

Independent Evaluation Report

Mid Term Evaluation of Project on “Promoting Decent Work through Good Governance, Protection and Empowerment of Migrant Workers: Ensuring the Effective Implementation of the Sri Lanka National Labor Migration Policy (Phase II)”

Submitted to ILO Office/Colombo

By

Dr. A.J. Weeramunda - Independent Evaluator

October 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF ACRONYMS	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
1. BACKGROUND ON THE PROJECT AND ITS LOGIC	6
1.1. Project Planning	6
1.2. The Need for a Project	6
1.3. Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries	7
1.4. National Implementing Partners	8
1.5. Rationale and Justification for a Second Phase	8
2. REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION	9
2.1. Purpose and Scope of Evaluation	9
2.2. Evaluation Methodology	9
2.3. Evaluation Tools	10
2.4. Limitations	10
2.5. Method of Analysis	11
2.6. Achievement of Intended Outcomes by the Project	11
2.7. Steps Taken by the Project to Address the Important Gaps Identified in the Independent Evaluation of 2013	19
3. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS AS PER CORE EVALUATION CRITERIA	25
3.1. Relevance	25
3.2. Effectiveness	27
3.3. Efficiency	29
3.4. Sustainability	31
3.5. Project Expenditure	32
3.6. Overall Assessment of Project	32
4. CONCLUSIONS	34
4.1. Dissemination of Information on Safe Migration	34
4.2. Setting Up Special Mediation Boards	34
4.3. Project's Relevance	35
4.4. Effectiveness of the Project	35
4.5. Project Efficiency	36
4.6. Project Sustainability	37
5. RECOMMENDATIONS	39
6. LESSONS LEARNT	40
7. POSSIBLE FUTURE ACTIONS	40
8. ANNEXES	41

LIST OF ACRONYMS

ALFEA	Association of Licensed Foreign Employment Agents
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
CMS	Centralized Management System
CoEC	Code of Ethical Conduct
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CRPO	Child Rights Protection Officer
CWC	Ceylon Workers Congress
DO	Development Officer
DGM	Deputy General Manager
DMO	District Medical Officer
DS	Divisional Secretary
DSD	Divisional Secretariat Division
DWCP	Decent Work Country Programme
EFC	Employers' Federation of Ceylon
EDO	Economic Development Officer
FBR	Family Background Report
FHSO	Family Health Services Officer
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GN	Grama Niladhari
GND	Grama Niladhari Division
GCC	Gulf Cooperation Council
GCE	General Certificate of Education
IDB	Industrial Development Board
ILO	International Labour Organization

LJEWU	Lanka Jathika Estate Workers Union
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEA	Ministry of External Affairs
MFEPW	Ministry of Foreign Employment, Promotion and Welfare
MW	Migrant Worker
MWF	Migrant Workers Front
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NAC	National Advisory Committee
NCD	Non Communicable Disease
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
NLMPSL	National Labour Migration Policy for Sri Lanka
NPC	National Programme Coordinator
NTUF	National Trade Union Federation
NUSSL	National Union of Seafarers of Sri Lanka
OECD	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
OIC	Officer in Charge
OM	Operational Manual
PHI	Public Health Inspector
PHM	Public Health Midwife
PAC	Project Advisory Committee
PREDO	Plantation Rural Development Organization
SAH	Swiss Labour Assistance
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
SDO	Samurdhi Development Officer
SLBFE	Sri Lanka Bureau of Foreign Employment
SLEMA	Sri Lanka Employment Migration Act

SLNSS	Sri Lanka Nidhahas Sevaka Sangamaya
ToT	Training of Trainers
TUSL	Trade Union of Sri Lankan Airlines
UCWF	Up Country Workers Front
USD	United States Dollar
WDO	Women Development Officer
YSO	Youth Services Officer

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The mid-term evaluation of the technical cooperation project entitled “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” commenced in July 2014 when the TOR was advertised. Actual study activities were conducted in August, by which time, of the total project period of 30 calendar months commencing from 15th March 2013 and ending on 14th September 2015, 15 months were completed.

The Project works in close coordination with the Ministry of Foreign Employment, Promotion and Welfare (MFEPW) and its main implementing agency, namely, Sri Lanka Bureau of Foreign Employment (SLBFE), and other stakeholders including worker and employer organizations, non-governmental organizations, civil society bodies and research institutions. The Project is funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC).

The evaluation focused on 4 project outcomes as outlined in the PRODOC for Phase II and examined the extent to which its outputs and their associated activities were able to achieve the intended outcomes. Of the 4 outcomes, the Project has been able to achieve almost all activities under the first outcome, which was ensuring that Government and stakeholders have capacity to provide adequate information to migrants and families of migrants at decentralized levels. The Project did this by developing and disseminating a package of information on safe migration through ToT and sensitization programmes it conducted for government officers and representatives of civil society organizations purposively selected from several districts and regions in the Island. The programme logic states that the Project will build the capacity of government and respective stakeholders to provide adequate information when necessary. The Project has been able to reach more than 950 government officers who were direct beneficiaries of the above programmes. The activities that remain to be addressed are the development of the training curriculum for DOs and follow-up review sessions on the twenty safe migration sessions conducted at DS level.

The Project’s coverage of the remaining 3 outcomes, namely, strengthening grievance redress mechanisms through more ethical recruitment practices and anti trafficking measures, ensuring that stakeholders have capacity to promote reintegration measures, and enabling Sri Lankan government

officials and civil society actors to share experiences on the Sri Lankan model of migration governance in the region have so far been incomplete although it has launched several activities under each outcome. This appears to be chiefly due to procedural delays that require the Project to steer all activities through a series of consultations with all relevant stakeholders including government agencies, awaiting committee reports and adopting actions with the concurrence of the Project Advisory Committee.

The critically important activities that remain to be completed or are in the process of being completed by the Project are ensuring that training and capacity building programmes for duty bearers as detailed in component 1, 2 and 3 and experience sharing exercise at local, district, regional, national and international levels. The latter activity has to commence as early as possible so that lessons learnt could be put into practice during the remainder of Phase I. In addition, activities that remain to be completed are (a) ensuring accountability and enforcement in critical areas such as engaging the support of Sri Lankan missions in receiving countries to implement the Operational Manual it has developed during Phase I (b) implementing and finalizing the centralized grievance handling mechanism and (c) training conciliation and law enforcement officers in methods to counter anti-trafficking.

One of the chief lessons learnt from the Project experience is the usefulness of working through and with a tripartite constituency that brings in participation from ILO, the government and non-governmental stakeholders including trade unions and civil society organisations. Another is that it is easier to create and disseminate a product such as the information package on safe migration than creating changes in policy and the workings of organizations. A third relates to difficulties in conducting reintegration of returnee migrants due, on the one hand, to their heterogeneous nature and, on the other, to challenges such programmes have to face such as empowerment of female returnees and providing sources of credit for self-employment projects.

While the Project has sufficient time and funds to complete all required outputs, it has to work immediately with the concerned state agencies such as the MFEPW and SLBFE who are expected to take over and expand the activities that the Project has commenced. One such activity is to implement the tools and methodology for conducting outreach for government officers at decentralised levels and thereby provide awareness programmes and information services for promoting safe migration. While it is understood by Project management that relevant state agencies will take over the above functions, this study recommends that the taking over of critical project functions by state agencies should commence now itself and well before the Project comes to a conclusion by September of next year. Taking this proactive step would enable project management to provide the necessary backstopping as when required.

1. BACKGROUND ON THE PROJECT AND ITS LOGIC

This section provides a brief background of the Project and its logic including project planning, the need for a project, definitions of the terms “direct” and “indirect” beneficiaries, national implementing partners and the need for a further follow-up phase.

1.1. Project Planning

The ILO Colombo office has been supporting the Government of Sri Lanka to implement selected areas of the National Labour Migration Policy since December 2010. This was facilitated and supported by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation in Sri Lanka. The Project is planned and executed in two main phases, namely, Phase I, from December 2010 to March 2013 (this includes the no-cost extension period and is about 27 calendar months) and Phase II from 15th March 2013 to 14th September 2015 (30 months). While the total amount for funds provided by SDC for Phase I was USD 599,414, the amount for Phase II was USD 639,877. This evaluation which was conducted in July/August 2014 focuses on activities undertaken by the Project up to the mid-point of Phase II (15 months) of which 18 months have been nearly completed leaving a balance of 12 months for completion of project activities.

1.2. The Need for a Project

Sri Lanka’s migrant labour force continues to be a vibrant and vital part of its economy. In 2010 migrant workers contributed 4.1 billion USD to the national economy. Sri Lanka’s total migrant worker population of approximately 2 million people comprises approximately 60% females and 40% males. In the past two years, migrant workers continued to secure largely low skilled employment with 84% of the female migrant workers and 39% of the male workers being employed at that skill level, the former having found employment as housemaids principally in Middle East countries. One of the main developments in the migration process in the past few years is the increase in the number of male migrants with their numbers exceeding female migrants in 2010 and 2011 by a small margin (approximately 49% female worker departures against 51% male worker departures)¹. However, the demand from most Middle Eastern countries continues to be for low skilled female workers.

The above fact poses a tremendous challenge for responsible agencies as many females who migrate abroad for employment continue to come from socially and economically less privileged segments of the

¹ Annual Statistical Report (2012), Sri Lanka Bureau of Foreign Employment

local population characterized by social problems such as marital separation or discord, divorce, lack of economic support for mothers and indebtedness that are the main drivers of the process of out migration. The central paradox (if not the contradiction) in the above scenario is that a significant contribution to the nation's coffers comes from people who are vulnerable before they migrate for employment, while they are employed abroad and after they return permanently to the country. This places a heavy responsibility on all concerned partners to provide them with protection and empowerment which is also a main and perhaps the singular mission of the ILO.

The strategic areas of the 2nd phase of the project are improving government mechanisms to allow migrants and their families access to information and redressal at the local level, increased interaction between government and civil society organizations to address migrant worker issues and greater and wider sharing of successful project outcomes and outputs as well as lessons learnt through the project at local, regional and international levels.

1.3. Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries

For the purposes of this evaluation, the term “direct” beneficiaries as defined in the PRODIC will refer to government officials who have been targeted by the Project for programmes it has held to enhance and build on their capacities to implement project objectives. They include (a) Officers in Charge of District and Provincial level offices of the SLBFE (b) Development Officers (DOs) of the MFEPW who are attached to the Divisional Secretariat Offices of the country comprising about 1000 individuals spread out in nearly 18 out of the total of 21 districts, and other officers such as EDOs, SDOs and WDOs who function from DS offices and (c) Grama Niladharis (GNs) who form the grassroots level administrative units of the central government and who are in direct contact with people. The term, “indirect” beneficiaries will refer to the general public that includes the large number of females and males who are potential migrants, those leaving for overseas employment and migrant workers returning home after finishing their employment contracts.

1.4. National Implementing Partners

The Project has worked through ILO's tripartite constituency including Government institutions such as the MFEPW, the SLBFE and the Ministries of Labour and Labour Relations, External Affairs, and Justice, the Employers' Federation of Ceylon (EFC), the private sector including the Association of Licensed Foreign Employment Agents (ALFEA), the trade unions and civil society representatives and

Community Service Organisations (CSOs) who are partners of SDC. This is reflected for example, in having representation for these agencies in officially constituted supervisory and advisory boards such as the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) and National Advisory Committee (NAC). Ownership is further reiterated by printing the name of the SLBFE in all documents created by the Project thereby enable the SLBFE to continue to use the documents. While MFEPW and SLBFE have served as key institutions in the management and implementation of the Project, the administrative arrangement outlined above should continue after the Project comes to a close and thereby provide an assurance for its sustainability. As the PAC is project based, some of the key civil society organizations could be included in the NAC to support and monitor overall policy implementation beyond the project period.

1.5. Rationale and Justification for a Second Phase

This second phase of the project has built on ILO's experiences in supporting the MFEPW to take forward the actions stipulated in the National Labour Migration Policy (NLMP) for Sri Lanka. In this phase ILO is to ensure the strategic continuation of programmes and initiatives supported in the previous phase as well as work on new initiatives to further policy objectives.

2. REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION

This section will discuss the purpose and scope of evaluation, the method of analysis used and method of data collection and analysis, review of project implementation followed by a discussion of concrete steps taken by the Project to address the issues raised in the previous evaluation of Phase I² (see Annex 1).

2.1. Purpose and Scope of Evaluation

The main objectives of the evaluation are:

- a) To review the process of project implementation towards the achievement of short term and medium term outcomes as stated in the original project document and
- b) To identify constraints, failures, achievements and best practices and make recommendations to modify implementation strategies to be reflected in the second half of the Project³.

2.2. Evaluation Methodology

In order to achieve the evaluation's overall objective, the evaluator began the exercise by conducting a desk review followed by a series of consultations held with a variety of stakeholders. These were held with eight (08) categories of stakeholders, namely, (i) ILO (b) implementing agencies such as MFEPW and SLBFE (ii) key officers in MFEPW (iii) key officers in SLBFE (iv) donors (SDC), (v) trade unions (vi) the private sector represented by ALFEA and (vii) direct beneficiaries that included government and other stakeholders who had participated in ToT and sensitization programmes conducted by the Project and (viii) NGOs.

In addition, the evaluator conducted fieldwork and relied on interviews with direct beneficiaries from 3 project districts, namely, Puttalam, Kandy and Kurunegala, and included such government officers as DOs, EDOs, SDOs, GNs and FHSOs who were purposively selected for interview purposes by the project

² Zackariya, F. (2013), "Independent Evaluation Report", mimeo, ILO, Colombo

³ I wish to acknowledge the support given by several ILO staff members to conduct this study successfully, namely, Ms. Swairee Rupasinghe, National Programme Coordinator, Mr. Asitha Seneviratne, Programme Assistant, and Ms. Sharon Wijegoonawardena, Admin/Finance.

management. Altogether a fairly representative sample of 45 respondents was interviewed in order to obtain the diversity of views regarding the Project⁴. Their distribution is shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Distribution of the study sample by category, number and respondents			
#	Category	Number	Respondents
01	ILO	05	Country Director, Senior Programme Officer, National Programme Coordinator and Administrative Assistant/Finance
02	MFEPW	03	Secretary, Additional Secretary and Deputy Director
03	SLBFE	04	DGM/ Legal Section, DGM/Local Affairs, Manager/Reintegration and Sociology and Manager/SLBFE Provincial Office at Kurunegala
04	Donors (SDC)	02	Director of Cooperation and National Programme Manager
05	Trade Unions	01	Vice President, CWC
06	Private Sector	01	Immediate Past President of ALFEA
07	Direct Beneficiaries	27	17 DOs, 3 EDOs, 2 SDOs, 2 GNs and 3 FHSOs
08	NGOs	02	Project Manager, Helvetas and Programme Manager and M&E Manager, Swiss Development Assistance

2.3. Evaluation Tools

The evaluator used a set of open-ended questions in order to encourage respondents to express their views on the implementation and achievements of the Project (see Annex 2). These questions aimed at finding out to what extent the Project have achieved its intended outcomes at the time of evaluation.

2.4. Limitations

Limitations of the study were time constraints that only allowed purposive sampling of project districts and respondents and their accessibility and availability to attend scheduled interviews.

⁴ The evaluator obtained the support of Mr. B. Sampath, to participate in the process of evaluation and assist the conduct of Focus Group Discussions and used a small number of open-ended questions covering key project activities to guide the interviews.

2.5. Method of Analysis

The method of analysis will use the OECD core evaluation criteria, namely, relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Reference will also be made to other cross-cutting issues such as regional impact, poverty alleviation, labour standards, social dialogue, gender, etc.

The analysis will focus on the extent to which the Project has been able to achieve its 04 intended outcomes as specified in the PRODOC as follows:

2.6. Achievement of Intended Outcomes by the Project

As spelled out in the PRODOC, the Project set before itself the achievement of 4 principal outcomes. An analysis of the extent to which its outputs have measured up against the above targets is as follows.

Outcome 1: Government and stakeholders have capacity to provide adequate information to migrants and families of migrants at decentralized levels

The outputs of the Project to achieve the above outcome were:

:

1. A standard package of information developed on safe migration and informed decision making for migration for employment for low skilled female and male workers.
2. Training of Trainers (ToT) conducted for a group of 21 persons representing government (SLBFE), trade union and civil society organisations (men and women) on the information package and developing an agreed plan of action for monitoring information dissemination to the local level
3. Sensitization workshop conducted for SLBFE district level officers on the developed standard package of information.
4. Sensitizations for 120 government officials (men and women) working in 20 Divisional Secretary Divisions (DSD) on safe migration and service delivery.
5. Capacities of 600 Government officials at Grama Niladhari (GN) level developed to disseminate information on ethical recruitment and safe migration in 200 GNDs.

The Project has completed all of the above activities. However, some comments are in order regarding the activities which the Project carried out to achieve the above output.

a. Content of the Package of Information

The package of information covers a wide range of items that would be helpful for low skilled persons who intend to migrate for employment such as making preparations for leaving the country, and behaviours expected during travel by plane, during employment and after returning. Issues and concerns that would matter to prospective migrants are presented in the package realistically and with an understanding of ground realities that the migrant would face in all of the above situations. Good examples to that effect are questions he/she should ask before taking a decision to migrate, selecting a particular type of occupation, wage rates prevalent in popular destination countries, what to do before departure such as obtaining a Family Background Report, obtaining a work visa and undergoing pre-departure training programmes held by the SLBFE etc. The package of information is therefore a reliable source of ready reference to anyone should the need arise from a prospective indirect beneficiary. Interviews conducted with divisional level officers such as DOs have highlighted the effectiveness of the package when addressing the variety of queries raised by clients such as would-be migrant workers. The simple and straightforward style used in the script has enabled officers to use the material with ease.

Comment:

SDC partners have pointed out some revisions in the wording in the Tamil version of the document which is now being rectified.

b. Selection of Project Districts

Initially, the Project selected 4 districts, namely, Kandy, Kurunegala, Gampaha and Puttalam, to launch dissemination of the standard package of information as they were considered “high migration districts”, namely, Kandy, Kurunegala, Gampaha and Puttalam; the 5th district of Anuradhpura was selected on advice given by the PAC although there were several districts with higher rates of migration than Anuradhapura as shown in the statistics on migration supplied by the SLBFE for year 2012.⁵

c. Selection of Participants for ToT and Sensitization Programmes

In order to implement the actual information dissemination, the Project conducted ToT and awareness programmes at national level and sensitizations at district and DS/GN levels with the objective of reaching out to a wide a spectrum of beneficiaries.

⁵ Annual Statistical Report of Foreign Employment, 2012, Sri Lanka Bureau of Foreign Employment

National Level Programmes

The Training of Trainers (ToT) programme which was conducted at Kandy included 14 SLBFE Officers including regional managers from Kandy and Kurunegala districts, 2 OICs from the district centres of Jaffna and Galle, 1 Assistant Manager from the District Centre in Gampaha, 7 DOs attached to the DS offices at Chilaw, Nuwara Eliya, Batticaloa, Kalmunai, Kandy, Ampara, and Kurunegala, and 2 Administrative officers from the SLBFE headquarters in Colombo. Nomination of officers was done by the SLBFE. Although the Project specifically requested for OICs of the Districts or SLBFE Resource Centers closest to where the partners worked to ensure a good mix of staff, it was also not possible to have so many OICs out of their workplace for that long. Additional districts such as Nuwara Eliya, Batticaloa and Ampara were selected since in these districts SDC partners also worked while administrative officers from Colombo headquarters of SLBFE were selected for headquarter level coordination and exposure.

In addition, a sensitization session was held at Dambulla for 40 officers including 7 officers from SLBFE district centers and training centers and 32 DOs from the above SLBFE centers followed by a similar programme held in Galle for 10 SLBFE officers and 33 DOs from Sabaragamuwa and Southern Regions.

District Level Programmes

The Project held a total of 04 such programmes in each of the “high migration districts” of Kandy, Kurunegala, Puttalam, Gampaha and Anuradhapura for a total of 231 officers attached to a total of 21 DS Divisions from all of the above project districts. The selection of DS Divisions within districts was based on recommendations made by SLBFE officials; the Divisions were selected due to incidence of high migration levels within them.

Officers such as Samurdhi Managers, GNs, SDOs, WDOs, EDO, CRPOs, HRDOs, YSOs and SDOs were selected due to their strategic positioning within the government’s administrative system as dispensers of services to the general population. The Project assumption was that they were very likely to come into contact with its indirect beneficiaries, namely, labour migrants and their families, in the course of performing their administrative functions and would therefore be able to dispense information contained in the standard information package.

GN Level Programmes

Reaching down to the next lower rungs of the administrative system, the Project conducted a total of 20 sensitization programmes in 20 DS Divisions purposively selected from the 5 project districts. The programmes covered a total of 555 officers attached to the same number of DS offices including GNs, PHMs, EDOs, DMOs, and a sampling of the same types of SLBFE officers who participated in district level programmes.

In addition, the Project provided sensitization on safe migration to 13 representatives from NGOs from Gampaha, Kandy, Batticaloa, Colombo, Galle and Kegalle Districts and 20 representatives from trade unions such as NTUF, CWS, MWF, LJEWU, UCWF, SLNSS, NUSSL, and TUSLA thereby extending its outreach activities to include a wide spectrum of beneficiaries in addition to government stakeholders.

Except for DOs, all other officers attending the 5 day training programme served as resource persons. The DOs were the resource persons for the DS level programmes and helped coordinate GN level participants, select venues etc. and were fully engaged. Officers such as EDOs, FHSOs and GNs were expected to transfer their knowledge to local people.

Comment:

It is apparent from the foregoing description that the Project made a heavy investment in time and money to provide coverage for government officers at national, district and sub-district levels covering a wide spectrum of districts, divisional secretariat divisions, and stakeholders totaling nearly 1000. The availability of the information package on safe migration in both local languages (Sinhala and Tamil) is a noteworthy achievement since it ensures that this information could be transmitted to people in any part of the country. The Project assumed, however, that direct beneficiaries would eventually transmit the information they received to other officers at their own level or below them or to indirect beneficiaries of the Project. However, field interviews with direct beneficiaries indicate that this impact depended on the willingness and degree of commitment of the officers concerned, suggesting that the Project did not place sufficient emphasis on this responsibility. At the same time, the Project did not provide these officers with a method of reporting results of the training received for monitoring and evaluation purposes of the Project.

Outcome 2: Grievance redress mechanisms are strengthened through more ethical recruitment practices and anti trafficking measures

Outputs to achieve the above outcome were as follows:

- 1 A centralized grievance referral mechanism established through relevant government, civil society institutions, trade unions and employer organizations feeding in to the SLBFE's MIS
2. Training programmes conducted for SLBFE Conciliation Officers and Counseling Officers at national and district level on the referral system
3. An alternative dispute resolution forum established for migrant workers and their families in the form of Special Mediation Boards in 5 Districts and
4. A mechanism established to periodically monitor the implementation of the Operational Guidelines for diplomatic missions in labour receiving countries.

The Project has been able to complete some but not all activities required to achieve outputs as follows.

- a. Establish a centralized grievance referral mechanism through relevant government, civil society institutions, trade unions and employer organizations feeding into the SLBFE's MIS

The Project has facilitated the appointing of a sub-committee to guide this activity comprised of officers from SLBFE and has developed a work plan which includes (a) making a final list of complaint receiving points (b) developing and improving on a format for complaints recording and (c) getting each agency represented in the subcommittee to recommend how complaints can be streamlined within their organization and so ensure that the complaint reaches the SLBFE's CMS.

Activities remaining are (a) conducting a half day awareness programme on the existing CMS of SLBFE and how complaints from other agencies are registered with the CMS (b) enhancing capacity of DOs on SLBFE's new complaint referral mechanism and complaints handling (c) targeting GN/DS levels and (d) conducting sensitization sessions for police in high migration districts and relevant officers of other agencies. Once these data are entered into the SLBFE's CMS and analyzed, they will serve as an accurate indicator of the impact of Project interventions since, logically speaking, there should be significant increases in the number and nature of complaints received proportionate to the number of out-migrants from Sri Lanka in a given year.

- b. Establish an alternative dispute resolution forum for migrant workers and their families in the form of Special Mediation Boards in 5 Districts

The Project made a contract with the Asia Foundation in Colombo to carry out an initial assessment of prospects for an alternative dispute resolution forum. According to the draft report submitted by the contractor, it was the Ministry of Justice that proposed in 2010 the possibility of setting up Special Mediation Boards at district level as a means to provide a non-formal system of dispute resolution for migrant workers and their families. The Boards were also expected to handle disputes related to migration but of a personal or family nature as they do not come under the purview of the SLBFE's Conciliation Division.

Comment:

Contracting the feasibility for setting up alternative dispute resolution forums to the Asia Foundation was important for stakeholders and the Project to know what the ground situation was. The objective was to have a system even before an Appeals Board, proposed in the new Sri Lanka Employment Migration Act, came into existence. However, it needs to be noted that neither the new Act nor SLBFE's Conciliation Division cover personal or family issues, a policy gap that the Project has sought to address. Another observation is that whereas the new Act will make provision for an Appeals Board to serve the functions of Special Mediation Boards, such a Board will most likely be centrally located whereas the latter were to be positioned at the district level to start with thereby making it easier for those with complaints to access them instead of having to come to Colombo as they do at the moment. Furthermore, experience has shown that the greater the proximity of the dispute settlement medium to the place of origin of the complaint, the greater the likelihood that the complaint will be resolved with the comparative advantage going to the complainant who is usually the migrant or the relative of a migrant.

Recommendation:

Taking the above factors into consideration, the Project has to rigorously pursue its original policy plan to install dispute resolution systems to be situated at the district level even if the new Act installs an Appeals Board.

- c. Establish a mechanism to periodically monitor the implementation of the Operational Manual (OM) for diplomatic missions in labour receiving countries

The Project has reprinted the financial section of the OM which was developed during Phase I. Subsequently, the Project developed a feedback form for distribution to staff of Sri Lanka's foreign missions to obtain information on how the OM is being used, what problems they encounter in implementing it and their suggestions for improving it. It is recommended that the form be included in the

online system of the SLBFE for officers in missions to access and provide feedback periodically. Establishing the form online is recommended to limit paperwork.

Comment:

Developing and circulating a feedback form was an essential and important step taken by the Project to ensure that concerned officers will indicate to the SLBFE and to the Project that the OM is indeed being implemented.

Recommendations:

For ensuring that concerned officers in the Sri Lankan missions will complete the feedback form with the required information and submit it for reporting and monitoring purposes the Project cannot depend on the goodwill and dedication of those officers. The Project has to request the Secretary to the Ministry of External Affairs to give clear instructions to heads of Sri Lankan missions in labour receiving countries to ensure that the feedback forms be filled and returned to the Project on a monthly basis. If necessary, the Project may have to conduct an awareness programme for these officers on the importance of completing the feedback form to achieve the vision of the National Labour Migration Policy and its goal of providing safe and secure labour migration for Sri Lankans. However, ensuring that officers at the diplomatic missions will provide accurate feedback information on complaints they receive from migrant workers will require much more than what the Project can do within its mandate. For example, observers have pointed out the crucial role that can be played in this regard by watchdog groups such as unions or organizations formed among labor migrants in receiving countries that can pressure the missions to carry out their expected functions in respect of providing safety and security to migrant workers.

Outcome 3: Stakeholders have capacity to promote reintegration measures

In order to reach the above outcome, the Project has contracted with the Creators' Forum, an NGO, to undertake a detailed study on the lessons learnt and suggest recommendations based on the pilot reintegration projects in two districts, namely, Kurunegala and Ampara. The contractor has submitted a draft report that has highlighted the following:

- The approach and concept of the pilot
- The role of different agencies and stakeholders involved and their respective capacity to manage reintegration
- The diversity of the migrant returnees
- The different phases of labour migration

- The implementation time factor
- Involvement of other stakeholders
- The need for systematic recording of information on returnees for follow-up

Comment:

This was an independent review of the pilot projects on reintegration only. The contractor is still to finalize the findings which will be taken up in the lessons learnt on reintegration workshop to take place later on this year.

Outcome 4: Sri Lankan government officials and civil society actors share experiences on Sri Lankan model of migration governance

Expected project outputs include:

1. Periodic forums conducted between ILO and civil society organisations, and trade unions working on migrant worker issues
2. Periodic forums held between ILO and relevant Government stakeholders to share experiences and cross fertilize information obtained from ground experiences and
3. Development of policy briefs and visibility materials on policy coordination and implementation

The ILO developed the ToR for the partner exchange platforms and conducted the first thematic exchange forum on reintegration. Other SDC partners took up other subject areas such as the Rata Viruwo programme, access to justice and obtaining legal redress, pre-departure preparation that allowed sharing of information with SDC partners.

Comment:

According to one NGO partner, the exchange platforms have brought all local CSO partners of SDC together on a quarterly basis. However, it is also noted by the same source that the flow of information does not take place from below to the top, from action to policy level and that the SLBFE which is one of the main government actors has to know what the CSOs are saying at these platforms.

Recommendations:

The Project has to ensure the active participation of SLBFE and MFEPW in periodic forums of the future and thereby ensure that the information from these forums reaches policy levels. Ideally, experience

sharing exercises should commence before the second half of Phase II begins so that the conclusions derived from these forums and consultations can be put into practice during the remaining project period.

2.7.Steps taken by the Project taken to address the important gaps identified in the Independent Evaluation of 2013.

This section focuses on recommendations made in the Independent Evaluation Report on Phase I (given in italics) followed by comments made by this evaluator on what concrete steps the Project has taken to address them.

2.7.1. While awareness raising and increasing public visibility were integrated in the Project activities in the original proposal and work plan, it is recommended that these efforts are critical to link public awareness to educate government officers, migrant workers and their families. Parallel to this, setting a plan for monitoring mechanisms to track the process and its efficacy is equally important. [Short term]

Comment:

Raising public awareness was not an expected Project outcome of Phase II although some degree of awareness-raising could be expected indirectly through the Project's efforts to provide knowledge on safe migration to a segment of government officers operating at district and divisional levels. With regard to developing a monitoring mechanism for Phase II, the Project has adopted the following measures:

For each Safe Migration session:

- Pre and post session questionnaires
- Session Evaluation questionnaires

For Review sessions:

- Questionnaire for ToT group (SLBFE officers & SDC partners)
- Questionnaire for DS level Development Officers (DO's) and OIC - SLBFE
- Questionnaire for the other officers at DS level
- Questionnaire for the GN level Development Officers
- Questionnaire for other officers at GN level officers
- Questions for Individuals (For all 3 categories)

For database Purposes:

- National, District and DS level response database (qualitative)
- Stock (SM information packs) distribution database
- Database on participants/officers reached at each of the sessions

5 District level review sessions have taken place: 1 in each of the 5 project districts.

Currently, the Project has engaged the services of a database specialist to enter the monitoring data for evaluation and analysis purposes.

Comment:

It is noteworthy that the data that the Project obtains through the above sources are qualitative in nature and focus on impressions, opinions etc of project beneficiaries. What is required, however, is a record of what the beneficiaries have done and what results they have achieved by implementing the tasks expected of them in terms of numbers of clients benefited, gaps in implementation etc. Moreover, although the above database for monitoring purposes is being set up to suit the requirements of the ILO, in the view of a member of a CSO, what is really needed is for the Project to set up a M&E database with the SLBFE to monitor the work that CSOs do with DOs so that the M&E system will be owned by the MFEPW and the SLBFE. This is particularly necessary since CSOs do not have the authority to monitor the work of DOs on their own.

2.7.2. Training and capacity building of conciliation officers could also focus on social- gender analysis in problems handling so that they could approach complaints in an effective manner. Tamil Conciliation Officers should be recruited to handle complaints from Tamil speaking people. [Short term]

Comment:

Since further training and capacity building of conciliation officers has not been undertaken yet in the Phase 2, it is too early to say whether such training will include social-gender analysis. The recruitment of Tamil Conciliation Officers does not come under the Project brief and is a responsibility placed on the MFEPW.

2.7.3 Gender analysis, worker rights and focus on vulnerable communities could be further developed through enrichment- qualitative case studies [Long term]

Comment:

The safe migration database allows space for qualitative case studies through feedback the Project receives from DOs on the impacts of cascade training programs. The DOs have had contact with people who have come for advice and counselling and their responses are rated. The Project also receives qualitative data from reintegration project activities. The database will include qualitative case studies. Evaluations will continue till the end of June next year.

All the work done by the Project is linked to the rights of the migrant worker. The Project has encountered vulnerable communities through its work with PWAs, female headed households, and disabled returnees when establishing criteria for selecting beneficiaries of the reintegration project.

2.7.4. Monitoring has to be not only confined to collecting information but should include analysis of information to feed into improved implementation, performance and obtaining of results. The two way information process to the migrant workers from the agency/institution and vice versa has to be built in and part of the planning and designing. [Short term]

Comment:

The Project expects to undertake the above type of analysis once all monitoring data under Component 1 are fed into its database. Analysis of available information is being done in all components of the Project through baseline assessments, independent reviews etc.

2.7.5. Communication within PAC should be strengthened especially inter agency, as information flows on decisions made outside the PAC affects the Project related policy directions and identifying priorities. There should be increased strong representation of CSOs and Unions for more effective contribution through genuine equal partnership. Also within the PAC, there needs to be an up-scaling of their role for close Project monitoring, better communication and involvement on policy advice, directions and support effective advocacy. [Short term]

Comment:

The Project cannot control communication among stakeholders who are members of the PAC. All it can do is to make sure that all proceedings are sent to members after every meeting. Both soft and hard copies are circulated and meetings are held every three months. PAC members have an interest in project activities. NAC will continue after the project closes as it is specified in the national policy on migration. Both are created by the Ministry and a key stakeholder is the Secretary of MEA.

2.7.6. It would be better if future project programme designs incorporate specific qualitative process indicators [including gender issues] in order to maximize the project effects within the time frame. [Short term]

Comment:

The Project has not incorporated specific qualitative process indicators to address gender issues relating to delivery of project services in future project programme designs. These will primarily relate to (a)

recording complaints received at Sri Lankan foreign missions in labour receiving countries with specific reference to implementation of the Operational Manual and (b) recording complaints at all other complaint receiving stations under the Project plan to prepare an integrated database on complaints. In the above contexts, Project will have to develop an instrument to collect data on:

- Participants: by number, occupational status
- Queuing: waiting time and number waiting
- The locale where services are provided (e.g. rural, urban)
- Economic status and racial/ethnic background of those receiving services
- Quality of services received

2.7.7. It is strongly proposed that the ILO sustain the technical support beyond the current Project phase to address the immediate priorities, policy level issues and systemic - structural challenges that have been identified, and effective regulatory- monitoring mechanisms are established within a realistic time frame. [Short term]

Comment:

ILO will sustain the technical support during Phase II to address the immediate priorities, policy level issues and systemic structural challenges that have been identified and effective regulatory-monitoring mechanisms are established before the end of Phase II.

2.7.8. It is suggested that a Inter-Ministerial Coordinating Committee could be set up to address communication gaps, build effective relationships, ensure better information flows, and ensure open consultation and collective policy reflection. [Short term/Long term]

Comment:

Although an inter-ministerial coordinating committee does not exist within the Project management system at present, it is already in place in the form of the PAC.

2.7.9. The crucial factors and the main challenges are empowerment, access, and enforcement. Pilot testing of operational-grievance handling mechanisms should be conducted, with process monitoring of the value chain of migration to ensure the rights, protection and dignity of migrant workers at the micro, meso and macro levels. The desk reviews and the evaluation confirm this critical need of an Autonomous Body whether in the form of a 'Counseling unit' or an office of 'Ombudsman' which can be used as a stepping stone to document and study access to quality services. [Short term/Long term]

Comment:

The Project has not addressed the above gaps which can be considered as relevant to ensure its proper management if it is to realize its ultimate goals. The office of Ombudsman or autonomous counseling unit will not be necessary once the Project will set up Special Mediation Boards and that too till such time that the Government approves the Sri Lanka Employment Migration Act under which people will be able to take their complaints to an Appeals Board.

2.7.10. Availability of awareness raising booklets in both languages and especially the need for material in Tamil which addresses the needs of Tamil speaking workers has to be addressed urgently. To develop conciliation officers' skills, it is crucial to promote exchange of experiences, skills and knowledge of staff in different locations to open channels for feedback, documentation, learning and to build sound practices and procedures. [Short term/Long term]

Comment:

The Project has translated the standard information package on safe migration into Tamil and distributed about 400 copies of the same to government officers fluent in Tamil and working in areas with Tamil migrants. All other publications are also done in Tamil as per government regulation. However, exchange of experiences among conciliation officers and opening channels for feedback documentation and learning are matters that the Project will need to address during Phase II.

2.7.11. The Reintegration project must seek to empower women and build understanding of their social and economic position and condition. Migrant workers have to be approached in a holistic and inclusive way so that the migrant workers can be part of the planning process. It should be understood that financial support and entrepreneurship is only one entry and it will not automatically empower women [Short term]

Comment:

The issue of empowerment of returnee women migrants is yet to be addressed since the Project is still working towards formulating a sub policy on reintegration. However, it will need to address the issue of how this empowerment will take place and who will be entrusted with implementing it once the basic issues of financial support and entrepreneurship are addressed by the Project.

2.7.12. It is important that all training and capacity building programmes for duty bearers could be enhanced with gender-class analytical skills so that they have a clear gender-class orientation and strategy to address specific needs and vulnerabilities of women migrant workers throughout the chain of migration and understanding of empowerment. Gender qualitative indicators could be included in the process monitoring, in the Project design and the project cycle management. [Short term]

Comment:

The Project is to include the gender/class component in the proposed curriculum for DOs. The Project is yet to include gender qualitative indicators in the process monitoring system being developed by it at present.

2.7.13.To upscale the current institutionalising efforts with more focus on strengthening processes that are being currently established; by ensuring accountability and enforcement; and the ILO, MFEPW, SLFBE, ALFEA and partners extending their influence to effective programme delivery and advocacy at all levels. Local, district and provincial levels of activities should be undertaken in this regard, these should be measured and documented to allow prioritization of interventions and enhanced delivery services to the migrant workers. [Short term/Long term]

Comment:

The Project is yet to undertake the up-scaling of its current institutionalizing efforts although 4 exchange forums at the local level through SDC partners have taken place. There are distinct plans being prepared to conduct an international exchange forum on selected themes for international sharing before the Project expires.

3. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS AS PER CORE EVALUATION CRITERIA

This section presents the finding as per core evaluation criteria spelled out in the TOR (for an analysis of Project performance according to specific criteria please refer to annex to the TOR in Annex 1 of the Report). This is followed by a brief comment on project expenditure as against its activities both implemented so far and planned for the near future.

The core criteria for evaluation are focused on the following themes:

- Relevance
- Effectiveness
- Efficiency and
- Impact/sustainability.

Reference will also be made to other cross-cutting issues such as regional impact, poverty alleviation, labour standards, social dialogue, gender, etc.

3.1. Relevance

- Project outcomes relate to national development plans in several ways. The Project ties up with the Ministry of Labour's National Labour Migration, Decent Work and National Employment and Human Resources Policy that has components relevant to foreign employment and labour migration. Secondly, the Project very much takes into consideration the importance of addressing the needs of migrants from low socioeconomic levels particularly by making available a ready source of information that officials at decentralized levels in the country's administrative system could impart to their clients who came from such social backgrounds. The Project also took steps to promote the introduction of mediation boards that could take up personal and family complaints that were not addressed by the existing Conciliation Division of the SLBFE, the main state agency in charge of managing migration related matters.
- The project has direct relevance to the ILO's commitments to the Country Strategy (DWCP 2008-2012) as, "*Enhanced labour administration and promotion of equitable employment practices,*" and relates to the ILO International Instruments and Frameworks, CEDAW, and UN Convention

on Protection of Migrants' Rights to ensure labour standards, norms adhered to and its enforcement.

- The ILO country priority of poverty reduction and decent work is based on promoting social justice and internationally-recognized human and labour rights. Gender equity and HIV are cross cutting, while the core issues are 'creating jobs and income opportunities, guaranteeing rights at work', 'extending social protection and promoting social dialogue and tripartism. On the other hand, Sri Lanka has pledged in the Ten Year Development Plan (2005-2016) to ensure 'safe, skilled migration' as the basic strategy. Moreover, the National Policy for Decent Work [DWCP 2006-2016] is premised on promoting 'decent', 'just' and 'secure' employment for all citizens.
- Project activities also have relevance to strategic objectives of the ILO, and Sri Lanka DWCP outcomes include promotion of three priority outcomes, namely, enhanced access to more and better jobs in economically disadvantaged and crisis affected areas, enhanced labour administration and promotion of equitably employment practices and improved tripartite cooperation initiatives linking job security, productivity and competitiveness. In addition, the Project has mainstreamed the following cross-cutting themes: informal economy, gender equality, international labour standards and HIV/AIDS in the workplace.
- The Project was founded on promoting ILO's core values and strategic policies since its main emphasis was on protection of migrant workers, rights at work, providing a dignified workplace, working on contracts with focus on wages, health and other benefits, overtime pay and with workers rights to dignity, empowerment and information.
- The national partners, especially, appreciated the role of the ILO in sharing information, technical advice on migration issues and state obligations, revising draft legislation and operational guidelines, and capacity building.
- All the national and social partners were unanimous that the ILO intervention should be continued in providing strategic direction and advice, inputs on policy-action research, publications and strengthening legal-governing-regulatory-monitoring processes.
- ILO's technical knowhow has been gathered internationally since the organization is mandated to work on labour migration issues. ILO has specialists on mediation with skills on legal aspects.

ILO sends requests to its HQ legal division and gets their expertise; ILO has experience with tools in the region in Malaysia and Thailand through ILOs ASEAN triangle project. For example, documents ILO developed on its Vietnamese experience were used for developing Code of Conduct

- Institutional technical knowhow, regional experience was incorporated into the project; in house expertise such as program officers were also an important resource. For example, in the case of drawing expertise on reintegration, policy briefs on specific issues have been included in the project design. To develop the project on trafficking, ILO drew on experiences from other projects e.g. supporting HIV positive people. For development of materials, cross project collaboration within the ILO was obtained.

3.2. Effectiveness

- Project activities, outputs, outcomes and objectives in the project design are logically interrelated in the form of a log frame which spells out how the above elements fit with one another and with the overall objectives of the project. The PRODOC clearly mentions the background, the justification for each outcome, and the outputs and activities to be undertaken under each output.
- There was feedback from the relevant contextual analysis as it highlighted issues and concerns that were developed to frame the PRODOC. All project activities and outputs have been framed in such a way as to achieve the intended outcomes and objectives of the Project. All activities and outputs of the Project are also consistent with the intended impacts and effects although the Project presently has no objective system to measure these impacts and effect.
- Implementation arrangements with government agencies were effective. No areas required any changes except at the outset when it was planned to situate project implementation with the MFEPW under an officer of that ministry. However, this arrangement proved to be unworkable due to personality differences between the particular officer and ILO staff responsible for the execution of the Project. Hence, implementation was shifted from the relevant ministry to the ILO office in Colombo under an officer of the ILO, designated as National Programme Coordinator.
- The Project has continued to develop good working relationships with national implementing partners by adopting a clear and transparent strategy when dealing with the latter and thereby won their appreciation and confidence regarding ILO's capacity to assist relevant governmental and

non-governmental agencies. The printing and circulation of a large number of copies of the information package have been done using the management practice of calling for tenders and signing of contracts. Financial resources have also been used with minimum cost by conducting ToT trainings in meeting rooms in local government offices or restaurants rather than in 5 star hotels. This has also set a model when the concerned government agencies will expand Project modalities to reach larger numbers of beneficiaries in more districts than is being done at present.

- The Project' s engagement strategy was to work with MFEPW, the key government ministry mandated to manage and promote migration, and the SLBFE, the main state agency under the MFEPW that effectively deals with all administrative issues concerning migration.
- Demonstrable success achieved by the Project so far has been in establishing a mechanism to promote dialogue between government and non-government stakeholders including CSOs and NGOs and the private sector and in developing and disseminating a standard package of information on safe migration in a selected 6 districts considered as “high migration districts” among a large number of government officers and others working at decentralized levels with migrants and their families. Overall, about 40% of the project outcomes have been achieved. Delay in the last two months was due to delay in recruitment of a programme officer who will come on board from September this year to assist the National Programme Coordinator. This administrative step taken by the ILO will ensure that all remaining activities will be completed on schedule.
- Management capacities and arrangements put in place to support the achievement of results have included a labour migration team consisting of manager, programme assistant and finance and administration assistants who also has technical support from senior programme officer and guidance from the Director and support from regional and HQ labour migration specialists.. This team has been ably supported by the Project Advisory committee representing a variety of partners including labour unions, civil society organisations, and NGOs handling labour migration issues. Regular meetings with the participation of higher level partners including MFEPW, SLBFE and SDC have ensured that the Project not only has their support and approval but also ensured that all project activities are undertaken in a transparent manner.
- Phase II of the Project has been able to achieve almost all outputs connected with Component 1. Its main achievements in that regard are the development of standard information guide on safe

migration which was the main instrument for conducting ToT programmes with the project's direct beneficiaries. In addition, the Project has been able to commence work on the remaining activities by initiating dialogue and discourse among its implementing partners and thereby achieved a consensus on the direction that future interventions should take. Project activities under Component 1 have included a number of outreach programmes to build capacities of government officials and office bearers of CSOs who have benefited both from ToT programmes and sensitization sessions that will enable them to disseminate information to both direct and indirect beneficiaries. Project's effectiveness under Component 1 is also demonstrated in its ability to work with and establish linkages with a variety of partners at national, district and sub district levels including NGOs and CBOs through whom it has received information about the efficacy of its interventions at grassroots level. Furthermore, management capacities both in-house and at regional and international levels were mobilized to support the achievement of the above results.

- The major factors influencing the achievement of objectives to date are willingness of state and non state stakeholders to communicate with one another on the same forum, work toward achieving common objectives and be willing to take guidance from the ILO. The factors influencing non-achievement stem from the very nature of government bureaucracies such as the MFEPW and SLBFE who are major stakeholders and the need to follow procedures set by ministries including referral of any major activity to subcommittee and awaiting their reports all of which are time consuming.

3.3. Efficiency

- Each major area of intervention employs methodologies and approaches of technical support available in house with the ILO and, if not, ILO gets assistance from international or regional experts.
- The ILO has adequate monitoring of project implementation by ILO, where activities are sub-contracted to implementing partners since it has service contracts given to individual consultants and there is adequate monitoring of the outcomes via email and sharing of documents. And opportunities are given to stakeholders to comment on reports etc. so it is a collective activity.

- Project's current monitoring method is to rely on reports of important meeting including PAC and circulating minutes of all meetings to stakeholders. These reports focus on outputs of the Project or its products rather than its impacts. The Project has developed a database for feeding inputs obtained through questionnaires administered to its direct beneficiaries and this information which is both quantitative and qualitative will be available for future monitoring and evaluation activities. It is important for the Project to also assist SLBFE to create its own M&E framework to monitor the performance of its DOs.
- Intended beneficiaries including government officers at the divisional and local level are extremely satisfied with safe migration information packages and ToT programmes held by the Project.
- The Project has commenced to conduct district level evaluations for safe migration (05 evaluations, one per district); results are entered into a database. Comments from ToT Groups also go into the database.
- Activities were conducted in a cost-efficient manner. For example, ToT programs were held in meeting rooms in local restaurants and not in 5 star hotels. Furthermore, ILO has internal safeguards for service contracts, seminars, events, and all that has to be justified before any money is spent.
- In terms of timely achievement of outcomes, there have been delays in achieving outcomes that relate to making policy changes since the Project has to consult with tripartite stakeholders and this takes time.
- Outputs were implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives such as when the Project had to change the strategy taking guidance given by the government and other stakeholders but the outcomes have been achieved. The Project looked at alternatives and took other opinions into consideration which promotes ownership.
- Resources were allocated cost effectively such that there has been a lag in expenditure which is expected to pick up dramatically when the Project conducts exchange of ideas forum for local, district, regional, national and international levels.

3.4. Sustainability

- The Project has built national ownership by facilitating implementation at the national level through tripartite stakeholders. Documents go as SLBFE documents with ILO assistance. Benefits can be sustained since the Project shares benefits and procedures with all stakeholders.
- Benefits from the project can be sustained or replicated after the project period since it has adopted a strategy of ensuring that installing policy changes will be done according to the national plan of action.
- The project approach can be up-scaled and institutionalized by national partners and the project is implemented according to that modality. More impacts could be achieved by spreading the plan to cover other districts with the support of the SLBFE; also the training program planned for DOs will be implemented in such a way that they can apply that knowledge in another capacity or work elsewhere.
- The Project's key mechanism to ensure sustainability is the PAC which consists of representatives from both state and non state sectors. Continuity of the PAC will thus be the main guarantee of the Project's sustainability.
- The Project works at a policy level so that the strategies and formats it has developed can be adopted by relevant state agencies and continued after the Project. Every step of the way, the project has been designed to ensure this sustainability. Although the ILO staff had to maintain their independence and yet work with the SLBFE and there were personality differences between the two parties at the outset, they were rectified. Furthermore, for everything the Project does, it gets clearance from the SLBFE and they are proud of the documents that have been developed as they have been a partner in developing them.
- The Project has done a small but important part that indicates a clear path to be followed by concerned implementing agencies, chiefly, the SLBFE. However, the Project has to take additional steps to ensure that the SLBFE will take up the challenge of continuing and expanding on the work done by the Project.

- Activities undertaken so far during Phase II of the Project will undoubtedly contribute toward achievement of broader, long-term and sustainable development changes due to the Project focus on educating and creating awareness among both direct and indirect beneficiaries. The process has been institutionalized by educating officers of the state's administrative machinery who will be the future torch bearers of what the Project wants ultimately to communicate to the public at large. These achievements can be up-scaled once other state agencies emulate the methodology of the Project to conduct public education and awareness and other issues that the Project has addressed.

3.5. Project Expenditure

Project expenses have been less than 50% due to the non completion of planned tasks as per work plan by shifting major cost centres to 2015.

3.6. Overall Assessment of the Project

- Its highest achievement has been in respect of Outcome 1 (Government and stakeholders have capacity to provide adequate information to migrants and families of migrants at decentralized levels). The Project was able to develop a comprehensive package of information on safe migration and successfully tried out a strategy for disseminating this package among a large number of its direct beneficiaries who are government officers working at decentralized levels. Thus in respect of Outcome 1, the achievement could be regarded as 90% since there are still two activities that the Project has to complete in that respect, namely, finalizing training curriculum for Development Officers and conducting follow –up reviews of sensitization sessions conducted at the Divisional level.
- In regard to Outcome 2 (Grievance redress mechanisms are strengthened through more ethical recruitment practices and anti trafficking measures), achievement so far could be regarded as about 30% with several outputs remaining to be addressed, some partially, others totally. Thus, in respect of establishing a centralized grievance referral mechanism, the Project has to await the findings of the subcommittee appointed to report on the matter and take action accordingly. Training programmes conducted for SLBFE Conciliation Officers and Counseling Officers at national and district level on the referral system still remain to be formulated and implemented. With regard to establishing an alternative dispute resolution forum established for migrant workers and their families in the form of Special Mediation Boards in 5 Districts, the Project has only obtained the feasibility report of the consultant hired to do so. The Project expects the final word on this matter to be given once the

legislature passes the Sri Lanka Employment Emigration Act since the act will have provision for an Appeals Board. It is doubtful if the Appeals Board will be a suitable solution to the problem since it will likely be centrally located limiting access to complainants from outlying regions. Finally, the mechanism to periodically monitor the implementation of the Operational Guidelines for diplomatic missions in labour receiving countries does not appear to yield any substantial feedback to the Project.

- In regard to Outcomes 3 (stakeholders have capacity to conduct reintegration measures) , the Project has only made a start by having a consulting firm to conduct a review of the pilot projects on reintegration so that the level of achievement could be regarded as about 20%.
- In regard to Outcome 4, (Sri Lankan government officials and civil society actors share experiences on Sri Lankan model of migration governance) the Project's level of achievement could be regarded as 25% since it has held series of exchange forums at district level among project partners who are CSOs whereas in the areas of holding regional workshops on the Sri Lankan model of migration governance and preparing policy briefs, the Project has much more to achieve.
- In sum, while the Project has made significant advances in respect of one outcome, in the remaining 3 outcomes, the achievement is much lower leaving the Project with a heavy workload to be undertaken during the balance period of about a year. All project stakeholders including its chief administrative arm which is the PAC have to take cognizance of the overall low level of project achievement and commit themselves to see that all outcomes are achieved within a short time.

4. CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions of this evaluation are presented under main themes as follows.

4.1. Dissemination of Information on Safe Migration

- 4.1.1. The package of information covered a wide range of items that would be helpful for officers working at decentralized levels of the government's administrative system to transmit it to the Project's indirect beneficiaries. Issues and concerns that would matter to prospective migrants are presented in the package realistically and with an understanding of ground realities that the migrant would face in all of the above situations.
- 4.1.2. The safe migration information package is in the main languages of the country, namely, Sinhala and Tamil, so that it can be easily disseminated in all parts of the country
- 4.1.3. The ToT has had a positive impact on its participants who have taken steps to transmit the information to other officers following the cascade training method taught during training although it needs to be stated that this knowledge transfer did not take place uniformly in all project districts. This suggests that the Project did not give sufficient emphasis on the responsibility expected of trainees to extend their knowledge to others.
- 4.1.4. Sensitization programmes on safe migration were extensive and covered government and non-government personnel in 8 districts of the Island in addition to 5 project districts and benefited a total of nearly 1000 persons.

4.2. Setting Up Special Mediation Boards

- 4.2.1. Neither the new Act nor SLBFE's Conciliation Division covers personal or family issues, a policy gap that the Project has sought to address.
- 4.2.2. Whereas the new Act will make provision for an Appeals Board to serve the functions of Special Mediation Boards, such a Board will most likely be centrally located whereas the latter were to be positioned at the district level to start with thereby making it easier for those with complaints to access them instead of having to come to Colombo as they do at the moment.
- 4.2.3. Furthermore, experience has shown that the greater the proximity of the dispute settlement medium to the place of origin of the complaint, the greater the likelihood that the complaint will be resolved with the comparative advantage going to the complainant who is usually the migrant or the relative of a migrant. The present arrangement allows comparative advantage to recruitment agencies which are mostly located in Colombo.

4.3. Project's relevance:

- 4.3.1. The Project's relevance to national development plans is noteworthy since it ties up with the Ministry of Labour's National Labour Migration, Decent Work and National Employment and Human Resources Policy that has components relevant to foreign employment and labour migration. Secondly, the Project very much takes into consideration the importance of addressing the needs of migrants from low socioeconomic levels particularly. The Project also took steps to promote the introduction of mediation boards that could take up personal and family complaints that were not addressed by the existing Conciliation Division of the SLBFE, the main state agency in charge of managing migration related matters.
- 4.3.2. Project activities also have relevance to strategic objectives of the ILO, and Sri Lanka DWCP outcomes include promotion of three priority outcomes, namely, enhanced access to more and better jobs in economically disadvantaged and crisis affected areas, enhanced labour administration and promotion of equitably employment practices and improved tripartite cooperation initiatives linking job security, productivity and competitiveness.

4.4. Effectiveness of the Project

- 4.4.1. Project activities, outputs, outcomes and objectives in the project design are logically interrelated in the form of a log frame which spells out how the above elements fit with one another and with the overall objectives of the project.
- 4.4.2. There was feedback from the relevant the contextual analysis as it highlighted issues and concerns that were developed to frame the PRODOC. All project activities and outputs have been framed in such a way as to achieve the intended outcomes and objectives of the Project. All activities and outputs of the Project are also consistent with the intended impacts and effects although the Project presently has no objective system to measure these impacts and effect.
- 4.4.3. The Project has continued to develop good working relationships with national implementing partners by adopting a clear and transparent strategy when dealing with the latter and thereby won their appreciation and confidence regarding ILO's capacity to assist relevant governmental and non-governmental agencies..
- 4.4.4.1 The Project' s engagement strategy was to work with MFEPW, the key government ministry mandated to manage and promote migration, and the SLBFE, the main state agency under the MFEPW that effectively deals with all administrative issues concerning migration.

- 4.4.5. Demonstrable success achieved by the Project so far has been in establishing a mechanism to promote dialogue between government and non-government stakeholders including CSOs and NGOs and the private sector and in developing and disseminating a standard package of information on safe migration in a selected 6 districts. Overall, about 40% of the project outcomes have been achieved.
- 4.4.6. The major factors influencing the achievement of objectives to date are willingness of state and non state stakeholders to communicate with one another on the same forum, work toward achieving common objectives and be willing to take guidance from the ILO. The factors influencing non-achievement stem from the very nature of government bureaucracies such as the MFEPW and SLBFE who are major stakeholders and the need to follow procedures set by ministries including referral of any major activity to subcommittee and awaiting their reports all of which are time consuming.

4.5. Project Efficiency

- 4.5.1. Intended beneficiaries including government officers at the divisional and local level are extremely satisfied with safe migration information packages and ToT programmes held by the Project.
- 4.5.2. The Project has commenced to conduct district level evaluations for safe migration (05 evaluations, one per district); results are entered into a database. Comments from ToT Groups also go into the database.
- 4.5.3. Activities were conducted in a cost-efficient manner. Furthermore, ILO has internal safeguards for service contracts, seminars, events, and all that has to be justified before any money is spent.
- 4.5.4. In terms of timely achievement of outcomes, there have been delays in achieving outcomes that relate to making policy changes since the Project has to consult with tripartite stakeholders and this takes time.
- 4.5.5. Outputs were implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives such as when the Project had to change the strategy taking guidance given by the government and other stakeholders but the outcomes have been achieved. The Project looked at alternatives and took other opinions into consideration which promotes ownership.
- 4.5.6. Resources were allocated cost effectively such that there has been a lag in expenditure which is expected to pick up dramatically when the Project conducts exchange of ideas forum for local, district, regional, national and international levels.

4.6. Project Sustainability

- 4.6.1. The Project has built national ownership by facilitating implementation at the national level through tripartite stakeholders. Documents go as SLBFE documents with ILO assistance. Benefits can be sustained since the Project shares benefits and procedures with all stakeholders.
- 4.6.2. Benefits from the project can be sustained or replicated after the project period since it has adopted a strategy of ensuring that installing policy changes will be done according to the national plan of action.
- 4.6.3. The project approach can be up-scaled and institutionalized by national partners and the project is implemented according to that modality. More impacts could be achieved by spreading the plan to cover other districts with the support of the SLBFE; also the training program planned for DOs will be implemented in such a way that they can apply that knowledge in another capacity or work elsewhere.
- 4.6.4. The Project's key mechanism to ensure sustainability is the PAC which consists of representatives from both state and non state sectors. Continuity of the PAC will thus be the main guarantee of the Project's sustainability.
- 4.6.5. The Project works at a policy level so that the strategies and formats it has developed can be adopted by relevant state agencies and continued after the Project. Every step of the way, the project has been designed is to ensure this sustainability. Although the ILO staff had to maintain their independence and yet work with the SLBFE and there were personality differences between the two parties at the outset, they were rectified. Furthermore, for everything the Project does, it gets clearance from the SLBFE and they are proud of the documents that have been developed as they have been a partner in developing them.
- 4.6.6. The Project has done a small but important part that indicates a clear path to be followed by concerned implementing agencies, chiefly, the SLBFE. However, the Project has to take additional steps to ensure that the SLBFE will take up the challenge of continuing and expanding on the work done by the Project.
- 4.6.7. Activities undertaken so far during Phase II of the Project will undoubtedly contribute toward achievement of broader, long-term and sustainable development changes due to the Project focus on educating and creating awareness among both direct and indirect beneficiaries. The process has been institutionalized by educating officers of the state's administrative machinery who will be the future torch bearers of what the Project wants ultimately to communicate to the public at large. These achievements can be up-scaled

once other state agencies emulate the methodology of the Project to conduct public education and awareness and other issues that the Project has addressed.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations are as follows.

- 5.5. Taking the level of the Project's overall performance which is relatively low and incomplete, all Project stakeholders including the PAC have to commit themselves to ensuring that the Project completes all outputs in respect of all 4 components within the balance project period [To MFEPW and PAC, short term].
- 5.6. The Project has to request the Secretary to the Ministry of External Affairs to give clear instructions to heads of Sri Lankan missions in labour receiving countries to ensure that the feedback forms concerning the OM be filled and returned to the Project on a monthly basis. If necessary, the Project may have to conduct an awareness programme for these officers on the importance of completing the feedback form to achieve the vision of the National Labour Migration Policy and its goal of providing safe and secure labour migration for Sri Lankans.[To Project Management and Secretary, MEA; short term]
- 5.7. Project has to rigorously pursue its original policy plan to install dispute resolution systems to be situated at the district level even if the new Act installs an Appeals Board [To Project Management and Secretary/MFEPW, short term].
- 5.8. All training and capacity building programmes for duty bearers could be enhanced with gender-class analytical skills so that they have a clear gender-class orientation and strategy to address specific needs and vulnerabilities of women migrant workers throughout the chain of migration and understanding of empowerment. Gender qualitative indicators could be included in the process monitoring, in the Project design and the project cycle management.[To Project Management; medium term]
- 5.9. The Project should facilitate creation of a M&E system at the SLBFE especially to document and report on the progress achieved by DOs on the safe migration sensitizations and other activities on a monthly basis. [To Project Management; short term]
- 5.10. The Project has to collate and submit the proceedings of future periodic forums to the attention of SLBFE so that both sides could maximise the opportunity and to ensure that the forums produce strategic outcomes. [To SLBFE, short term]
- 5.11. Ideally, international and other experience sharing exercises should commence at least halfway of the second half of Phase II begins so that conclusions derived from these forums and consultations can be put into practice during the remaining project period. [To Project Management; medium term]

6. LESSONS LEARNT

The important lessons are as follows:

- 6.5. The Project has demonstrated the usefulness of working through and with a tripartite constituency that brings in participation from ILO, the government and non-governmental stakeholders including trade unions and civil society organisations.
- 6.6. The Project has created a breakthrough in opening lines of communication between MFEPW and CSO partners.
- 6.7. While achievement of the first outcome appears to have been relatively easy when compared with that of the remaining 3 outcomes, the difference may be due to the fact that the first outcome was essentially about producing a product as opposed to other outcomes that involve changes in existing policy and institutional arrangements at the SLBFE.
- 6.8. The Project has learnt that developing a reintegration sub policy is no easy task due on the one hand to their heterogeneous nature and on the other on the enormous nature of challenges such programmes have to face such as empowerment of female returnees and guaranteeing sources of credit to undertake self-employment projects. It is also not something that the MFEPW or SLBFE can carry out alone.

7. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Although the Project management assumes that state agencies such as MFEPW and SLBFE should and will take over implementation activities once the Project completes its designated time period, it should not wait till the end for this to happen. Rather, it can negotiate with these agencies to take over the most immediate and relevant implementation activities and strategies that have been tried and tested during the project period such as conducting awareness programmes for more officers at decentralized levels.

It is important that the takeover by state actors of some aspects of the Project occur while the project management is still there so that the latter can observe how effectively the takeover is taking place and provide backstopping where necessary. Such a takeover would involve identification of personnel at the MFEPW and SLBFE to handle the takeover function and a definition of their responsibilities and scope of work to be undertaken during the takeover period.

Ideally, the takeover team should be headed by a senior officer of the MFEPW with experience in public administration, with sufficient time at his/her disposal to carry out the implementing functions and with a willingness to work with project partners including CSOs and NGOs.

8. ANNEXES

The following annexes are attached to this report.

Annex 1: TOR

Annex 2: Data Collection Instruments Used

Annex 3: Final Work Schedule

Annex 4: List of Persons Interviewed

Annex 5: Photo Coverage

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE OF MID TERM EVALUATION

Title of 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 2 (LM Phase 2)
TC CODE	SRL/12/03/SDC
Administrative Unit	ILO Colombo
Technical Backstopping Unit	ILO Colombo
Type of Evaluation	Mid Term Internal Evaluation
Timing of Evaluation	6th August 2014 – 16th September 2014
Project budget	US\$ 639,877
Project duration	30 months (15 March 2013 – 15 September 2015)

1. INTRODUCTION AND RATIONAL FOR EVALUATION

This Mid-term project evaluation is in compliance with the ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation (2012). The internal evaluations are managed by ILO official who have no prior involvement in the projects and are conducted by external independent consultant(s). Key stakeholders, ILO constituents, partners and the donor will however be consulted throughout the evaluation process.

The Mid-term project evaluation of the LM Project is planned for July/August 2014, with the final report expected to be completed by 16th September 2014. The main purposes of this internal evaluation is for improving the programme performance. The evaluation findings will strengthen ILO's institutional support and would also provide valuable inputs to strengthening ILOs management capacity and would reflecting the changes which occurred in the operational and administrative environment since 2013.

The evaluation will be managed internally by one of the ILO officials. However, in order to maintain project accountability, an evaluator should be chosen that is free from responsibility for project management. The ILO Regional Evaluation Officer, who is based at ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP) will provide technical backstopping for the evaluation, if needed. The evaluation will comply with evaluation procedures and standards and follow ethical safeguards, all as specified in ILO's evaluation procedures.

2. BACKGROUND OF PROJECT AND CONTEXT

2.1. Contextual Background

The migrant labour force is considered a vital part of Sri Lanka's labour force, in terms of participation as well as contribution to the national economy. The Sri Lanka Bureau of Foreign Employment (SLBFE) estimates Sri Lanka's current migrant population to be 1.8 million. Each year, the number of migrants leaving the country increases. In the last five years approximately 200,000 people have left the shores of the country in search of work. Roughly 2.8% of the country's labour force migrates annually. The 2012 statistics of the SLBFE state that 'recorded sources of foreign exchange earnings show that remittances from Sri Lankans working abroad were Rs. 763,980 million in 2012, and it was 61.34 per cent of the total foreign exchange earnings of the country. Thus remittances contribute 8% of the GDP of the country. .

Sri Lanka's labour migration process has a number of pressing issues which demand attention. In terms of managing the labour migration process, Sri Lanka is making several efforts to ensure migration in dignity, security and equity for all Sri Lankan citizens. As a country of origin Sri Lanka's focus on labour migration is determined by the demands of the international labour market that has shaped the profile of the country's migrant labour force. Despite diverse initiatives, both by government and the non-governmental entities, Sri Lankan migrant workers face a multitude of obstacles at all stages of the migration process; pre-departure, in service and upon return and reintegration. Many of these issues stem from the skill profile of Sri Lanka's migrant work force where the majority of workers fall within the low skilled (termed unskilled in statistics) and housemaid/domestic worker categories.

There are a number of reasons for the exploitative and abusive situations faced by migrant workers. They are personal, regulatory and structural. The lack of skills of a majority of migrants that prevents getting higher paid jobs, inadequacies in training as well as the failure to learn from the training provided due to low levels of absorption capacity, education, social stresses and mind-set; the lack of comprehensive contracts and government to government agreements to safeguard and protect migrant workers, the lack of government led monitoring mechanisms in labour receiving countries that provide for proactive monitoring and protection mechanisms through diplomatic missions; lack of legal mechanisms for redresses, especially domestic workers are some reasons for these exploitations and abuses. Despite safeguards provided by the State, migrant workers, especially those in the low skilled category face numerous exploitative and abusive situations while overseas. These are documented and range from non-payment of salaries, early and forced termination without compensation, exploitative work conditions such as long hours of work, burden of work, lack of rest and leisure to abusive situations including verbal, physical, mental and sexual abuse and confiscation of travel documents.

2.2. Project Background

This proposed project is a continuation of the similar named project to support the government to effectively implement the national labour migration policy from 2010 till the 14th March 2013. The second phase of this project, running for a period of 30 months, focuses on ensuring local level government officials have the knowledge to share safe labour migration information with prospective migrant workers and their family members including returnees, mechanisms are in place to regulate the

recruitment agents, grievance handling mechanism is strengthened, alternate dispute resolution mechanisms are explored and set in place, a reintegration policy is formulated and government is supported in selected reintegration initiatives and local and international advocacy and experience sharing is facilitated.

The overall development objective 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”

2.3. Specific Objectives of the Project

1. To improve the access to information for migrant workers to ensure informed and safe migration.
2. To improve access to justice for women and men migrant workers and their families by strengthening grievance addressing mechanisms, ethical recruitment practices and anti-trafficking measures.
3. To support the effective reintegration of returnee migrant workers by formulating a reintegration sub-policy and addressing selected areas of the reintegration sub-policy to fulfil economic and psychosocial needs of primarily low skilled workers.
4. To share project outcomes at local, national, regional and international levels among all social partners.

The project contributes to:

1. Sri Lanka DWCP (2013 – 2017) outcome 3,
2. ILO OBW CPOs LKA105
3. UNDAF 2013-2017 Pillars 1 and 3

2.4. The Donor

The project is funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation in Sri Lanka. The Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) is Switzerland's International Cooperation Agency within the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (FDFA). SDC presence in Sri Lanka was established in 2003 with a Field Office in Jaffna and subsequently a Cooperation Office in Colombo. The Swiss cooperation strategy for Sri Lanka, the *Swiss Medium Term Programme* was jointly developed by SDC and the Human Security Division, under which Switzerland co-funds, implements and coordinates humanitarian and development projects and extends support to political dialogue and rule of law in partnership with International Agencies, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) and the Government.

SDC's Global Programme for Migration and Development supports improved governance of labour migration in several countries of origin of migrant workers.

2.5. Partners

The project gives high priority to working with ILO's tripartite constituency: government institutions namely the Ministry of Foreign Employment Promotion & Welfare, Sri Lanka Bureau of Foreign Employment (SLBFE) and the Ministry of Labour and Labour Relations, employers including the Employers' Federation of Ceylon (EFC) and Association of Licensed Foreign Employment Agents (ALFEA) and trade unions.

The Ministry of Foreign Employment Promotion & Welfare and SLBFE are the key institutions in the project management and implementation. The implementation of the project is carried out under the guidance of Tripartite Advisory committee also known as the Project Advisory Committee which meets every 3 months.

The project also involves civil society organizations and migrant associations in the various activities that are carried out and special attention is paid to women migrants.

The project also explores avenues for collaboration and aims to build partnerships with other development agencies to expand the scope of various project activities.

2.6. Project Implementation Strategy

The project is a 30 month initiative aimed at supporting the commitments and undertakings of the Sri Lanka National Labour Migration Policy. The overall objective of the project is to contribute to the sustainable economic and social development of Sri Lanka by promoting decent and productive employment opportunities for women and men while safeguarding the rights, freedoms, security and dignity of migrant workers and their families. The project is guided by the provisions of the National Policy which is based on the ILO Multilateral Framework, ILO and UN Conventions and takes into account Sri Lanka's National Policy on Decent Work. Gender equality issues and tripartite participation is treated as cross-cutting themes in the programme design and all project activities.

Implementation of the project is participatory and inclusive of all stakeholders to maximize ILOs strategic relationships to ensure a consultative and participatory implementation process that is owned by all stakeholders. Implementation is done in close consultation with all stakeholders, primarily with the tripartite constituents, to develop a common understanding of the approach and their respective roles in achieving the outcomes including sustainability of the initiatives.

2.7. Progress to Date (As at end May 2014)

ILO's work on improving the governance of labour migration since 2010 with support from the SDC, complements the extensive work carried out in previous years by the ILO on promoting the rights of migrant workers.

During the time period under evaluation March 2013-May 2014, the project has developed safe labour migration information packages (SM guides) in Sinhala, Tamil and English and Published same in Sinhala and Tamil. A training of Trainers programme was conducted to finalize the content of the SM guides and develop training capacities of SLBFE officers and Development officers in respective districts where the safe migration sessions were to be conducted. That is Kurunegala, Kandy, Gampaha, Puttlam and Anuradhapura. As SDC partners were also conducting a component on safe migration their staff and SLBFE officers in the areas they were to cover were also included in the ToT. A total of 14 officers trained.

Safe Migration sessions were also conducted for SLBFE officers covering all remaining districts (83), DS level officers involved in migration information dissemination (134) and local level officers from 18 out of 20 DS Divisions in selected project districts (479).

The safe migration info package has also been reviewed and revised and is currently being reprinted. As extensive review programme has also been developed to measure the impact of the safe migration sessions among the national, district and local level officers. A brief questionnaire on the use and effectiveness of the Operational Manual for SL Diplomatic Missions in destinations countries has also been developed and discussions are underway on how it will be administered.

A Code of Ethical Conduct for licensed recruitment agents and licensees was published and launched in December 2013, with easy to understand guides for prospective migrant workers being developed. A Sub-committee has been set up for centralizing the grievance redress mechanism and the complaint form was reviewed and a work plan was developed for implementation by the SLBFE with ILO providing support. A report was developed on the possibilities of setting up Special Mediation Boards for settlement of migrant worker disputes by The Asia Foundation and further discussions are underway to review the legal implications for the SLBFE.

The pilot reintegration project was reviewed by an independent group and findings and recommendations were presented to relevant officials of the MFEPW and SLBFE for consideration. The recommendations and suggestions have been forwarded to the sub-committee on reintegration under the National Advisory Committee on Labour Migration for further follow-up action with the support of the project.

The project has supported the development of a Terms of Reference for the SDC partner exchange platform and conducted the 2nd of the partner exchange forums. The Project has contributed positively towards exchange platforms hosted by other SDC partners. ILO's profile in terms of regional and international processes has improved with the involvement in the 5th Senior Officials Meeting of the Colombo Process, which Sri Lanka is currently chairing. The Project has also supported the Secretary, MFEPW to prepare for his statement at the 7th Global Forum for Migration and Development (GFMD) held in Sweden on the 14-16th May 2014.

2.8. Management Arrangements

At national level, The Director of the ILO Colombo office is responsible for the overall implementation of the project. The ILO serves as the lead agency assisting the Government of Sri Lanka, in particular the Ministry of Foreign Employment Promotion and Welfare and the SLBFE, in its execution and implementation.

The project is managed by a National Project Coordinator (NPC) under the guidance of the Senior Programme Manager of the ILO Country office. The NPC is supported by a Programme Assistant and an Finance & Administrative Assistant.

The project is guided at National level by the Project Advisory Committee chaired by the Secretary, MFEPW and consisting of ILOs social partners and key stakeholders in Labour Migration to provide guidance for the project and has a pre-approved Terms of Reference. The work of the project is also discussed at the National Advisory Committee on Labour Migration.

At the regional and international level, the project also draws upon the expertise on standards, employment, gender equality, skills, social protection and social dialogue based in ILOs headquarters in Geneva, Regional Office in Asia and the Pacific, and in the Sub-Regional Office for South Asia in New Delhi, India. Technical backstopping for the project is provided by the Senior Migration Specialist based in the Regional Office for the Asia and the Pacific (ROAP) and MIGRANT through their Asia desk officer. The project had access to various ILO technical resources including manuals on labour migration, migrant worker standards and protection of men and women migrant workers and publications and research materials from ILO's past and on-going projects on migration. The project continues to draw on the experience, and lessons learnt in several technical cooperation projects implemented in the Asia region.

2.9. Participation of Employers' and Workers' and Civil society Organizations

The project cooperates with the national networks of trade unions, migrant associations, CSOs and NGOs working to protect the rights of migrant workers.

The tripartite constituents are invited to participate in committees responsible for formulating social protection and welfare policy improvements programmes for migrants and their families.

3. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

3.1. Purpose:

The main purposes of internal evaluation are to improve programme performance.

- Review the process of project implementation towards long-term and medium-term outcomes as stated in the original project document.

- Identify constraints, failures, achievements and best practices and make recommendations to modify implementation strategies to be reflected in the second half of the LM project.
- The primary user of the evaluation will be the ILO Project Team, Technical and Administrative backstopping units.
- The evaluation findings will be available for other secondary users, as required.

4. EVALUATION SCOPE

The scope of the evaluation is to verify project progress from date of implementation, **15th March 2013 up to 30th June 2014** and identify constraints, failures, achievements and best practices and make recommendations to modify implementation strategies to be reflected in the second half of the LM project.

For the purpose of internal evaluation, the questions should consider OECD/DAC core evaluation criteria (e.g. relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and/or sustainability) against the intervention which will be assessed. Reference should also be included, when relevant, to other cross-cutting issues such as regional impact, poverty alleviation, labour standards, social dialogue, gender, etc. Evaluation questions should address:

Relevance: Relevance relates to the extent that objectives of the project are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, and relevant to country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies. Also, relevance relates to whether the project results or approach are strategic and include the comparative advantage of the ILO;

Effectiveness: Evaluation questions on effectiveness should be aimed at the extent to which the intervention's immediate objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. In addition, effectiveness questions might measure the extent to which management capacities and arrangements supported the achievement of results;

Efficiency: Efficiency questions are aimed at measuring how well resources and inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are economically converted to results.

Sustainability: This is related to an analysis of the project's contribution to broader, long-term, sustainable development changes. Evaluation questions of this nature aim to assess the likelihood that the results of the intervention are durable and can be maintained or even scaled up and replicated by intervention partners after major assistance has been completed.

Impact: Impact examines the positive and negative changes from an intervention, directly or indirectly intended or unintended. It attempts to measure how much difference we make. Impact expands the focus to the longer-term and wider-reaching consequences of achieving or not achieving intended outcomes

5. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The main program components to be assessed, and the related assessment criteria, issues and evaluation questions are summarized below.

No.	Criteria	Specific Information
1	Relevant and strategic fit of the intervention ILO Country Strategy (DWCP) and its influence on Project design	Evaluation of the Project design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there coherence between project activities, outputs, outcome and objectives in the project design? • Is there coherence between the outputs, outcome and objectives as described in the PRODOC and the objectives of the Project? • What specific institutional technical know-how, added value was ILO bringing to Sri Lanka under this project? • How relevant was the contextual analysis during the project design? • Were the planned operational /implementation arrangements effective? What changes were made and how did they impact on the overall implementation of the project? • How was the ILO institutional technical capacity and added value incorporated into the project design? • Was ILO experiences in other projects on migration incorporated into the project design? If so how? • How does the Project outcomes relate to the DWCP, UNDAF and national development plans? • Are the objectives of the project consistent with beneficiaries' requirements and country needs? • Its relevance and justification in relation to the socio-economic aspects of migrant workers. • Its engagement strategy • How are ILO core values and strategic policy aligned

		<p>with the objectives of the project?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project strategically align and support the national priorities and DWCPs?
2	Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How relevant are the activities towards reaching the overall objective of the project? • How effective are the implemented activities towards achieving the desired objectives? • Is the project on track – taking into account the achievement made to date? • What demonstrable success has the project achieved so far? • What contribution has the project made towards supporting the strategic objectives of the ILO, and Sri Lanka DWCP outcomes? • How effective are the management capacities and arrangements put in place support the achievement of result? • Does the project have an effective monitoring plan/mechanism to track the progress of the project? • To what extent are the immediate and intermediate outcomes of the project been achieved? • Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the ultimate outcome and the attainment of its objectives? • Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the intended impacts and effects? • What are the unique or unexpected lessons learnt through the implementation of the project? • What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives to date? • Does each major area of intervention employ

		<p>methodologies and approaches of technical support, management and facilitation that are appropriate and adequate to realize the expected results?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there adequate monitoring of project implementation by ILO, where activities are sub-contracted to Implementing partners?
3	Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How satisfied are the intended beneficiaries with the project outputs? • How inputs to yield results. • Were activities cost-efficient? • Were outcomes achieved on time? • Was the outputs implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives? • Resources allocation and cost, time?
4	Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How effectively has the project built national ownership? • How can the benefits from project be sustained or replicated after the project period? • Can the project approach be up-scaled and institutionalized by national partners or other actors after the project ends and what mechanisms is the project following to institutionalize the key findings/lessons? • What steps have been taken to ensure the sustainability of the project ? • How has sustainability been defined, designed and operationalized in the project? • Is there any clear exit strategy for the project ?

6. METHODOLOGY

The ILO will engage an external consultant to undertake the evaluation. The Consultant will report to the ILO Country Director and the ILO Evaluation Focal Point at the ILO Country will help facilitate & manage the evaluation process.

The Consultant is expected to review periodic progress reports to donors, minutes of National Advisory Committee and Project Advisory Committee meetings, Mission reports, seminar and stakeholder consultation reports any other related documentation that may be required. The evaluator will also meet with ILO staff and partners in Colombo as well as in the field.

6.1. Suggested methodology:

It is anticipated that the following broad areas of work shall form the process of preparation, analysis and report preparation:

- **Development of methodology and work plan.** The contracted consultant will develop a detailed methodology and work plan for meeting the objectives of this TOR. This should include participatory approaches with all stakeholders. These will be submitted to the ILO and agreed prior to commencement of Work.
- **Preparation of background documentation.** As part of the preparation process, the ILO will gather key background documents, and forward these to the consultants.

List of Documents include:

- Project Proposal & Logical Framework
- Progress Reports submitted to the Donor as per reporting guidelines
- All studies and reports produced for and by the Project to support the 4 components
- All other relevant documents and publications
- **Desk Review:** Consultant will review LM project documents and other relevant documents
- **Partner visits/ Field Observation :** MFEPW, SLBFE (Kandy, Anuradhapura and Puttlam for safe migration sensitization sessions) ML&LR, CSOs, Trade Unions, SDC etc
- **Key informant interviews**
FGD The methodology to be followed by the evaluator should include, but need not be limited to the review of documents, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions.
- **Report Formulation and Presentation**

The Evaluator will share the first draft of the findings of the evaluation with the ILO Country office and the project team on the **29th August 2014** to present the preliminary findings for verification. After receiving comments from ILO country office and the technical backstopping units in Bangkok the Evaluator will submit the final Evaluation Report to the Evaluation Manager by **16th September 2014**

7. MAIN DELIVERABLES

The main outputs will be the followings:-

- 1. An report on Preliminary Findings :** on project activities /outputs to be presented to ILO country office
- 2. The final evaluation report with the following contents:**
 - I.** ILO standard title page
 - II.** Executive summary
 - III.** Brief background on the project and its logic
 - IV.** Purpose, scope and clients of evaluation
 - V.** Methodology
 - VI.** Review of implementation
 - VII.** Presentation of finding as per evaluation criteria
 - VIII.** Conclusions
 - IX.** Recommendations (Including to whom they are addressed to)
 - X.** Lessons learnt
 - XI.** Possible future directions
 - XII.** Annexes

The report should be clearly written in English, using Times New Roman 11 point and spacing 1.5.

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

The ILO Evaluation guidelines to *Results-based Evaluation: Principles and rationale for evaluation – Version 1* includes the following criteria for drafting quality recommendations in evaluation reports:

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

In addition to The ILO Guidelines, EVAL has also issued *Guidance for Formatting Requirements for Evaluation Reports*, establishing the following criteria for the drafting of recommendations:

1. Actionable and time-bound with clear indication of whom the recommendation is addressed to,
2. Written in two to three sentences of concise text, (
3. Numbered (no bullet points) and (4) no more than twelve.
4. Also, recommendations must be presented at the end of the body of the main report, and the concise statement should be

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

Evaluation summary (as per ILO standard format): (in word file) the evaluation summary according to ILO template will also be drafted by the evaluation team leader after the evaluation report has been finalized. The evaluation manager will finalise the evaluation summary.

Project scoring matrix (to provide scoring of the project based on ILO evaluation matrix)

The evaluation reports and its contents are the property of the ILO.

ILO management will prepare management response to the evaluation recommendations and action to act upon the recommendations will be undertaken and report to ILO Evaluation Unit.

8. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENT, WORK PLAN AND TIME FRAME

8.1. Evaluation management and roles of evaluators and stakeholders:

The **evaluation manager** is of ILO. He/she will finalise the TOR and be in charge of the selection of the evaluation consultant. The project team in Sri Lanka will handle all contractual arrangements with the evaluator and provide any logistical and other assistance as may be required.

The evaluator(s) reports to the evaluation manager,.

Evaluator's roles: The national independent consultant who has no prior involvement in the project will undertake the evaluation and will be responsible for delivering the above evaluation outputs using a combination of methods mentioned above. **Selection/Qualifications of Evaluator:** One independent national evaluation specialist with a University Degree. He/she should have a proven track record in the evaluation of similar complex projects, experience with country situations similar to that of Sri Lanka. Experience in the field of labour migration will be an advantage.

The tasks of the Project: The project management will provide logistic support to the evaluation and will prepare a more detailed evaluation mission agenda. The project needs to ensure that all relevant documentations are up to date and easily accessible by the evaluator.

8.2. Proposed Work plan and time allocation

Timelines: The work on the evaluation to begin by the 6th August 2014 and the final report to be submitted by 16th September 2014.

Month	Day	Date	Tasks /Activities
July	Wednesday	6 th August	Desk Review – Meeting with Labour Migration Project Team and Programme Team in ILO
	Thursday	7 th	Desk Review; Arranging interviews with stakeholders in Colombo
August	Friday	8 th	Desk Review (continued) Arranging interviews with stakeholders in Colombo
	Sunday	10 th	Departure to Kandy
	Monday	11 th	Visit SLBFE Resource Center in Kandy; interview staff (morning) Visit DS Office, Kandy and interview TOT members, DOs and other officers at DS level including GNs
	Tuesday	12 th	Visit SLBFE Resource Center in Kurunegala; interview staff (morning) Visit DS Office, Kandy and interview TOT members, DOs and other officers at DS level including GNs
	Wednesday	13 th	Visit SLBFE Resource Center in Chilaw ; interview staff (morning) Visit DS Office in Puttalam and interview TOT member, DOs and other officers at DS level including GNs and return to Colombo
	Thursday	14 th	Interview key staff at SLBFE head office: Messrs,Batagoda, (GM) Fernando (AGM International Affairs) , Mrs. Herath (AGM Local Affairs) & Ms. Ratanayake (MoLLR) (whole day)
	Friday	15 th	Interview key staff at SLBFE head office: Mrs. Pathinayake (DGM/ Training) Mr. Wijeratne (DGM/sociology and Welfare) Mr. Randeniya (Foreign Relations)
	Monday Tuesday	18 th -20 th	Interview ACTFORM and CDS representatives in Colombo (morning) and visit staff of 2 training centers of SLBFE (afternoon) Interview Trade Unions in Colombo (CWC) (morning) and representatives from ALFEA and members of the National Committee on Women (afternoon) Interview key staff at MFEPW Secretary, Deputy Director etc (morning) Interview key staff at MEA DG Consular Affairs (afternoon) Interview key staff at Ministry of Justice Mrs. Anusha Abeywickrema Munasinghe (morning)

			Interview key staff of NCPA and Department of Probation and Childcare (afternoon)(the PAC members)
			Interview staff of Asia Foundation (morning) and SDC (afternoon) and Mr. Ruhunage in the afternoon
		21 st – 28 th	Prepare draft report
	Friday	29 th	Submit draft report to ILO
	Monday	8 th	Presentation of draft report to ILO (ILO Conference room)
	Thursday	12 th	Debriefing with selected stakeholders (ILO to invite)
September	Tuesday	16 th	Submit Final Report

The following will be considered minimum contents of the proposal. Please submit in the order listed:

1. Responder's company name or his or her name, business address, the contact person's name, telephone number, fax number and email address (as available).
2. A detailed methodology for meeting the objectives of the ToR.
3. A description of the deliverables and work plan that will identify the major tasks to be accomplished and be used as a scheduling and managing tool, as well as the basis for invoicing.
4. An outline of the responder's background and experience with examples of similar work done by the responder (two evaluation reports).
5. The cost proposal or proposed budget, please provide assumption made when developing this cost proposal.
6. Contact details for at least three organizations who have engaged the responder for similar assignments during the proposal review process

End of the Terms of Reference .

Annex to TOR: Specific Evaluation Criteria

The specific evaluation criteria and the relevant research questions on each criterion are presented as follows:

8.5.1. Relevant and strategic fit of the intervention

- ☐ Is there coherence between project activities, outputs, outcome and objectives in the project design?

Project activities, outputs, outcomes and objectives in the project design are logically interrelated in the form of a log frame which spells out how the above elements fit with one another and with the overall objectives of the project.

- ☐ Is there coherence between the outputs, outcome and objectives as described in the PRODOC and the objectives of the Project?

The . PRODOC clearly mentions the background, the justification for each outcome, and the outputs and activities to be undertaken under each output.

- ☐ What specific institutional technical know-how, added value was ILO bringing to Sri Lanka under this project?

Technical knowhow has been gathered internationally since the organization is mandated to work on labour migration issues. ILO has specialists on mediation with skills on legal aspects. ILO sends requests to its HQ legal division and gets their expertise; ILO has experience with tools in the region in Malaysia and Thailand through ILOs ASEAN triangle project. For example, documents ILO developed on its Vietnamese experience were used for developing Code of Conduct

- ☐ How relevant was the contextual analysis during the project design?

. There was feedback from the relevant the contextual analysis as it highlighted issues and concerns that were developed to frame the PRODOC.

- ☐ Were the planned operational /implementation arrangements effective? What changes were made and how did they impact on the overall implementation of the project?

Implementation arrangements with government agencies were effective. No areas required any changes except at the outset when it was planned to situate project implementation with the MFEPW under an

officer of that ministry. However, this arrangement proved to be unworkable due to personality differences between the particular officer and ILO staff responsible for the execution of the Project. Hence, implementation was shifted from the relevant ministry to the ILO office in Colombo under an officer of the ILO, designated as National Programme Coordinator.

☐ How was the ILO institutional technical capacity and added value incorporated into the project design?

Institutional technical knowhow, regional experience was incorporated into the project; in house expertise such as program officers were also an important resource. For example, in the case of drawing expertise on reintegration, policy briefs on specific issues have been included in the project design

☐ Was ILO experiences in other projects on migration incorporated into the project design? If so how?

Yes, for example, to develop the project on trafficking, ILO drew on experiences from other projects e.g. supporting HIV positive people. For development of materials, cross project collaboration within the ILO was obtained.

☐ How do the Project outcomes relate to the national development plans? Are the objectives of the project consistent with beneficiaries' requirements and country needs?

The Ministry of Labour has a National Labour Migration, Decent Work and National Employment and Human Resources Policy that has components relevant to foreign employment and labour migration.

☐ What is the Project's relevance and justification in relation to the socio-economic aspects of migrant workers?

The Project took very much into consideration their socioeconomic aspects to develop migration guides; the eventual target group consists of migrants from low economic level but heterogeneous backgrounds which makes policy formulation complicated.

☐ What was the Project's engagement strategy?

The key focal point was the MFEPW and the Ministries of Labour and External Affairs. The Project was not limited to one ministry. Coordination was done at the national level.

☐ How are ILO core values and strategic policy aligned with the objectives of the project?

The Projects main emphasis was on protection of migrant workers, rights at work, providing a dignified workplace, working on contracts with focus on wages, health and other benefits, overtime pay and with workers rights to dignity, empowerment and information.

☐ Does the project strategically align with and support the national priorities and DWCPs?

. The Decent Work country programme of the ILO is based on the country's policy on decent work and labour . The Decent work country program of 2014-2017 and strategy support this. Outcomes of the Project contribute to labour migration and developing a strategy to protect migrants

8.5.2. Effectiveness

How relevant are the activities towards reaching the overall objective of the project?

The activities undertaken by the Project are directed toward reaching its overall objectives .

☐ How effective are the implemented activities towards achieving the desired objectives?

They are effective as seen from feedback received from stakeholders who are supportive of what the Project has been able to accomplish so far.

☐ Is the project on track – taking into account the achievement made to date?

Certain events such as the conduct of forums to exchange ideas and experiences have got pushed back to the end of the second year due to unforeseen developments while achievement of some outcomes has been delayed due to the necessity for the Project to follow procedures and guidelines stipulated by government.

☐ What demonstrable success has the project achieved so far?

The standard package of information on safe migration has been extremely successful in empowering the local level officials who now have a ready reference source when imparting information required by clients.. More needs to be done to achieve success in areas such developing a sub policy on reintegration, . Government has listened to SDC partners.

☐ What contribution has the project made towards supporting the strategic objectives of the ILO, and Sri Lanka DWCP outcomes?

Under its Decent Work Country Programme 2008-2012, ILO with its constituents in Sri Lanka have identified the following three priority outcomes:

- Enhanced access to more and better jobs in economically disadvantaged and crisis affected areas;
- Enhanced labour administration and promotion of equitable employment practices;
- Improved tripartite cooperation initiatives linking job security, productivity and competitiveness.

In addition, the Programme mainstreams the following cross-cutting themes: informal economy, gender equality, international labour standards and HIV/AIDS in the workplace.

The Project has made distinct contributions to the achievement of these strategic goals by focusing on the importance of providing (a) reliable information on safe migration to ultimately benefit potential labour migrants so that they could access better jobs in the destination countries and (b) made headway in providing better conditions of work through focusing on administrative procedures that would ensure adequate opportunities for migrant workers to express their grievances and obtain redress for grievances through framing an monitoring of an Operational Manual to be adopted by Sri Lankan missions in destination countries. ,

☐ How effective are the management capacities and arrangements put in place to support the achievement of results?

ILO has a labour migration team consisting of manager, programme assistant and finance and administration assistants who also has technical support from senior programme officer and guidance from the Director and support from regional and HQ labour migration specialists.. This team has been ably supported by the Project Advisory committee representing a variety of partners including labour unions, civil society organisations, and NGOs handling labour migration issues. Regular meetings with the participation of higher level partners including MFEPW, SLBFE and SDC have ensured that the Project not only has their support and approval but also ensured that all project activities are undertaken in a transparent manner.

☐ Does the project have an effective monitoring plan/mechanism to track the progress of the project?

Project's current monitoring method is to rely on reports of important meeting including PAC and circulating minutes of all meetings to stakeholders. These reports focus on outputs of the Project or its products rather than its impacts. The Project has developed a database for feeding inputs obtained through questionnaires administered to its direct beneficiaries and this information which is both quantitative and qualitative will be available for future monitoring and evaluation activities. It is important for the Project to also assist SLBFE to create its own M&E framework to monitor the performance of its DOs.

☐ To what extent have the immediate and intermediate outcomes of the project been achieved?

Overall, about 40% of the outcomes have been achieved. Delay in the last two months was due to delay in recruitment of a programme officer who will come on board from September this year to assist the National Programme Coordinator. This administrative step taken by the ILO will ensure that all remaining activities will be completed on schedule.

☐ Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the ultimate outcome and the attainment of its objectives?

All project activities and outputs have been framed in such a way as to achieve the intended outcomes and objectives of the Project.

☐ Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the intended impacts and effects?

All activities and outputs of the Project are consistent with the intended impacts and effects although the Project presently has no objective system to measure these impacts and effect.

☐ What are the unique or unexpected lessons learnt through the implementation of the project?

The important lessons include (a) the usefulness of working through and with a tripartite constituency (b) the role of bilateral agreements to provide ultimate guarantee of security to migrant workers and (c) the difficulties in conducting reintegration of returnee migrants due to their heterogeneous nature/

☐ What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives to date?

The major factors influencing the achievement of objectives to date are willingness of state and non state stakeholders to communicate with one another on the same forum work toward achieving common objectives and be willing to take guidance from the ILO. The factors influencing non-achievement stem

from the very nature of government bureaucracies such as the MFEPW and SLBFE who are major stakeholders and the need to follow procedures set by ministries including referral of any major activity to subcommittee and awaiting their reports all of which are time consuming.

☐ Does each major area of intervention employ methodologies and approaches of technical support, management and facilitation that are appropriate and adequate to realize the expected results?

Each major area of intervention employs methodologies and approaches of technical support available in house with the ILO and, if not, ILO gets assistance from international or regional experts.

☐ Is there adequate monitoring of project implementation by ILO, where activities are sub-contracted to Implementing partners?

ILO has service contracts given to individual consultants and there is adequate monitoring of the outcomes via email and sharing of documents. And opportunities are given to stakeholders to comment on reports etc. so it is a collective activity.

8.5.3. Efficiency:

- How satisfied are the intended beneficiaries with the project outputs?

Intended beneficiaries including government officers at the divisional and local level are extremely satisfied with safe migration information packages and ToT programmes held by the Project.

☐ How do inputs yield results?

The Project has commenced to conduct district level evaluations for safe migration (05 evaluations, one per district); results are entered into a database. Comments from ToT Groups also go into the database.

☐ Were activities cost-efficient?

ToT programs were held in meeting rooms in local restaurants and not in 5 star hotels.

ILO has internal safeguards for service contracts, seminars, events, and all that has to be justified before any money is spent. However, in the outsourcing of two activities, namely, a feasibility study to set up special mediation boards and evaluation of two pilot projects on reintegration, do not appear to be well advised and have involved an unnecessary expenditure for the Project since in the former case, the Ministry of Justice had made the recommendation for setting up of Special Mediation Board and therefore could have been requested by the Project to follow through on that suggestion. In the latter instance, the materials for preparing a feasibility study were already available in the form of regular reports submitted by the Project to the PAC'

☐ Were outcomes achieved on time?

Although ILO cannot control the pace of the government, it has to go with the flow. Some activities could not be achieved according to the overall work plan as ILO has to consult with tripartite stakeholders and this takes time.

☐ Were the outputs implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives?

There are times when the Project had to change the strategy taking guidance given by the government and other stakeholders but the outcomes have been achieved. The Project looked at alternatives and took other opinions into consideration which promotes ownership.

☐ How efficiently were resources allocated, at what cost and what was the time sequence?

Compared to Phase I which had a delivery rate of 100%, the rate up to end of July for Phase II has been 26% which means that activities undertaken during the latter phase have been less costly. A 100% delivery rate will be achieved once activities are completed during the second phase of Phase II especially when the Project conducts exchange of ideas forum for local, district, regional, national and international levels.

8.5.4. Sustainability:

☐ How effectively has the project built national ownership?

Implementation arrangements are made at the national level through tripartite stakeholders. Documents go as SLBFE documents with ILO assistance. Benefits can be sustained since the Project shares benefits and procedures with all stakeholders.

☐ How can the benefits from the project be sustained or replicated after the project period?

The strategy is to ensure that this will take place, for example, by installing policy changes according to the national plan of action.

☐ Can the project approach be up-scaled and institutionalized by national partners or other actors after the project ends and what mechanisms is the project following to institutionalize the key findings/lessons?

The project approach can be up-scaled and institutionalized by national partners and the project is implemented according to that modality. More impacts could be achieved by spreading the plan to cover other districts with the support of the SLBFE; also the training program planned for DOs will be implemented in such a way that they can apply that knowledge in another capacity or work elsewhere.

☐ What steps have been taken to ensure the sustainability of the project?

The Project's key mechanism to ensure sustainability is the PAC which consists of representatives from both state and non state sectors. Continuity of the PAC will thus be the main guarantee of the Project's sustainability.

☐ How has sustainability been defined, designed and operationalized in the project?

Although this is only a 30 month project, it works at a policy level so that the strategies and formats it has developed can be adopted by relevant state agencies and continued after the Project.

Every step of the way, the project has been designed to ensure this sustainability. Although the ILO staff had to maintain their independence and yet work with the SLBFE and there were personality differences between the two parties at the outset, they were rectified.

For everything the Project does, it gets clearance from the SLBFE and they are proud of the documents that have been developed as they have been a partner in developing them.

☐ Is there any clear exit strategy for the project?

The Project has done a small but important part that indicates a clear path to be followed by concerned implementing agencies, chiefly, the SLBFE. However, the Project has to take additional steps to ensure that the SLBFE will take up the challenge of continuing and expanding on the work done by the Project.

ANNEX 2: DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT USED

AGENCY	PERSONS TO BE INTERVIEWED	QUESTIONS FOR INTERVIEWEES
MFEPW	Secretary	<p>Relevance: Are objectives of the Project consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, needs of the country, global priorities and donors' policies? Are project results or approach strategic and do they include the comparative advantage of the ILO?</p> <p>Effectiveness: At this mid-term stage, How far has the Project been able to achieve its immediate objectives or are expected to be achieved? To what extent did management capacities and arrangements support the achievement of results?</p> <p>Efficiency: How well were resources and inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are economically converted to results?</p> <p>Sustainability: What is the project's contribution to broader, long-term, sustainable development changes in the sector? What is the likelihood that the results of the intervention are durable and can be maintained or even scaled up and replicated by intervention partners after major assistance has been completed?</p>
	Deputy Director	
	Additional Secretary	
ILO	National Programme Coordinator	<p>a. What are the main bottlenecks to program implementation in Phase II?</p> <p>b. What are the roles of the Tripartite Advisory Committee and Project Advisory Committee in regard to selecting priority areas and allocation of Project funds for implementation? Are both committees necessary?</p> <p>c. What concrete steps has the Project taken to address the important gaps identified in the Independent Evaluation of 2013:</p>

Divisional Secretariat Divisions of Puttalam District,, Kurunegala and Kandy	Project's direct beneficiaries including DOs, EDOs, GNs and others	How useful is the training you have received when you wish to educate people about safe migration? Is there sufficient coverage of gender issues in the way information materials have been prepared? What problems have you experienced when taking the information package to the community level?
CWC	How can your organizations contribute to the success of the Project? What are the main problems facing implementation of project activities? What are the remedies you suggest?	
ALFEA		
SLBFE	DGM/Legal	What are the current methods used to handle grievances? What changes do you suggest? What can the Project do to improve the situation?
	DGM/Reintegration	What are the main issues facing reintegration? Is the Project on the right track with regard to handling the reintegration problem? What changes do you suggest?
	DGM/Local Affairs	What are the current plans to develop a training programme for DOs? What are the main issues facing implementation of the programme?
	Staff of District offices	W hat problems do clients bring to the district office? How does the office handle them? What changes are required in the present system?

CSOs		<p>How can CSOs help in expanding project activities in future?</p> <p>Do they see a link up with government agencies as feasible?</p>
------	--	--

ANNEX 3: FINAL WORK SCHEDULE

Date	Tasks /Activities
6 th August (Wednesday)	Desk Review Meeting with Director –ILO and briefing by members of Project Team at ILO
7 th August (Thurs)	Desk Review Meet Secretary, Deputy Director and Additional Secretary of MFEPW
8 th August (Fri)	Desk Review
11 th Aug (Mon)	Interview National Programme Coordinator at ILO Office
12 th Aug (Tues)	Interview DOs at Wennappuwa DS Office
13 th August (Wednesday)	Interview Admin/Finance and NPC at ILO office
14 th Aug (Thurs)	Visit SLBFE Resource Center in Kurunegala; interview DOs
15 th Aug (Fri)	Visit DS Office, at Akurana and Kandy and interview DOs
20 th August (Wednesday)	Interview Mr. Marimuttu of CWC and SDC staff in Colombo office; interview FHSOs at Wennappuwa MOH Office
22 nd (Friday)	Interview representative from ALFEA and visit SLBFE office
25 th August (Monday)	Interview staff at SLBFE office at Battaramulla
29 th August	Submit Draft Report to ILO
9 th September (Tuesday)	Present findings to ILO Team
15 th September (Monday)	Interview SAH and Helvetas representatives in Colombo
16 th September	Present findings to Stakeholders at ILO
22 nd September	Submit Final Report to ILO

ANNEX 4: LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Mr. Nissanka N.Wijeratne - Secretary, MFEPW
Ms. I.T. Weerasinghe - Additional Secretary, MFEPW
Mr. M.A.N Ahamed – Deputy Director, MFEPW
Mr. K. Muthukumarana, DGM, Legal Section, SLBFE
Ms. Kalyani Herath, DGM, Local Affairs, SLBFE
Mr. W.D.A. Sumanasara, Manager, Reintegration and Sociology, SLBFE
Mr. W. Leelarathna, SLBFE Provincial Office, Kurunegala
Mr. K. Marimuttu – Vice President, Ceylon Workers Congress
Mr. W.M. A. Aponso, Immediate Past President of ALFEA
Mr. Jean -Michael Jordan – Director Cooperation, SDC
Mr. Benil Thavarasa - Programme Manager, SDC
Ms. Madushika Lansakara – Programme Manager, SAH
Ms. Katrin Rosenberg – Programme Manager, HELVETAS
Mr. Ranjan Kurian, Project Officer, HELVETAS
Mr. Donglin Li- Director- ILO
Ms. Shafinaz Hassendeen – Senior Program Officer, ILO
Ms. Swairee Rupasinghe - NPC ,ILO

ANNEX 5: PHOTO COVERAGE



Figure 1: Evaluator (in foreground) conducting an FGD session with officers attached to Wennappuwa DS Division (Puttalam District)



Figure 2: Evaluator (background) conducting an FGD session with DOs from Kurunegala District



Figure 3: Two DOs from Wennappurwa DS Office with display of Information Package in Desk Calendar Format Developed by the Project



Figure 4: DO (on the left] with Prospective Female Migrant (seated on right) and relatives inside the crowded DS Office in Gangawata Korale DS Division of Kandy District



Figure 5: 3 FHSOs or midwives (in foreground) who have benefited from cascade training arranged by DO (in the background) from Wennappuwa DS Division



Figure 6: Exhibit of Project Poster on Trafficking on the Notice Board of GN Office in Wennaappuwa DS Division (Courtesy: Ruwan de Silva)



Figure 7: Exhibit of Project Poster on Safe Migration on Notice Board of a GN Office in Wennappuwa DS Division (Courtesy: Ruwan de Silva)