how you were selected for the training by the ILO project?
- What types of trainings and supports did you get from the project?
- What are major focuses of trainings and supports?
- Are the trainings and supports relevant?
- What are limitations of trainings and supports?
- What are main challenges of the migrant workers?
- Which challenges have been solved due to the project and which ones are not solved?
- Did the training/project address your gender specific needs?

Handout for participants in FGD

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
1. The training was useful/relevant.					
2. I am now aware of challenges that will meet me abroad.					
3. I feel more self-confident after the training.					
4. My salary has increased/will increase thanks to my increased awareness.					
5. The information/training I got inspired me to seek more information.					
6. I have used the information to raise a discussion with other migrant workers about employment and working conditions.					
7. After the trainings by the project, I have participated in discussions with other workers and agents about working conditions abroad.					

8. The project has stimulated a dialogue in media and among migrant workers about how working conditions can be improved.					
9. Did the training include how to handle their remittance (banking etc)?					
10. Did you encounter protection (abuse etc.) issues in your place of work?					
11. Was the Sri Lankan mission abroad helpful when you or your colleagues had issues?					

Annex IV tool Project team

Guide for Semi-structured interviews with:

Project management (ILO Country Director, NPC)

- What are/were motivations for the project set-up?
- Who are partners in the project? What are partner selection criteria?
- Was project design participatory and realistic?
- Has the project design clearly defined outcomes, outputs and performance indicators with baselines and targets?
- How relevant the project in terms of alignment with government priorities? ILO and UN priorities? Needs of beneficiaries?
- What are interactions/synergies between the ILO project and other government and NGOs initiatives?
- What are the underlying assumptions of the project? What are strengths and weaknesses of these assumptions?
- What previous experiences were used in designing and implementing the project?
- What are major **achievements** and **challenges/difficulties** faced of the project?
- What are mechanisms for monitoring and self-evaluation and key lessons learnt?

- How lessons learned and knowledge gained have been captured, compiled and shared?
- Are results of the project shared and used to facilitate scale up best practices (**scalability**)?
- **Crosscutting issues:** gender clearly indicated in the project document and did the project equally benefit female workers?
- How useful are the baseline and end line reports to assess the project effectiveness?
- Is there any strategy put in place to ensure sustainability of the results after the life of the project (**sustainability**)?

Annex V tool PAC

Guide for Semi-structured interviews with:

PAC members

- Was project design participatory, realistic and its implementation valid and timely?
- Has the design clearly defined outcomes, outputs and performance indicators with baselines and targets?
- Relevance of the project to the government development strategies, plans and policies at federal, regional and local levels? Is it relevant to the felt needs of the beneficiaries: migrant workers?
- Who are major beneficiaries of the project? How project beneficiaries were selected (beneficiary selection criteria)? Any potential appropriate beneficiaries left out from the project?
- What are major achievements of the project in terms of improving targeted policies, creating enabling environment (systems, people's attitudes, etc.), improving social dialogue and meeting other targeted outputs/outcomes at various levels?
- What are unintended/unexpected effects of the project (both positive and negative)?
- Have the available technical and financial resources been adequate to fulfil the project plans? If not, what other kind of resources may have been required?
- Assess if the management and governance arrangement of the project contributed to facilitate the project implementation
- Has the project created good relationship and cooperation with relevant national, regional and local level government authorities and other relevant stakeholders, including the development partners, to achieve the project results?

- Has the project received adequate administrative, technical and - if needed - policy support from the ILO office and specialists in the field?
- **Crosscutting issues:** gender clearly indicated in the project document and did the project equally benefit female workers?
- Do you think that the project outcomes/results are sustainable? Why?
- What foundations have the project laid in place in order to ensure sustainability?

Annex VI Tool GOV

Guide for Semi-structured interviews with:

National and Regional government officials/staff

- Why your office/bureau/institute has been engaged in the project?
- Was project design participatory, realistic and its implementation timely and valid?
- Who are project beneficiaries? How project beneficiaries were selected (beneficiary selection criteria)? Any potential/appropriate beneficiaries left out from the project? If yes, why?
- Relevance of the project to the government development strategies and objectives of your office? Is it relevant to felt needs of beneficiaries (migrant workers)?
- Has the project filled gaps in government offices/bureaus in terms of skills and resources at various levels?
- What are major achievements of the project in terms of improving targeted policies, creating enabling environment (systems, people's attitudes, etc.), improving social dialogue and meeting other targeted outputs/outcomes at federal and regional levels?
- What are the types of cases reported?
- Is there a reduction or increase in the number of cases?
- Are they cases/complaints recorded and analysed?
- Did the training help the officials to handle cases/complaints more efficiently?
- Has the training/awareness reduced the number of cases/reported cases on child abuse?
- What are unintended/unexpected effects of the project (both positive and negative)?
- What are barriers in your office/bureau (if any) that limited full utilization of resources, information and capacity provided by the project?
- Has the project received adequate administrative, technical and - if needed – policy support from the ILO office and specialists in the field?
- Do you think that the project outcomes/results are sustainable? Why?

- What foundations have the project laid in place in order to ensure sustainability?
- **Crosscutting issues:** gender clearly indicated in the project document and did the project equally benefit female workers?

Annex VII tool employers

Guide for Semi-structured interviews with:

Employers/Agencies

- What are reasons to join the project?
- How relevant the project is to the needs of employers and agencies in terms of improving labour migration?
- Has the project influenced your relations with clients?
- What are factors that may strengthen the relevance of the project and its activities?
- What are major challenges related to labour migration?
- What are key successes of the project in addressing the major challenges?
- What are impacts of the project on the beneficiaries?
- What are the protection elements institutionalized by the agencies after their training to safeguard the migrant workers serviced by them?
- How many complaints were reported during the years 2018/19.
- How did you handle the complaints?
- Did the training strengthen the case handling? Examples
- What are unintended/unexpected effects of the project (both positive and negative)?
- What are employers'/agencies barriers and drivers for using information and capacity provided through the project?
- How results of the project can be sustainable?
- **Crosscutting issues:** gender clearly indicated in the project document and did the project equally benefit female workers?

Annex VIII tool EOs

Guide for Semi-structured interviews with:

Employers' federations/associations

- Why did this employers' association join the project?
- What is relevance of the project to the needs of employers in terms of improving labor relations (increasing productivity, reducing absenteeism, motivating workers, increasing understanding of employers about rights of workers, etc.)?
- In what way has the project helped to increase the capacity of your organization?
- Has the project filled in skills and/or knowledge gaps in your organization?
- What are factors that may strengthen the relevance of the project and its activities?
- What are major challenges migrant workers are confronted with?
- What are key successes of the project in addressing the major challenges?
- What are impacts of the project on the beneficiaries (migrant workers)?
- What are unintended/unexpected effects of the project (both positive and negative)?
- What are employers' barriers and drivers for using information and capacity provided through the project?
- **Crosscutting issues:** gender clearly indicated in the project document and did the project equally benefit female workers?
- How results of the project can be made sustainable?

Annex IX tool TUs

Guide for Semi-structured interviews with:

Trade Union federations/confederations

- Why did your organization join the project?
- What is relevance of the project to the needs of workers in terms of improving working conditions (increasing wage, reducing conflicts, motivating workers, awareness creation among workers about their rights and responsibilities, etc.)?
- In what way has the project helped to increase the capacity of your organization?
- Has the project filled in skills and/or knowledge gaps in your organization?
- What are factors that may strengthen the relevance of the project and its activities?
- What are major challenges between agents, employers and employees?
- What are the major challenges migrant workers are confronted with?
- What are key successes of the project in addressing the major challenges?
- What are impacts of the project on the beneficiaries (migrant workers)?

- What are unintended/unexpected effects of the project (both positive and negative)?
- What are barriers and drivers for using information and capacity provided through the project?
- **Crosscutting issues:** gender clearly indicated in the project document and did the project equally benefit female workers?

Annex X tool Agent

Guide for Semi-structured interviews with:

Agents

- Why agents/agencies have engaged in the ILO project?
- How much the ILO project is known to the agency community?
- Is the project relevant to the agents? If yes, in which way? If no, why?
- So far, has the agent's community benefited from the project? What are the major benefits?
- Have outcomes of this project been noticed?
- How the benefits/results of the projects would be maximized and sustainable?
- **Crosscutting issues:** gender clearly indicated in the project document and did the project equally benefit female workers?

Annex XI tool for Implementing partners

Guide to semi-structured interviews with implementing partners

- Was the project set-up adequate and did it contribute to the success of the project?
- Was project design participatory and realistic?
- Were you informed about the projects overall outcomes, outputs and performance indicators?
- What are interactions/synergies between the ILO project and other projects implemented by your organization?
- Are you aware of the underlying assumptions of the project? What are strengths and weaknesses of these assumptions?
- What previous experiences did you use in implementing the project?
- What are major **achievements** and **challenges/difficulties** faced of the project?

- What are mechanisms for monitoring were put in place?
- Were lessons learned and knowledge gained discusses among partners?
- Are results of the project shared and used by other stakeholders to facilitate scale up best practices (**scalability**)?
- **Crosscutting issues:** gender clearly indicated in the project document and did the project equally benefit female workers?
- Is there any strategy put in place to ensure sustainability of the results after the life of the part of the project you was responsible for (**sustainability**)?